



# **PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT**



## **Consultation Report**

November 2020

## 1. Introduction

This document provides a summary of the responses received during the public consultation period for the Parking Standards SPD and summarises the main issues and outlines where responses have informed changes to the draft SPD.

The SPD comprises layout and design guidance and parking requirements for new development and sets out standards for cars, cycles, scooters, power two wheelers, electric vehicles, disabled and other users and underground and multi-storey parking. It contains parking standards using a zonal approach based on accessibility to public transport, shops and services. It covers a range of other considerations and worked examples for preferred parking design. It brings together three legacy authorities' SPDs into one consolidated SPD to ensure consistency across the BCP area for customers and planning decision makers.

The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications within the BCP Council area. It supports the policies in the Local Development Plan to deliver key outcomes including sustainable housing and economic growth. It helps to prioritise opportunities to walk cycle and use public transport to tackle climate change in line with corporate objectives and measures of success including increased use of public transport, reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> emissions to deliver actions in the council's climate and ecological emergency commitment declared in July 2019. The SPD will also directly contribute to the council's corporate strategy (November 2019) to ensure that sustainability underpins all our policies and work towards achieving a net zero carbon target by 2030 and develop an eco-friendly active transport network.

## 2. Consultation process

Consultation on the Parking Standards, draft supplementary planning document – September 2020 was carried out from 9am 14th September 2020 to midnight 12th October 2020. Comments were invited by e-survey and email.

We consulted with a wide range of residents, developers, landowners and planning agents on the draft Parking Standards SPD, together with statutory consultees and interested stakeholders.

3,214 individual consultation emails or letters were sent out to those on the planning policy database. Posters were sent to all 24 libraries within the BCP council area. An online survey was produced which asked for people's views on the content of the draft SPD. The draft SPD and survey (designed in Snap) were published on the consultation tracker on the BCP website and made available at on each of the platforms (Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole) to inform the public of the consultation.

The consultation was promoted via the main BCP council social media channels on Facebook, Twitter and Linked In, to potentially reach a larger audience. The consultation was featured and promoted in monthly Roads and Travel e-newsletter.

The extent of consultation described in the paragraph above means the Council have met its commitments as set out in the Statement of Community Involvement (2020) by using a variety of means to engage with the community and interested stakeholders in the preparation of planning documents. The consultation also complies with the

statutory requirements as they apply to supplementary planning documents in the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

### 3. Responses to the draft SPD

There were 298 respondents who submitted representations. In terms of responses received, 80% are BCP residents (239), 4% non BCP residents (12), and 16% responded on behalf of an organisation (47). A breakdown is shown below:

Respondent type	Count	Percentage
BCP resident	239	80%
Non BCP resident	12	4%
On behalf of Organisation	37	16%
On behalf of statutory body	2	
On behalf of community group	3	
On behalf of BCP Council	5	

**The main issues expressed by respondents have been grouped into topics. In summary, representations from residents have been mixed or negative, whereas the development industry and those submissions on behalf of organisations were generally more supportive and welcomed the SPD. There were a few comments that the document was too technical but the primary audience to this document is developers and agents and none of the responses from these groups raised any issue to this effect. In summary, the main points raised were as follows:**

- Concern that proposed parking standards are inadequate (161 comments).
- The housing numbers will cause parking pressures (104 comments).
- Proposed parking standards would put pressure on surrounding streets (70 comments)
- There is too much reliance on public transport (63 comments).
- There is not enough choice to travel other than by car (49 comments)
- Traffic congestion is an issue across BCP (39 comments)
- Issues over cycling provision in light of revised national policy (39 comments)

Respondents also commented on a wide range of transport, parking and other topics related to the following themes:

- Electric vehicle charging infrastructure (25 comments)
- Presentation of the document (25 comments)
- High levels of car ownership (24 comments)
- Design requirements (22 comments)
- Need for proper parking enforcement (21 comments)
- Concern over zone definitions (18 comments)
- Disagreement with visitor parking standards (17 comments)
- Need for better transport infrastructure (16 comments)
- Cycle Parking and double deck cycle design (18 comments)
- Car parks (11 comments)
- Disabled parking provision and disability (13 comments)

- Impact on the environment (10 comments)
- Concern about pavement parking (10 comments)
- Concern about town centre strategy and policy (10 comments)
- Concern about parking bay sizes (10 comments)
- Impact on the elderly (9 comments)
- Parking charges (9 comments)
- Playing fields (9 comments)
- Impact on schools (9 comments)
- Saleability of properties with zero/low parking requirements (8 comments)
- Impact on delivery vehicles (8 comments)
- Need for more resident Parking Permits (7 comments)
- Parking/Driveways (13 comments)
- Issue with parking space sizes (6 comments)
- Underground parking (6 comments)
- Impact of standards on development viability/developer profits (11 comments)
- Zone boundaries and definitions (17 comments)
- Improve opportunities to consider greater use of car clubs

Based on the consultation feedback, all representations have been considered and some have led to modification of the draft SPD. Appendix 1 lists in full, the officer response and actions.

A summary of each main issue, a sample of the feedback received, and officer comment is shown below:

### 3.1 Main issue 1: Concern over proposed parking standards

**In general, the residents raised the greatest number of concerns over the proposed lower parking standards, either as a singular issue or as part of their comments on other elements that they found unfavourable. Some respondents felt this would have an overall negative impact on people’s freedom and mobility, saleability of housing and letting commercial premises, the impact of Covid on homeworking, or that car ownership levels will not change.**

*“Provision for parking in residential development is totally inadequate. There should be a minimum of one space provided for each residential unit with 2 parking spaces for units with 3 habitable rooms and above.”*

*“Tables 9 and 10. There is too little car parking provision shown for flats and houses.”*

*“1 car space for 2-bedroom flats/houses in Zone D is inadequate, especially as this is meant to include visitors & delivery vehicle parking - the same comment/concern applies to Table 12 (HMO).”*

*“Require a minimum of one off-street spaces per household.”*

*“I think that the plans for the properties being built without parking spaces is outrageous! Make more parking spaces available at the development to prevent neighbouring roads being crowded with cars.”*

*“Change your approach to parking. Not providing residential properties with parking only increases the developers profit making housing planning more dense. It doesn’t suddenly lead to people selling their cars!”*

*Failure to provide on-site car parking will mean that apartments are unsaleable and commercial premises difficult to let.*

**Officer comment:** The council recognises the concern regarding reducing provision of parking however the SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative, safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. BCP Council has significant housing and other development pressures to meet the long term needs of the area. The right balance between promoting modal shift and deliverability needs to be reached. In July 2019, the Council declared its commitment to addressing a Climate and Ecological emergency. This has given rise to a fundamental shift in corporate direction to take more direct action through new ways of working to reduce carbon emissions and meet a target of net zero carbon emissions by 2030. It is a fundamental aim of this SPD to promote modal shift to more sustainable travel. However, following the consultation feedback it is recognised that there are circumstances where variation to the proposed standards will be sought depending on the nature and location of the development. Hence, the SPD clarifies how variations to standards, in terms of increases or reductions, can be considered.

A sample of comments received in support of Parking Standards, mainly from the development industry.

**Submissions on behalf of the development industry were generally more supportive of the SPD. Where respondents commented on behalf of organisations, feedback was more positive in terms of the aims and objectives of the SPD. It was widely agreed that there was a need for a consolidated SPD to ensure that parking requirements were applied consistently across BCP. There was also a deeper understanding of the need to reduce carbon emissions and address climate change by encouraging modal shift.**

*“I would like to commend the Council for taking an active approach to reaching the national target of net-zero emissions by 2050. The Council recognises its responsibility to make the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole region carbon neutral ahead of 2050 and in making its operations carbon neutral by 2030. Reviewing parking standards to reduce car dependency and increase cycle provisions indeed works positively towards this outcome.”*

*“In 2019 BCP Council rightly declared a climate emergency that, on its own, demands a shift in the way that we travel, and think about movement. BCP’s Councils proposed Parking Standards SPD is an honest step towards recognising that we need to use policy at a local level to have a positive impact on the environment and the places we live and work. The nature of car ownership and usage has been changing as has the number of young people learning to drive (down 20% in the past 10 years) and we need to adapt and move with the times. The pandemic has offered us a once in a lifetime opportunity to hit reset and to think about how we live, work and travel. As an urban designer it is often frustrating how we prioritise the storage of vehicles over the creation of good urban placemaking. These policies at a wider level provide the opportunity to reduce car dependency, help improve air quality, reduce obesity and provide young people*

*more freedom to move about their neighbourhood safely. At a site level they afford the opportunity to increase density, provide more affordable homes, increase open space and to reduce the amount of paved areas that is required- thus reducing the heat island effect. This SPD is a step in the right direction and these measures to reduce car ownership in urban areas need to be balanced with a positive set of policies to implement and support walking, cycling and public transport across the conurbation.”*

*“Fully supports BCP Council’s policies on moving towards a lesser reliance on private cars and promoting car free developments within developments in Zone A, specifically in respect of residential, student accommodation and commercial developments within this zone. Also notes that the previous (and currently adopted) parking standards have acted as an impediment to development within the main centres. This is due to the substantial cost associated within providing basement parking, which is the approach which has been required to deliver car parking to meet the adopted Car Parking SPD standards. By removing the previous onerous car parking standards within the main centres, WJG considers that this will ‘unlock’ the redevelopment of sites within the main centres. Entirely supportive of the new draft parking standards and fully welcomes the proposed changes. The parking standards of zero provision in Zone A for ‘C3 Flats’ and ‘C3 House’ is entirely appropriate and reasonable given the urban town centre location and proximity to the public transport, services and shopping facilities. Fully supportive of the parking standards set out for ‘Sui Generis Student Accommodation’ in Zones A, B and C which is ‘Nil: use public car park’. Also, fully supportive of the introduction of Zone A zero car parking for commercial and retail uses, and agrees that this will encourage commuting workers, shoppers, and visitors to use the strong sustainable travel options in these locations. This will certainly assist the Council’s aims of tackling climate change and a low carbon future.”*

*“Overall: The draft SPD is welcome, and we support the objectives therein. The key objectives listed at 1.2.3 are supported, they are aligned with those of the constituent Development Plans and Local Transport Plans. They are suitably ambitious but crucially deliverable. We are pleased to see BCP Council remedy the current misalignment in parking standards across the single urban area. We are pleased to see added emphasis given to cycle parking; the health benefits of cycling, promoted through secure storage and convenient access, should not be overlooked. The zonal approach is supported where underpinned by evidence and opportunity.”*

*“We are very supportive of the aim to efficiently manage parking associated with new development and the impact this itself can have on on-street parking.”*

*“Seems straightforward.”*

*“We welcome the draft SPD on parking standards in general, as it appears to promote sustainable modes of transport and forward-looking policy making.”*

*“The optimum vehicle parking standards for HMOs within both C4 (3-6 residents) and Sui Generis (7+ residents) use classes are proposed to be 1 per HMO regardless of zoning. This is supported, demonstrating action towards reduced car dependency through lowered requirements that should be applied accordingly.”*

*“Even though we welcome proposals regarding increasing the size of car parking sizes and the Council’s new approach to no car parking requirements in the town centres, we are mostly concerned that the new requirements set out in this SPD*

*have not been viability tested. Although we applaud the Council's intention to reduce carbon emissions further in new developments, new policy should only be introduced when it is viability tested in addition to other requirements of the Local Plan and tested at Examination in Public, to ensure that BCP Council can deliver upon its Local Plan housing requirements."*

*Our client welcomes the publication of a single Parking Standards SPD, which provides consistent guidance for new development across the conurbation. Our client also recognises and supports the overarching objective of the SPD to encourage sustainable development, with an emphasis on promoting increased cycling and walking and other new sustainable modes of transport.*

*"Change nothing. I am happy with the draft parking standards document as it is. I particularly approved of the zonal approach towards parking in BCP, and frequently disagree with the popular narrative that all developments, regardless of location must provide extensive parking. As our conurbation is the 3rd most congested city region in the UK, we really must ask ourselves how many more cars we can store and fit onto our roads before breaking point is reached (if you ask me, that was about 10 years ago). I see very little reasoning why city centre developments should have parking, being that the centres of population have good public transport links in all 3 towns, particularly rail access but also buses for local travel within the conurbation. Moreover, people will have a choice whether to buy or move into these properties, so it isn't as if they're being forced into a low-car lifestyle. Plus, with the recently expanded Beryl bikeshare it really is now easier than ever before to get around the local area without relying on a car, and this will only change with TCF investment. Furthermore, I also think the extensive section on bicycle parking is important, as it provides example of often overlooked bikes that don't always get catered for, cargo bikes, longtails, handcycles etc. So, I'm glad to see that Sheffield stands are widely promoted as they remain some of the most flexible and inclusive parking options. Likewise, the inclusion of entrance curbs also gets my approval, as dropped pavements are poor for people using mobility aids and uncomfortable for pedestrians to walk on. I have nothing more to add except that I support the draft parking stands in their entirety and wish to see this rolled out across BCP council when it comes to planning and development decisions. If you need any reference I am mainly a motorist who pre-lockdown did around 20,000 miles a year driving across the country, so please note I am not coming with any agenda other than I think our urban areas would be far nicer if we were less reliant on vehicles, and I'm glad the PSSPD supports this."*

### 3.2 Main issue 2: The housing numbers will cause parking pressures

**Respondents raised issues such as lack of free parking on surrounding streets, and the existing significant parking pressures in the area. The economic impact on town centres to encourage visitors at night. There was also concern that the SPD doesn't consider the impact of high-density development for Poole town centre. Suggestions included building multi-storey car park on surface car parks and providing permit parking for residents.**

*"Change your decision to even build houses let alone car parking spaces. This part of Poole is already too built up to have any more residents. It would be bedlam just trying to travel around the area with so many more residents."*



*"Remove the need for further homes in the area, the current lay of the land is already overcrowded and the traffic usage at peak times becomes untenable. Why have the council deemed it fit to further increase the dwellings of the area (Hamworthy/Turlin/Upton) to the degree that they do not provide adequate parking..."*

*"A zero approach to parking will encourage even more displaced parking in areas in Old Town Poole and East Hamworthy that already have parking issues with workers commuting to the town centre."*

*"The idea that extremely high-density housing developments might be built in Poole Old Town with ZERO parking provision for residents or visitors is impractical."*

*"Nowhere near enough parking, gross overdevelopment on in an area already struggling with traffic."*

*"Change the plans to build new homes on our green area playing fields at Turlin Moor in Hamworthy - it is destructive and will seriously compromise the health and well-being of those of us who have lived here for many years. We simply do not have the capacity to cope with the increased traffic, parking problems and lack of infrastructure in place."*

*"The current proposal will create a nightmare for existing residents. What level of car traffic have you assumed will be generated by this overly dense development?"*

*"None. I am very much in favour of development of Poole and Hamworthy area as much of it has been in decline. I am however concerned that the impact of hundreds of flats without parking allocation will lead to overflows, poor parking and dangerous roads. As a parent and cyclist in Poole, this greatly concerns me. Can the planners please advise how many homes will not have parking spaces and where they expect the average 1.3 cars per household to park?"*

**Officer comment:** The council notes the concern about government housing targets. To mitigate the impacts of anti-social parking, the council can use parking restrictions, such as Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) or where appropriate resident permit schemes (RPS). The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. It is a corporate strategy priority to deliver dynamic places and invest in the homes our communities need. The council has committed to increase overall housing supply and ensure all residents have access to good quality housing in order to create a sustainable, vibrant and inclusive economy.

### 3.3 Main issue 3: proposed parking standards would put pressure on surrounding streets

**Many respondents were concerned that reducing the amount of on-site parking would lead to additional parking pressure on surrounding streets. There was concern with town centre locations that existing pressure that could be exacerbated without adequate controls being introduced. Suggestions put forward alternative provision for residential uses, from 1 space per bedroom to a 2 spaces minimum requirement per dwelling.**

*"There has to be a holistic approach that includes management of on street parking. At present we have a complete mis-mash of on street parking and parking*



*enforcement. We have roads with parking restrictions that are not policed by enforcement officers. We have roads with no parking restrictions, which is very unusual, for a town centre location, these prime parking positions are often occupied by the same vehicle for days, weeks and in some cases months. We do not appear to have any resident parking schemes and we do not appear to have any clear joined up policy of charging for on street parking.”*

*“Although I commend the reduction in traffic, I do not think the removal of car parking spaces in new accommodation blocks will stop residents using cars. But will encourage them to seek parking in nearby streets etc and cause further problems in the Poole town and surrounding areas.”*

*“Providing no parking, or even 1 parking space for 3 bedroom houses will not work as the people who live in these houses will be forced to park elsewhere which will simply create further traffic build up throughout the entirety of Hamworthy and the length of the Blandford Road.”*

*“Improve the quality of our roads by reducing the amount of traffic on them. 400 new homes equal 1200 possible more cars in Hamworthy. Hamworthy is not big enough to support this.”*

*“If you design out where people are going to park (especially zones A and B) where are people going to park, there are none or very few provided with the new dwelling and anything on road is being actively designed out. It will just move to illegal, double parking etc.”*

*Need more parking as the reality is that people use cars. Limiting parking will just lead to dangerous or illegal parking nearby.*

*Inadequate parking standards result in overcrowded streets, and vehicles parked on pavements or close to junctions. Most homes will therefore require at least 2 spaces per property in these areas.*

**Officer comment:** The council acknowledges areas of existing parking stress are present in BCP. It is a corporate strategy priority to deliver dynamic places by developing sustainable infrastructure and implement a sustainable travel strategy, develop proposals for sustainable mass transit systems. The council is undertaking a Strategic Car Parking Review to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD.

### 3.4 Main issue 4: there is too much reliance on public transport

**Concern was raised about the impact of Covid, stating that it has undermined the confidence of passengers travelling on public transport. Suggestions included altering zone boundaries to align even more closely with high frequency public transport corridors.**

*“You cannot force people on to public transport and it will only gain momentum once transport replicates the personal comfort and safety of the car [a car is a perfect isolation pod - think Covid]! Also traffic free town centres are coming, they need to be truly traffic free however park and ride and/or periphery parking must be seriously considered.”*

*“I am concerned at the reliance on cycling and public transport. It is unrealistic to expect people to buy in new developments without adequate parking. It leads to confrontation and arguments. The area is already having problems because of the*

*force feeding of cycling to people who for many reasons need a car. I think it is a very thought out document.”*

*We simply do not have the capacity to cope with the increased traffic, parking problems and lack of infrastructure in place.*

**Officer comment:** The council acknowledges the increased reliance on public transport. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. The long-term impact of Covid on public transport usage is unknown at this stage, however it is assumed that demand for public transport will recover. The corporate strategy is clear on the direction of travel in terms of working towards zero carbon. Public transport will improve through achieving measures of success including strengthening the Quality Bus Partnership to provide higher quality bus services for residents to encourage increased usage, delivering an integrated smart travel app by 2023 and developing a communications campaign to promote sustainable travel to residents, schools, businesses and visitors by April 2021.

### 3.5 Main issue 5: there is not enough choice to travel other than by car

**Some respondents commented that there needs to be more frequent and wider accessibility by bus if a reduction in car use is proposed. There were comments that residents need their cars to travel outside the BCP area. Other respondents with mobility needs were concerned that care givers would not be able to park nearby to attend to their medical needs.**

*“There are insufficient alternatives to using cars. There will not be adequate provision by the time large sites are delivered in zones A and B. There will be considerable car ownership and use.”*

*“There should not be a reduction in parking spaces without a massive input of a variety of transport schemes which are affordable.”*

**Officer comment:** The council recognises some locations do not benefit from a wide range of travel choices. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change.

### 3.6 Main issue 6: traffic congestion is an issue across BCP

**Respondents concerned that that existing traffic congestion in BCP would get worse as a result of new housing development. Several suggestions were made to address congestion by reducing the amount of new housing or stopping entirely the SPD approach.**

*“The piecemeal approach will only lead to confusion and anger as well as increasing vehicle movements. A much better solution would be to find space between the road and the cliff edge (currently mostly scrub land) for a cycle lane which would remove cyclists from the roads used by cars.”*

*“It seems the council are unaware off the mass traffic congestion in Hamworthy and Upton. Or the extreme lack of parking for current residents with some households who have to park at least a street away from their residence. Your document fails to*

*suggest how you would resolve this. More to the point it appears your current housing plan will significantly affect the local population having a detrimental effect on their lives.”*

*“Don’t do any of it it’s going to cause a nightmare for traffic”.*

*“How do you propose safe cycling with inadequate roads mass house building which is scandalous.”*

**Officer comment:** The council notes that traffic congestion is an issue across the conurbation. However, the aim of the SPD is to provide detail on parking requirements for new development within the BCP area. As such operational matters on the highway are outside the scope of this SPD.

### 3.7 Main issue 7: Issues over cycling provision in light of revised national policy

**Some respondents commented on the amount of guidance on cycle provision with views mixed on the details required. the development industry generally supported greater clarity on the type and location of cycle facilities. Additional responses were made direct reference to the publication of national guidance (LTN 1/20) and policy (Gear Change) for cycle provision.**

*“While many bike types have been mentioned, proposed stands do not cater for all types: • to cover off disability bikes, trikes and other accessible vehicles inclusion of 'priority' stands with more width (widths are not mentioned) • Standard narrow, covered and 2-tier racks are too narrow for many bikes and essentially useless. With more and more 'fat tyre' cargo and ebikes (with tyres over 2.2 inch) many of the racks will not be useable.”*

*“The university feel the draft cycle space ratios set out in Table 20 present a potential risk to future development proposals given the university has circa 19000 students. The university would welcome a more holistic view of cycle parking quantum/provision across an HE campus site to be considered by the Local Planning Authority when considering future planning applications.”*

*“In terms of cycle spaces, 0.5 per habitable room is proposed for C4 HMOs and 1 per habitable room for Sui Generis HMOs as optimum levels. In principle this is supported, however a degree of flexibility and case-specific review should be undertaken in order to ensure that requirements are reasonable, particularly in the Sui Generis case. This would include consideration of the location, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure as well as public transport accessibility.”*

*“Bournemouth University feel that double deck cycle parking storage provides a good quality, space efficient option for future proofing increased demand for cycling provision to support the objectives of the BU Travel Plan. Finding physical space to locate high quality parking facilities which aligns to the draft layout and design guidance in the document will be challenging, especially given the Higher Education cycle parking ratios for HE students and FTE staff outlined in Table 20. We would like the guidance to acknowledge that consideration to use double deck cycle parking storage be considered on a contextual basis of any application.”*

**Officer comment:** The council welcomed the support for enhancing cycling provision. It should be noted that government policy has strengthened the need to promote active

modes of travel into new developments as a core requirement. This aligns with Local Plan policies and corporate strategy priorities to embed sustainability in BCP council's new ways of working to achieve zero carbon targets and prioritising an eco-friendly and active transport network. The consultation feedback has informed several changes to the SPD, recognising that additional clarity is required on some aspects of cycle provision.

### 3.8 Main issue 8: strengthen the consistency of parking zone boundaries

**This has been identified as a main issue to address as feedback suggests improvements should be made to the boundary maps. There were several responses which questioned the criteria applied to zones and accessibility to public transport. Suggestions were made to extend existing zones to include all sustainable transport corridors, or to create a new zone**

*“One side of the Penn Hill local centre is in Zone B, one in Zone D. The ability to make appropriate and optimum use of sites in the area is currently constrained by the parking availability and the need to comply with parking standards which would be significantly less onerous were the boundary moved a short distance to incorporate the local centre. Making that change would facilitate ongoing investment in the area, delivering enhancement to the existing buildings to deliver additional housing and allow greater flexibility in terms of the development which may be delivered. That will, in turn support the vitality and viability of the local centre and the range of businesses located there.”*

*“We support the zonal approach but consider that sustainable public transport corridors reflected in the Poole Local Plan should be applied in terms of parking levels along these corridors.”*

*“ Supports the zonal approach on which the parking standards are applied on a hierarchical zonal basis within the BCP area, reflecting differing accessibility levels. Agrees that within ‘Zone A – Main Centres’, there is high accessibility to public transport, services, shops and other facilities, as well as car ownership being a lot lower than the BCP average. Therefore, agrees that the current stringent car parking requirements should be significantly relaxed, and zero car parking should be promoted. This is consistent with town centres and cities throughout the country where local authorities have taken advantage of these benefits and promote moving towards zero car parking in such areas.”*

*“The zonal approach is supported where underpinned by evidence and opportunity.”*

*“Parking Zones map to better reflect the actual sustainability of sites and their access to sustainable transport options. The map largely draws boundaries between parking zones along the centre lines of roads. This leads to the anomalous situation whereby two sites on the opposite sides of the same road essentially are classed as having different levels of sustainability and have differing parking standards despite having identical accessibility to public and sustainable transport modes and in many cases being highly sustainably located. “*

*“Improve/change the zone definitions, particularly Zone B, and increase the number of parking spaces available for homes in these areas. Many of the district centres listed (such as Moordown and Broadstone) are miles from a main line railway station, while others (Ashley Cross, Hinton Admiral) are in close proximity.”*

*“The SPD identifies four hierarchical zones across the conurbation, which reflect their differing accessibility levels. Whilst this approach is accepted, the zones downplay the disparity of accessibility by other modes of transport to the car between Zones A and B, and Zones C and D. Zones C and D are generally inaccessible by train and suffer from infrequent and indirect bus services. On this basis greater flexibility over parking provision in new development is required in these locations, until more viable alternative modes of transport are available.”*

**Officer comment:** The council welcomes the suggested alterations to parking zone boundaries. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. The consultation has informed changes to the zone boundaries on the map to better reflect the actual sustainability of sites, their access to sustainable transport options, local shops and services in Penn Hill, Broadstone, and between Christchurch and Tuckton, Westbourne, Boscombe and Lansdowne to Pier.

### 3.9 Main issue 9: Electric vehicle charging infrastructure (EVCI), specifications and requirements

**Several respondents commented on the EVCI provision as being an additional cost to development viability, for affordable and market housing. Some concern was expressed that the requirements were in excess of what is needed for commercial or medical organisations and their business users. Other respondents were supportive of the approach for incorporating EVCI into new development, recognising the benefits to health, air quality, and carbon emissions.**

*“Support for EVCI which meets future requirements.”*

*“The need for EVC, the requirement for new developments to include charging points for electric cars. This could easily add £3k+ per car parking space and we question the percentages for active and passive ChargePoint provision set out in Table 1.” (Development Company)*

*“Why are there not more charging points for electric vehicles?”*

*“It is noted that this effectively requires that every new residential building with an associated car parking space must have at least one EVCP. However, the Government's preferred option is to introduce a new functional requirement under Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations, which was expected to come into force in the first half of 2020 but is awaited. The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations will introduce a standardised, consistent approach to EVCP in new buildings across the country.”*

*In my view any residential development in any zone should have as a minimum 100% “passive“ provision for electric car charging. It is absolutely the way forward and 7 or 22Kw “active” charging should be available to at least 50% of the households to charge overnight.*

**Officer comment:** It is essential that the council seeks to future proof development in line with government priorities to drive the transition towards a cleaner future for road transport and better air quality, through the Road to Zero Carbon Strategy 2018. Leading communities towards a cleaner more sustainable future is at the heart of the BCP Corporate Strategy. Specifically, for **dynamic places**, to develop sustainable infrastructure, for **fulfilled lives** to



promote happy, active and healthy lifestyles, for a **sustainable environment** to develop an eco-friendly active transport network. The SPD will also contribute towards delivering measures of success including the council's net zero carbon target by 2030. The SPD sets out the context for the future transition to electric vehicles and recognises that the EVCI is a developing technology. Notwithstanding this, the SPD seeks to enable parking in new development to meet the requirements set out to ensure that development provides electric vehicle charging facilities where parking is proposed. Therefore, only where car parking is provided, will it be expected to meet the EVCI requirements, therefore car free development will have a zero electric vehicle parking requirement. In response to the consultation, the SPD has been amended to clarify that flexibility will be applied to the EVCI requirements subject to up to date and robust evidence demonstrating different business needs, user types and usage.

### 3.10 Other issues

**A less frequent number of other matters were raised primarily by respondents representing specialist segments of the development industry, including elderly persons accommodation and care provision and retail operators.**

“Housing for older and disabled people covers a wide range of accommodation from simple age restricted accommodation including retirement living/sheltered housing with little care or staffing but where some (but not all) residents can be expected to be car drivers, through to Extra Care development where some care and more staffing is provided. It is therefore too simplistic to base parking requirements for all forms of elderly persons housing on staffing. For such forms of development, any application of standards should be based on the parking needs of residents with some consideration to staffing. It is noted too that presently this is the same standard as proposed to be applied to residential care homes. The approach there may well be correct as staffing levels will be high and resident's needs, very low. It is therefore most strongly recommended that parking requirements for these form of development are best left to the evidence of the applicant and based on the exact type of development which is proposed and is locational characteristics. If this is not regarded as acceptable, it is suggested that a range be presented between 0.33 and 0.75 spaces per apartment (which are likely to always be one or two bed). This should allow for discussion and negotiation within that range as individual applications come forward.

**Officer comment:** The council welcomes the additional information regarding care provision and parking demand. Additional clarity and minor adjustments have been made to the requirement to harmonise perceived imbalances between differing use classes.

## 4. Summary and conclusions

The findings of the consultation were that the SPD was less well received by residents than by the development industry. Many respondents raised a wide range of issues, commenting on multiple sections in the draft SPD.

The SPD has been amended to respond to and address relevant issues raised and provide greater clarity on matters of detail, including:

- Rearrangement of sections that make the document easier to navigate, including grammatical and other identified corrections;
- Strengthening the cycle parking requirements applicable to different types of development;
- Providing further clarity on where variations from the standards may be considered;
- Clarification on the electric vehicle charging requirements applicable to different types of development;
- Closer harmonisation of the parking requirements for similar use classes;
- Improvements to the zonal mapping in line with suggested alterations;
- Inclusion of additional guidance for underground and multi-storey developments;
- Clarity on opportunities to deliver car clubs.



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD1	<p>3.6.4 The council requires applications for new development or material change of use to provide EV charge points that comply with Table 1. This meets current requirements. The most cost-effective approach is to do the provisional as part of all New developments while being built which future proofs the site and makes adding more charging points much more cost effective due to the reduction in disruptive and costly civils. Average age of a vehicle in UK is 8 years, constraints on EV car supply are the stopping point however, this is changing fast and much more charge points are or will be needed. There also exists significant income opportunities which is a consideration re BCP income/funding. 3.6.5</p> <p>The EVCI charge requirements increase in line with the number and intensity of usage as set out in Table 2. Table 2 Charge point Specification EV Charging Requirement Charging point Spec Power Requirements Correct Market Terminology Comments</p> <p>Individual Fast Charge Socket 7kw Mode 3 with Type 2 Connector 230v AC 32 Amp Single Phase dedicated supply 7kW is a slow charge &amp; just above what is classified as trickle charge 3-7kW for residential overnight charging is fine long dwells of 6+ hours Low cost Communal Fast Charge Socket Feeder pillar or equivalent permitting future connection 230v AC 32 Amp Single Phase dedicated supply 11-22kW is a fast charge Market avg is already 11kW 22kW load balanced future proofs requirements in destination charging ie staying 2+ hours, think opportunistic charging ie I may as well top up, drivers rarely empty Low to Moderate cost and can be offset. Intensive Communal Fast Charge Socket 50kw Mode 4 (DC) Multi standard charge point 400v AC 100Amp Triple Phase dedicated supply Known as a Rapid Charge not fast. No need for 50kW in communal Charge. If logistic charge ie major arterial routes then 50-150kW in areas of 1-2 hour dwell time. 350kW+ for fuel station approach. High infrastructure cost Concern about this area as may have been written within a defined availability of the EV evolutionary process, consumer and market considerations. The strategy on this needs to reflect on what the future will be not a rush which may be limited due to these considerations being missed or by those who have not had a full experience of EV or a comprehensive driving exposure so... After Home Charging where most charging is and will take place you have 2 main types... Opportunistic i.e. Workplace or destination i.e. supermarket, cinema, retail, leisure...you may as well top up why you are parked; suitable for AC, if people travelling from long distances to a local destination then a sprinkling of 25-50kW - DC could be considered - some key issues surrounding location and choice here...but infrastructure on 50Kw+ is very high...why not incentivise people travelling in to stay longer, enjoy the destination and spend more in to the advantage of the local economy,as opposed the encouragement of a quick drop off or in a then leave as they grab what they need.</p>	<p>Support noted. The requirements reflect on current best available guidance and government policy for decarbonising transport and complies with the NPPF 2019 to ensure adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>Another interesting aspect arises out of analysis of user habits projected forward vis charge point Kw's. 25Kw DC charge points are being targeted for the destination segment while other solutions may be too slow or too fast. 25Kw could be the ideal solution in most circumstances where customer dwell time is just right with home charging proving, and in my opinion will prove, to be the major segment for very specific reasons. Interesting also that this is a key strategic decision as the laying down, cabling and hardware costs are so different per Kw strength. The other consideration is that AC v DC charging is becoming the new Petrol v Diesel key strategic debate as we look forward to the growth in charging?</p> <p>3.6.6 Where communal facilities are provided, considered management practices are expected to resolve. This should be in advance any leasehold and freehold consents and or responsibilities regarding use, payments, charges or approvals. Such communal facilities must be capable of simultaneous use. Very obvious, but doesn't tackle the how or support it. If apartment blocks will the council encourage refurbishment to include/support the addition of EV. Currently Government if/is focused on New Build, why not set a standard for refurbishment that is inclusive of EV? This could be part of a council scheme with a funding model that pays council back through utilisation or offset at the very least.</p> <p>3.6.7 The provision of EVCI on-street is permitted in exceptional circumstances where on site constraints eliminate all other methods of onsite provision. Details will require agreement with the Local Planning Authority to ensure that such features do not result in highway safety issues. Additionally, a TRO will be required for any on-street bays. Obvious but again doesn't allude to any or suggested strategy....</p>	
<b>PSSPD2</b>	<p>Provide management summary of how the plans differ from current status quo. Lack of any such summary gives impression that Council will use points hidden in reams of technical detail to ignore residents' genuine concerns. Why have you omitted any management summary?</p>	<p>This is set out in the Cabinet Report. Executive Summary is set out on page. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD3</b>	<p>There needs to be an accommodation to 'park' mobility scooters in the dry. They are expensive and when they must be left outside, they should be sheltered. In shopping areas as well as at home. Not just sheltered housing.</p>	<p>Impractical to provide sheltered parking for mobility scooters everywhere. In large retail and leisure activity uses covered mobility scooter parking could be required. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD4</b>	<p>Please add a plan to penalise motorists who park vehicles on pavements, which always causes a hazard and/or obstruction to pedestrians. Why does there appear to be no plan to penalise motorists who park vehicles on pavements, which always causes a hazard and/or obstruction to pedestrians?</p>	<p>Outside the remit of the Parking SPD. However, this is currently subject to a government consultation on pavement parking. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD5</b>	Without control of public transport, the entire document is pie in the sky. Where I live the public transport is abysmal. Why do you think it will change?	Government currently have no intention of reversing deregulation of the bus market and consequently the council does not have direct control of the public transport system. The council is working with the bus operators to enhance the bus network and increase bus frequency along main corridors to support housing growth. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD6</b>	Several typing errors with repeated words and/or repeated multiword phrases throughout the document. This gives an impression of unprofessionalism. Throughout the document there is a sense of enmity to private cars. Even if this is what is intended it could/will alienate many members of the community. If the community is to provide cycle parking facilities; should the costs involved not be recouped by cyclist parking charges?	The reason for the Parking SPD is to ensure the Council has a single, up-to-date and consistent framework for parking standards for new developments across the BCP area. Having an updated set of parking standards will ensure that the Council's approach to parking requirements assists with the delivery of viable development aligns with BCP Corporate Strategy objectives of contributing to carbon reduction and promotes modal shift to more sustainable travel to recognise the council's commitment to respond to the climate and ecological emergency. Action: None
<b>PSSPD7</b>	Change schools parking to allow access for Disabled Teachers	Noted. Disabled parking is a requirement for new developments as set out in Appendix A. Action None.
<b>PSSPD8</b>	Little mention of business impact in Christchurch or Bournemouth. It was mentioned in Poole existing standards.	Noted. The Parking Standards SPD provides detailed guidance for developers and applicants, it is outside the scope of the document to make an analysis of business impacts. However, the zonal approach is applied on the basis of differing accessibility levels. It is assumed that where there is greater accessibility, there will be greater opportunity to travel by public transport, cycle and walk. There is also an emphasis on car sharing. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD9</b>	Yes and no respectively to the two questions in the initial paragraph	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD10</b>	In theory a good idea to encourage more local use of alternative transport but it is necessary to ask yourselves what happens when the need arises to travel further afield. Residents and visitors will still need to have their cars to venture out of the area so will need them to be parked somewhere. Where is it proposed to accommodate all the present and future vehicles? Also why is current planning focusing entirely on alternative means of travel instead of ALL means of travel including cars?	Noted. This is outside the remit of the Parking Standards SPD. Action None.
<b>PSSPD11</b>	The 5M set back for gated access will stop vehicles waiting in the road while gate opens BUT will still block pavement an improvement is required. Could not find any detail on entrants to car parks, I am thinking of the Sandbanks car park entrance which is a mess and needs a proper solution not mobile bollards as used for many Years this needs to be added.	Highways issue and outside the remit of the Parking SPD. This will be addressed via the emerging Strategic Car Parking Review. Action None.
<b>PSSPD12</b>	More CCS charging points.	Highways issue and outside the remit of the Parking SPD. This will be addressed via the emerging Strategic Car Parking Review. Action None.
<b>PSSPD13</b>	I believe the council needs to get the town centre plan better organised/optimised and more interesting to encourage a greater foot fall. Old Christchurch road, needs a comprehensive overhaul to start with. BCP is working with developers to enhance the carparks with majority residential development, there for the means are available to pinpoint locations within the town centre and encourage landlords to follow a theme with shop fronts. Put the love back into the town! Parking for all and any vehicle should be assessed on an individual basis.	Outside the remit of the Parking SPD. Action None.
<b>PSSPD14</b>	No - seems straightforward	Noted.Action: None
<b>PSSPD15</b>	Any new houses built should have parking at the front of the property rather than gardens	Noted. Parking provision should be secured where it enhances the quality of the built environment. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD16</b>	5.9 Residents Parking Schemes (RPS) - Change 5.9.3. Restricted access to parking permits for residents.	Noted. The purpose of the restriction is to encourage active travel and reduce congestion and is counter-intuitive to allow parking for all residents who are able to travel by public transport, cycle or walk. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD17</b>	Change' para 3.3.7 so it does not start 'These These.... 'clear up' numbers on the bottom of pages stops at 62 where the count at the tops says' 63 of 63, so you've lost one somewhere. Never before have I read such an in depth document solely on the subject of parking, one that I would have thought should and maybe would have been written many years ago when we first had cars and bicycles. The section on types of bicycles was if not thorough but rather unnecessary as they all are basically the same except for the one with a chair on the front which would be unstable. When I was at work we had to produce a document on our current working practises, and as the Company had an office in every county more or less, we 'borrowed' one from another county and altered it so it applied to ours. I am sure your 63 or 62 pages could be adapted for other counties to save them a lot of work.	Noted. The purpose of the Parking SPD is to provide detailed guidance for developers. This includes providing content which helps in designing better parking provision. Action None.
<b>PSSPD18</b>	Change - cancel the entire proposal. It has been reported that other local authorities who have introduced similar schemes have had to remove them due to residents' complaints, added traffic congestion and an increase in vehicle emissions in local roads. The piecemeal approach will only lead to confusion and anger as well as increasing vehicle movements. A much better solution would be to find space between the road and the cliff edge (currently mostly scrub land) for a cycle lane which would remove cyclists from the roads used by cars.	The draft Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out a consolidated approach across BCP to supersede earlier legacy council Parking SPDs and establish new local parking standards for residential and non-residential development schemes. On adoption the SPD will be a material consideration which will apply when determining future planning applications. It is a comprehensive document to be used by developers and consultants when they are designing new developments. It will be used by officers to assess parking requirements where planning permission is sought for new development. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD19</b>	At least reference public transport. Where a development is on a public transport corridor preference should be given to annual bus passes rather than car parking spaces. Who do we need to raise this with in order to make changes to this document?	Noted. Action: Consider change to document.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD20</b>	<p>The entire document shows no concern for the effect such a plan has on the highways. The lack of adequate parking on property will create a demand for on street parking which is already creating this council's area a serious congestion problem. The Highways could resolve the congestion problem by stopping on street parking and stopping verge/footpath parking especially now that the new footpath parking controls also make councils responsible for damage to underground utilities plant when caused by vehicles mounting the footpath/verge.</p>	<p>Noted. In October 2019 BCP Cabinet approved a Strategic Car Parking Review (SCPR). When completed, this will form a new single strategy for the provision (availability), operation, pricing and enforcement for parking across the highway network including car parks. Also, any operational issues and level of charges in car parks is expected to be addressed via the SCPR. It is envisaged this strategy, if approved, would be closely linked to the BCP Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document and support the emerging Local Plan to deliver the sustainable growth and provide viable, vibrant and sustainable communities well into the future. It is a corporate objective to encourage sustainable travel. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD21</b>	<p>I am concerned at the reliance on cycling and public transport. It is unrealistic to expect people to buy in new developments without adequate parking. It leads to confrontation and arguments. The area is already having problems because of the force feeding of cycling to people who for many reasons need a car. I think it is a very thought out document (I can't say 'well') It worries me what is happening to our local area. There seems to be more thought in pushing high rise living and less to the welfare of residents.</p>	<p>Noted. It is a corporate objective to encourage sustainable travel. In July 2019, the Council declared its commitment to addressing a Climate and Ecological emergency. This was a fundamental shift in corporate direction to reflect the wider global movement towards taking quicker and more direct action to reduce carbon emissions, including the aim of making BCP Council carbon neutral by 2030 and the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole region carbon neutral ahead of the 2050 national target. A key part of the response to this declaration will be to encourage reduced car travel journeys and promote more sustainable forms of travel (which is also supported by the Government's recent publication "Decarbonising Transport"). Limiting the amount of parking spaces in development in key areas will</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		contribute to helping reduce car ownership and reduce journeys by car. Action: None
<b>PSSPD22</b>	Add provision for e-Cargo bikes/Trikes/Trailers - using 50% space currently provided for diesel delivery vehicles as research across European cities shows up to 50% of freight deliveries can be done by bike or cargo bike ref: <a href="http://cyclelogistics.eu/index.php/news/citychangercargobike">http://cyclelogistics.eu/index.php/news/citychangercargobike</a>	Noted. We encourage this provision as set out in para 3.3.8 and 5.1.5. Action: None
<b>PSSPD23</b>	Improve 1) charge for disabled spaces 2) all flats and houses in any zone should have a minimum of one parking space to help with congestion on streets	Noted. Restricting parking in the most accessible locations encourages modal shift, reduces congestion and contributes to addressing climate change, all of which are corporate objectives. Action None.
<b>PSSPD24</b>	I think that it looks very sensible	Noted. Action: None
<b>PSSPD24</b>	It would seem to me that you have omitted two local centres that should be included they are Canford Cliffs and Lilliput, both of these centres are very important amenities for the local populous and should be in the Zoning.	Noted. These Local Centres fall into Zone D. Action: None
<b>PSSPD26</b>	WILL THIS BE REVIEWED IN LIGHT OF BCP LEADERSHIP? SUSTAINABILITY APPEARS TO EQUATE WITH AN ANTI-CAR POLICY, INSTEAD OF HOW CAR TRAVEL TIME COULD BE IMPROVED TO REDUCE POLLUTION CAUSED BY GRIDLOCK.	Noted. Outside the remit of this SPD. Action None.



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD27</b>	<p>Change nothing. I am happy with the draft parking standards document as it is. I particularly approved of the zonal approach towards parking in BCP, and frequently disagree with the popular narrative that all developments, regardless of location must provide extensive parking. As our conurbation is the 3rd most congested city region in the UK, we really must ask ourselves how many more cars we can store and fit onto our roads before breaking point is reached (if you ask me, that was about 10 years ago). I see very little reasoning why city centre developments should have parking, being that the centres of population have good public transport links in all 3 towns, particularly rail access but also buses for local travel within the conurbation. Moreover, people will have a choice whether to buy or move into these properties, so it isn't as if they're being forced into a low-car lifestyle. Plus, with the recently expanded Beryl bikeshare it really is now easier than ever before to get around the local area without relying on a car, and this will only change with TCF investment. Furthermore, I also think the extensive section on bicycle parking is important, as it provides example of often overlooked bikes that don't always get catered for, cargobikes, longtails, handcycles etc. So, I'm glad to see that Sheffield stands are widely promoted as they remain some of the most flexible and inclusive parking options. Likewise, the inclusion of entrance curbs also gets my approval, as dropped pavements are poor for people using mobility aids and uncomfortable for pedestrians to walk on. I have nothing more to add except that I support the draft parking stands in their entirety and wish to see this rolled out across BCP council when it comes to planning and development decisions. If you need any reference I am mainly a motorist who pre-lockdown did around 20,000 miles a year driving across the country, so please note I am not coming with any agenda other than I think our urban areas would be far nicer if we were less reliant on vehicles, and I'm glad the PSSPD supports this.</p>	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD28</b>	No	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD29</b>	<p>change. The parking spaces for 3/4 bed houses(4/5 HR) and for 3 bed flats(4HR). They should have 1 space for cars in zone 1. It would be very unusual for a medium to large dwelling not to need a car, whether for school runs, taking older family members out or shopping trips. Not many people do their weekly shop spending £60 plus by bus! Bags will be too large and too many.</p>	Noted. Communities within Zone 1 are within the most accessible locations and the Council has a responsibility to manage the increasing numbers of vehicles, address congestion and reduce the impacts of climate change in accordance with local and national planning policy, the NPPF and corporate strategy. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD30</b>	We live in Moorside Road ,Corfe Mullen and have become very concerned about the traffic and amount of parked cars we have down our road now. Cars are blocking entrances to driveways and with a lot of the residents being elderly this has become a problem. Cars are also parking towards the corner of our road increasing the chance of an accident. Most of the people parking here live elsewhere and because they have no parking at their address they have decided to park as close as they can using our road as their car park which none of the residents are happy with...	Noted. The aim of the SPD is to provide detail on parking requirements for new development within the BCP area. Operational matters on the highway are outside the scope of this SPD. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD30</b>	1. Vehicles should not be parked on the pavement because they cause damage to the pavement surface and impede pedestrians. 2. Parking standards should be rigorously enforced as in Portsmouth. 3. Vehicles parked on double yellow lines should be towed away. 4. Vehicles parked illegally parked in disabled bays should be fined twice - once for being illegally parked and secondly for preventing a disabled person from parking there as seen recently in Post Office Road where two foreign vehicles were parked in the disabled bays for much of the morning of 29th September. 5. To encourage to frequent the town centre the Bourne Avenue parking spaces should be free to use. 6. A park and ride and system should be established as in Winchester, Salisbury and Portsmouth.	Noted. The aim of the SPD is to provide detail on parking requirements for new development within the BCP area. Operational matters on the highway are outside the scope of this SPD. Park and Ride provision will be dealt with in the emerging BCP Local Plan. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD32</b>	IMPROVE 3.6.4 EV Provision, further consideration should be given to introducing flexibility where affordable housing schemes are proposed, service charge costs could be prohibitive for affordable housing with residents being charged for a service they may have no use for. Passive provision would be more appropriate. IMPROVE tables 9/10 Zone A – significant areas captured by the proposed Zone A are family housing where car ownership levels are likely to be high and a necessity. A new development will only be successful if people want to live there, it is questionable whether families will choose to buy a home with no parking. The impact could be that areas in Zone A become concentrated with one property type and will lack diversity of occupation. Lower paid workers are often very car dependent particularly if they work shifts and cannot access public transport due to working unsociable hours many of the areas within Zone A are likely to house lower paid workers. Parking provision should balance the need to encourage sustainable travel with realistic provision, zero parking will work for some types of development but not all regardless of the location. Parking stress as a result of zero provision on new developments is likely to lead to increased objections from existing neighbouring streets due to the likely impact upon those residents and businesses.	Noted. The council's approach to parking requirements assists with the delivery of viable development aligns with BCP Corporate Strategy objectives of contributing to carbon reduction and promotes modal shift to more sustainable travel to recognise the council's commitment to respond to the climate and ecological emergency. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD33</b>	Improve _ Green areas on the map must be covered by effective parking enforcement up to the boundaries of the area. All roads within the green areas should have Parkin restrictions. Presently some roads within these areas have no restrictions with vehicles parked for days or even weeks. This policy document appears to have been cobbled together without adequate research and development.	Noted. The Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership from the 2011 census. Action None
<b>PSSPD34</b>	Add - more car and bicycle parking spaces for ALL residential properties, particularly Zones a & b 1 parking space per HMO, are you joking? Surely this is completely unrealistic for a house of Multiple Occupancy.	Noted. Evidence shows that HMO 's are temporary low-cost housing alternatives for students or those on low incomes and unlikely to own a car. Action: None
<b>PSSPD35</b>	Add the proviso that any multi-storey form of parking should only be contemplated in the most extreme of circumstances as it is not popular with intended users, as the appearance of it quickly deteriorates, it attracts crime and anti-social behaviour, and is a blot on any landscape. Just look at all the ones in the BCP area now!	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD36</b>	Parking is a requirement that is not to be underestimated. Apart from an income generator it is also an essential consideration for the elderly and infirm, the disabled, families etc. Parking is also a welcoming indicator to visitors, shoppers etc. Badly designed or short in supply it undermines business, tourism etc. It also forces on street parking to the detriment of road cleansing, service deliveries, emergency vehicles etc. When all move to electric vehicles they will need to park. You cannot force people on to public transport and it will only gain momentum once transport replicates the personal comfort and safety of the car [a car is a perfect isolation pod - think Covid]! Also traffic free town centres are coming, they need to be truly traffic free however park and ride and/or periphery parking must be seriously considered. Strategic thought to these issues is key to outcome. one day all traffic might be automated however that is some way off but requires a part of the strategic consideration; even then one needs to future think re emergency travel, long distance travel, overseas travel and international/"European travel. Getting people on to public transport is an ideal but buses travel main routes of which many are limited by space which is insufficient to permit bus lanes in many areas - historic infrastructures cannot be ignored. Where is the strategy that pulls it all together?	Amenity areas shrink as parking grows and is a symptom of overdevelopment. Encouraging car free development will encourage low car ownership families, cleaner air and less congestion. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD37</b>	<p>The document is very long and overly complicated. The executive summary needs to be improved. It doesn't clearly outline the parking per flat/house at tables 9/10 upfront. The change to parking allocation is a change from previous policy and should be clearly outlined to local residents. The parking allocation needs to change for Zone A and Zone B developments. It's unrealistic to remove all residential parking in Zone A, and only provide residential parking in Zone B for 3 bed flats and 2 bed houses. This consultation needs to be improved by providing all of the information in one place for residents - how many homes are planned in Zone A? What is the breakdown of home size to be developed in Zone B i.e. 1 bed, 2 bed flats etc. If this type of zoning is not done correctly for mass housing developments, it can easily lead to displaced parking in other zones in the future. I would like you to confirm that the SPD removes all parking facilities in new developments in Zone A I would like you to clearly outline the housing allocations (1 /2 / 3 bed flats and houses) that are planned in all major development zones from the Poole Plan. Please can you clarify what the parking allocation was in the past, and why this has changed.</p>	<p>The SPD is a comprehensive document to provide further detail on parking requirements to support Local Plan policies. The order of the sections and chapters have been fully considered for usability prior to consultation. The SPD is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and covers the issues the relevant issues that developers need to design development proposals. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD38</b>	<p>Change requirement for parking in all developments; although I commend the reduction in traffic, I do not think the removal of car parking spaces in new accommodation blocks will stop residents using cars. But will encourage them to seek parking in nearby streets etc and cause further problems in the Poole town and surrounding areas. why was this proposal put forward - who thought that the removal of car parking was a good idea?</p>	<p>Noted. The Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership from the 2011 census. Action None</p>
<b>PSSPD39</b>	<p>1.3.1 What evidence is there that states that not providing parking at an apartment block encourages uses of other forms of transport? Clearly no parking availability will reduce the saleability of the properties as they will be competing with those properties that do offer parking. The only remedy will be to offer extremely cheap accommodation which is incongruous with the premium waterside positions of the Quay developments.</p>	<p>Noted. Evidence shows that car ownership in highly accessible locations are lower than for suburban locations. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD40</b>	<p>Additional parking required: Surely, it's unrealistic to expect thousands of residents to exist without a car unless an increase in affordable and reliable public transport is provided. We have to assume that a large percentage of owners or tenants will need a car to get to work and back. There being a limited amount of jobs in light industry in the area to support the percentage of workers from these proposed thousands of new homes. Are you planning to rule against car ownership for the prospective buyers and tenants?</p>	<p>Noted. Limiting the amount of parking spaces in development in key areas will help to reduce car ownership and reduce journeys by car, working towards making BCP Council carbon neutral by 2030 in accordance with its commitment to addressing a climate and ecological emergency Action None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD41</b>	Change 1.3.2. I do not believe that it is sensible to force households in the number that you're planning on allowing to be built/planning for, to have no parking allocation at all. This will simply shift the parking issue elsewhere in Hamworthy, a part of the conurbation that is already extremely limited.	Noted. The ability and desirability to accommodate additional trips by private car is no longer sustainable or feasible. Instead, the focus relies on active transport (eg walking, cycling and the use of public transport). Action: None
<b>PSSPD42</b>	CHANGE It is utter madness to build ANY residential occupation without providing car parking facilities. Every unrestricted road in Poole is already littered with private cars, often on both sides of the road and any suggestion to add to this congestion indicates a real "head-in-the-sand" attitude to the realities of urban life. Even if one partner in a household can get to work without a vehicle, for sure, the other partner will need one. In addition, so many people live away from their place of birth where their maternal and paternal families still live, consequently, there is a need for private transport to facilitate visiting where - as in most cases - public transport is inadequate. We would all love public transport to be so efficient, convenient and affordable that the general population don't need or want a private car. Just who are the people who have put forward this "pie in the sky", idealistic idea that residents will not want or need a car? It is ridiculous and, once again, it is the existing tax-paying residents of Poole who will suffer the consequences.	Noted. BCP is experiencing worsening congestion across its road networks, particularly those that also are shared with the area's high frequency bus routes. The cost to the local economy of congestion is significant and therefore it is strategically important in terms economic growth for it to be addressed. Taking a progressive approach to reducing parking standards will help to achieve modal shift to other forms of travel and will therefore help reduce congestion and improve health and wellbeing. Action: None
<b>PSSPD43</b>	Yes. Provision for parking in residential development is totally inadequate. There should be a minimum of one space provided for each residential unit with 2 parking spaces for units with 3 habitable rooms and above. This is particularly important in the Poole town centre regeneration area. There is inadequate parking available in the Old Town area. Additional development with the level of parking provision proposed will lead to a large number of property owners and their visitors with nowhere to park their cars. This will lead to chaos in the streets of the Old Town.	Noted. Limiting the amount of parking spaces in development in key areas will help to reduce car ownership and reduce journeys by car, working towards making BCP Council carbon neutral by 2030 in accordance with its commitment to addressing a climate and ecological emergency Action None.
<b>PSSPD44</b>	Changes to cycle parking - while many bike types have been mentioned, proposed stands do not cater for all types: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• to cover off disability bikes, trikes and other accessible vehicles inclusion of 'priority' stands with more width (widths are not mentioned)</li> <li>• Standard narrow, covered and 2-tier racks are too narrow for many bikes and essentially useless. With more and more 'fat tyre' cargo and ebikes (with tyres over 2.2 inch) many of the racks will not be useable - the rack outside Sainsburys Alder Hills is a classic example.</li> <li>• Extending dropped curbs and making provision for 'turning' space - especially for cargo bikes, trikes and disability bikes that are larger, heavier and sometimes difficult to manoeuvre.</li> <li>• Consider pay to lock schemes/stands that provide much better security than off the shelf available to purchase - such as <a href="https://www.cyclehoop.com">https://www.cyclehoop.com</a>, <a href="https://www.cyclepods.co.uk/secured-by-design/">https://www.cyclepods.co.uk/secured-by-design/</a></li> </ul>	Noted. In section 3.3 consideration has been given to cycle parking provision for most types of cycles as shown in Fig 11. Guidance is provided on cycle storage for a variety of situations. Area for alternative bike types (e.g. cargo bikes or trikes) should be considered. Check - London Cycling Design Standards Action: Make changes.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD45	<p>1. Figure 28 Change extent of Zone B at Broadstone to match the central zone as defined in the Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan. They are similar but would make sense to be the same. Or remove Zone B totally from Broadstone so it is all Zone D (see point 3 below) - currently Broadstone is all under one category. 2. Tables 3 to 33 Change parking standards for Houses with Multiple Occupancy. Seems to show 1 space allowed for small HMO but 0 (? maybe just 1?) for a large HMO. 3 Tables 3 to 33 Change parking standards to provide more spaces. Zone B flats/small single dwellings have requirement for 0 spaces - this is not acceptable. The Zone B you have defined for Broadstone includes areas of purely residential use, currently with off street parking. If these were replaced with flats/small units with 0 parking the impact on neighbouring areas would be severe. The Zone B standards are too severe for a local centre such as Broadstone where the residential areas are very close to and mingle with the modest central commercial area. 4 Improve thinking around reduction in parking spaces. Reducing car usage is a good aim, but it does not necessarily lead to reduced ownership, just reduced mileage. Reducing parking standards then just causes major parking problems. This was acknowledged at the time of the publication of Manual for Streets. Reduced ownership assumes a significant move to public transport, but we have no guarantee that bus services will continue at the current level. Indeed, in the current circumstances with Covid services are more likely to reduce and, if so, will they come back? 5. Improve thinking re Covid. What impact will it have long term? More home working could reduce demand for public transport making it less viable so reinforcing the need for households to retain a car. Alternatively, home working could reduce car commuting enabling households to get rid of a car. 6. Improve reference to electric bikes and scooters. These are rapidly developing areas and could play a significant role in the future. 7. Improve reference to car share clubs. With the move to electric vehicles there could be a big role for car clubs. For instance, a household has an EV for daily use but wants a different powered vehicle for long journeys beyond the range of an EV and so uses a car club. Car clubs need to be easily accessible so bicycle parking at the car club location would make sense. 8. Improve logic for spaces for pubs and restaurant in relation to private dwellings. In Zone B pubs and restaurants get spaces but small dwellings do not. So, if you live in Zone D (say) you can drive your car from home to a pub/restaurant in Zone B. If you live in a small dwelling in Zone B you are not expected to have a car, as no space has been provided, so you cannot drive to a pub/restaurant in Zone D. Such logic may work in a large urban centre but seems wrong for small centres such as Broadstone. Why do pubs get so many spaces anyway?</p>	<p>Noted. Action: Align Zone B with the central zone as defined in the Broadstone Neighbourhood Plan. Strengthen text to provide opportunities to deliver car clubs for developments in Zones A and B.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD46	<p>Since the Draft SPD was written LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design has been published. Chapter 11 contains some useful guidance on cycle parking, as well as other cycling guidance which are useful when considering highway design in relation to new development. Section 3.2 Cars. Para 3.2.9. Word “Research” duplicated at beginning of para. Garages. Should there be space in these explicitly for cycles? There is a danger of a loophole that would allow houses to be built with no cycle storage. Relatedly consideration should be given to the width of a modern SUV with doors open when specifying the required minimum width of a garage. Section 3.3. Cycles. Cycle parking is an integral part of any development and should be considered right from the start of the design process. It should not be treated as a last minute add-on to be considered in the final stages of design. Could the text be simplified here? E.g. start with a section on the location and access (including illumination) of cycle parking which applies to all forms of parking. Then go into the details for each of the three types of cycle parking (secure, visitor etc.)? Also note the following from LTN 1/20 with regard to accessibility and cycling. Para 11.3.2 As with car parking, a proportion of the cycle parking (typically 5%) should be provided for non-standard cycles to accommodate people with mobility impairments.” Para 3.3.3. “above ground” suggests that parking on higher floors is acceptable? Should be “at ground level” or something to that effect? There should also be a maximum length and minimum width of any access. Failure to meet these requirements makes getting a bike out so inconvenient that it will deter use. Para 3.3.5 refer to figure 13. Para 3.3.6 add “in exceptional circumstances” possibly also add where parking is expected to be predominantly used by young fit adults, i.e. halls of residence &amp; railway stations. Double deck parking is also a problem for shorter people, the very young, the elderly, some females and bikes with luggage, child seats etc.. Any double deck stands should be assisted, i.e. with gas struts or sprung to reduce the lifting effort required. Anticipated increase in use of electric bikes which are heavier could also have an effect. See also the following from LTN 1/20. Two-tier stands 11.4.9 Two-tier racks can be used to provide additional density, offering around a third more cycle parking capacity in the same footprint. However, two-tier cycle racks are typically optimised for a “standard” two-wheeled, two-m-long cycle. 11.4.10 Additional provision for three-wheelers, tandems, recumbents and other “non-standard” cycles should also be provided where two-tier racks are in use. 11.4.11 Two-tier stands require a ceiling height of at least 2.7m (see Figure 11.4), so may not fit in all older buildings or basement parking areas of new developments. Some users will find it difficult to lift their bike from the floor onto the tray of the upper tier, although the mechanisms to lift the stands into position are spring loaded or</p>	<p>Noted Action: Make changes as suggested in conjunction with other representations.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>gas-assisted. Para 3.3.8 Ground anchors can be specified for cargo bikes which offer more flexibility. These are used in some London cycle hubs. Para 3.3.12. concerned that this is too vague/weak. What does “expected” mean, is it “required”? This area needs more work and at present risks providing loopholes which would mean inadequate provision in houses and to some extent flats. There is currently a significant issue particularly with smaller houses which have very little space inside and out. If car-free development is to be permitted in Zones A &amp; B residents in these zones must be provided with adequate alternative and sustainable forms of personal transport. bikes and Ebikes will play a critical role for shorter journeys and residents need convenient, accessible space/s to store them (See LTN 1/20 Para 11.8 below). The number of cycle spaces for flats and in particular houses in Tables 9 and 10 is insufficient, e.g. 1 space for a house with 5 or more habitable rooms which is likely to be occupied by a family in Zone A with no car parking cannot be appropriate. More consideration needs to be given to these residential standards. 11.8 Residential facilities 11.8.1 It is good practice to provide dedicated cycle parking within new development as outlined in the NPPF in the same way as car parking is provided. Many people choose to keep their cycle inside their house or flat for security. However, the absence of internal cycle storage may lead to the blocking of internal circulatory spaces and stairwells, which inhibits evacuation and rescue in the event of fire or other emergency. New developments should always therefore provide dedicated ground floor cycle storage. Figure 16 shows stands that are too close to the (glass) wall, bikes on these stands would fall over if they do not have kick stands. This image should be replaced by a more appropriate one with stands at least 500mm from the wall. 3.3.19. Too vague: the bars should be sufficiently closely spaced that it is not possible to remove a cycle., i.e. replace “can” with “must” when talking about the removal of a cycle. Ideally specify a distance between the bars. Any electronic lock should not be dependent on a continuous power supply to remain locked – i.e. cutting the cable should not deactivate the lock. Need minimum width of access (1.2m+?) to facility. NB if aisles go around a 90 degree bend, width needs to be increased to an absolute minimum of 1.25 m and ideally 1.5 m (ATOC Bike Rail Toolkit – 2012). Para 3.3.21. 1st sentence repeats Sheffield Stands. Para 3.3.22 what is “craft”? Sliding doors may be OK if the doors cannot be lifted off their runners and removed. Para 3.3.26 As suggested bike hangers should be a last resort but would be useful for HMO and flats conversions where no other form of cycle parking can be provided. This would probably require a TRO and an S.106 agreement[?] as well as an agreement with a provider who would maintain the hanger (see LTN 1/20 11.8.2 &amp; 11.8.3 below). 11.8.2 In areas where existing houses and flats</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>are accessed by steps, or have no outside storage space for cycle sheds, on-street cycle parking may be more practicable (see Figure 11.13). This potentially presents problems of security and exposure to the elements. Figure 11.13: Secure on-street “Cycle Hangar” in Hackney, London 11.8.3 On-street cycle parking “hangars” can be retro-fitted to a street or within an estate and are normally only available to registered key-holders. Cycle hangars provide a dedicated place to park a cycle securely outside the curtilage of an existing building and not on the footway. Cycle parks are commonly located underground in residential blocks (see Figure 11.14). Proposed cycle parking standards should be checked against those proposed in LTN 1/20 and the highest of the two adopted. Consideration should also be made of anticipated growth in cycling as outlined in LTN 1/20 (below). 11.3.4 Spare capacity should always be provided to cater for growth and turnover. The effect of new infrastructure should also be factored into any decisions about planned reserve capacity of cycle parking facilities.” Any car parks equipped with entry control (e.g. lifting barriers) should have cycle by-passes or shortened barriers to enable cyclists to enter/exit without dismounting and pushing their cycles. Cycle storage in underground and multi-storey car parks should be in the most accessible locations, with good natural surveillance and well lit. Cycle parking should not be scattered about in inaccessible areas where it has proved impossible to locate a car parking space.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD47</b>	Not sure that Westbourne is a Zone A Main Centre anymore - nowadays similar to Southbourne Zone B District Centre Winton (Wimborne Road) is more of a Zone A Main Centre. Same for Castlepoint. Need more cycle parking in Christchurch on the High Street towards the Priory and Church Street near the Priory. Need some on-street disabled parking on Southbourne Grove - unable to find any except in Woodside Road car park & top of Irving Road. Disabled parking provision in Poole car parks is dire - spaces are too few, poorly sited for non-vehicle disabled access & too narrow	Noted: The zonal approach to parking standards reflecting differing accessibility levels in the BCP area. Zone A generally covers the Town Centre. Westbourne and Boscombe/Pokesdown's close proximity to Bournemouth Town warrants its inclusion within Zone A. The evidence shows that there is lower car ownership in Westbourne and Boscombe/Pokesdown. Disabled street parking is outside the remit of this SPD. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD48</b>	Improve I live in Branksea Avenue. I am concerned that the scheme appears to be light on vehicle parking. Indeed, it seems to be trying to force new residents to give up using vehicle transport by making it impossible to park. To me this echoes the approach of King Canute concerning halting the tide. The inevitable result will be that residents do not give up their vehicles, that they park anywhere they can regardless of whether it is dangerous parking or inconsiderate to other property owners in the area. I frequently visit Poundbury, Dorchester, and generally their approach to parking provision is reasonable, considering the fairly high-density of development. I believe this BCP scheme, by trying to force on people a change in the way we live, is putting the cart before the horse. When other means of encouraging a change in behaviour have proven successful then development can be done as you plan here. I am convinced BCP will live to regret allowing this development as it stands and certainly the voters will.	Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car and to encourage safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD49</b>	You have to remember that there are a lot of disabled drivers who cannot walk far and need extra space	Noted. The disabled parking requirements are set out in section 3.7. The level of provision accords with best practice guidance as outlined in Appendix A. Action: None
<b>PSSPD50</b>	Tables 9 and 10. There is too little car parking provision shown for flats and houses.	Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car and to encourage safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD51</b>	Change wording such that planning permission cannot be granted if there is insufficient realistic provision for off-street parking and roads are wide enough to allow on street parking for visitors etc without hindering other vehicular access. DO not allow streets close	Noted. This is outside of the remit of the Parking Standards SPD. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	to schools to be crammed with student/staff cars or overwhelmed with parent drop-offs/pick-ups	
<b>PSSPD52</b>	Add in item 3.2.5 a minimum carriage way width. Improve item 3.2.6 to minimum Aisle width of 6.4m as cars are getting ever longer and to aid end bay access in particular. Improve 3.2.7 to avoid doubt, show diagram of angled bays.	Noted. Action: Make changes as suggested.
<b>PSSPD53</b>	All very technical. Experience says you will try and minimise provision on the unrealistic expectation that car usage will be discouraged. Also likely to be caused by overdevelopment of sites - seen regularly in the area	Noted. The ability and desirability to accommodate the existing provision is no longer sustainable or feasible. The SPD is a comprehensive guidance covering the requirements for applicants, developers and agents, to help deliver on corporate priorities including housing economic growth. to design. Action: None
<b>PSSPD54</b>	The width limit for vehicles is 2.5 metres, excluding: rear vision mirrors, signalling devices and side-mounted lamps and reflectors. This will not fit well into a 2.6 meter space. Could the Executive summary be clearer and the document written in plain English for easy consumption by people who are not planning experts	Noted. The SPD is a comprehensive guidance covering the requirements for applicants, developers and agents, to help deliver on corporate priorities including housing economic growth. to design. Bay width is a key component of its usability and durability and considered to be sufficient at 2.6m wide and 4.8 long. Action: None
<b>PSSPD55</b>	Change/Improve/Add: 4.2 C3; Table 9 (Flats) & Table 10 (Houses): 1 car space for 2 bedroom flats/houses in Zone D is inadequate, especially as this is meant to include visitors & delivery vehicle parking - the same comment/concern applies to Table 12 (HMO).	Zone D covers suburban and rural areas where there is the lowest accessibility. 1 space for up to 2 bed dwelling and 2 spaces for 3+ bed dwelling is considered acceptable. Action: None
<b>PSSPD56</b>	Require a minimum of one off-street spaces per household	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD57	I think you are obsessing over silly things. Not what matters!	Noted. The Parking Standards will help deliver on corporate priorities including housing and economic growth and present a consolidated approach by the council for parking requirements across the BCP area. Action: None
PSSPD58	Scheme Needs same parking spaces as homes	Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car and to encourage safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. Action: None.
PSSPD59	No room on our roads for anymore cars. No need for more spaces.	Noted. Action: None
PSSPD60	Giving just a few days notice of the deadline to respond to the document is disgraceful. It is impossible for the layman to absorb all this information quickly and respond coherently. An important provision should be the prevention of parking vehicles on pavements. This unsocial habit seems to emanate from the cities and has no place in BCP where the roads are sufficient to allow parking on the road with little inference with the free flow of traffic. Yet councils and police take no action against offending vehicles. Keeping pavements clear is important for the well being and safety of all, especially disability scooters, press etc and walking aids. Except for young children under the control of their parents, bicycles must be banned from using footpaths and such a ban has to be enforced. Also all bicycles should have a working bell - proper bell not of the digital type whose noise gets lost in the soup of such sounds.	Noted. The statutory period of consultation for an SPD is 4 weeks. This took place from 14 September to 12 October 2020. Other matters are outside the remit of the Parking SPD. Action None.
PSSPD61	Change. Your decision to even build houses let alone car parking spaces. This part of Poole is already too built up to have anymore residents. It would be bedlam just trying to travel around the area with so many more resident. We have trouble parking as it is when going shopping. I have to say this is madness and houses and parking spaces should be built out of town where residents have the choice to go to other schools and shopping centres and not just into Poole. .	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
PSSPD62	Change. No where near enough parking, gross overdevelopment on in an area already struggling with traffic	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD63</b>	I think that the plans for the properties being built without parking spaces is outrageous! Make more parking spaces available at the development to prevent neighbouring roads being crowded with cars	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD64</b>	The document is very long and very difficult to digest. Change - the plans to build new homes on our green area playing fields at Turlin Moor in Hamworthy - it is destructive and will seriously compromise the health and well-being of those of us who have lived here for many years. We simply do not have the capacity to cope with the increased traffic, parking problems and lack of infrastructure in place. We do not have enough parking as it is and it will make it impossible for those of us with mobility problems, to negotiate parking and traffic difficulties which would result. Leave us alone. Inadequate, regarding our neighbourhood.	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD65</b>	More car parking facilities, atleast one space per new home. Additional doctors surgery and pharmacy to supply new residents as current ones overwhelmed. With the average ratio being one car to a household. Where do you expect 3000 cars to park if only a handful of the new properties have a parking space? I understand the homes being so close to the town centre will hopefully mean there isn't a need for a vehicle but this is wishful thinking. Most households have a car and local residents would like to know where you will be encouraging parking? Nearby streets?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. The Strategic Car Parking Review will deal with on street parking. Action: None
<b>PSSPD66</b>	More car parking less houses or leave it as it is open space	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
PSSPD67	Change. Need more parking or less residences. This is nuts!	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
PSSPD68	Change. Your minds. Small builds, not family homes that are desperately needed and all those additional cars with no parking is going to cause massive problems. Hamworthy can not cope with the traffic as is let alone with approx. 3000 additional cars	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
PSSPD69	Add parking	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Full comment</b>	<b>Officer Comment/Action</b>
<b>PSSPD70</b>	Don't build on our playing field	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD71</b>	Change. 400 spaces is not enough. Blandford Road is already a car park at certain times of the day. Development of more houses will cause even more build up. In a time when we should be keeping as much green space as possible, this is a reckless proposal.	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD72</b>	Change - Reduce number of flats houses etc and give proper parking allocation in line with the average family requirements. Just a statement- making the supplement 63 pages is excessive and feels like a blocker - most people will switch off after about 10 pages..)	Noted. The aim of this draft SPD is to be provide detail on parking requirements. It is a comprehensive document designed to be used by developers and consultants when they are designing new builds. Action: None
<b>PSSPD73</b>	Add and improve parking at all sites. Why would you have no parking for 1000 flats?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD74</b>	Do not build on the rec this is horrendous - you wouldn't do this in sandbanks!!!! Our schools are already too oversubscribed and if there is no rec where would the children play. no room for houses let alone parking what an absolute shambles Poole council is, money grabbing selfish idiots!!!	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD75</b>	Not so many houses. Where are the children supposed to play?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD76</b>	Change the proposal to include at a minimum, one car parking place per residence.	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD77</b>	Change this ridiculous plan for hardly any parking. You have referenced a 2017 study into the slowing down of car use age, this is clearly out of date and not in keeping with the current and ongoing pandemic.	Noted. The SPD is a comprehensive guidance covering the requirements for applicants, developers and agents, to help deliver on corporate priorities including housing and economic growth over the long term. Action None.
<b>PSSPD78</b>	Improve parking allocation Table 9 C3. Ridiculous allocation of Zero cars for a 2-bedroom flat. They need at least 1 car space in Zone B	Noted. District centres have good local services, shops and other facilities or are in close public transport/mainline railway station. In determining the parking standards, dwellings Zone B would

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD79</b>	The proposed development will do nothing to enhance the area. Consideration has not been made for the local area and infer structure, services, and not least of all parking.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD80</b>	Add/change I cannot comprehend what planet you people at the Council live on it must be in some far distant rainbow coloured utopia. When will you realise people are never going to use overpriced public transport to commute to work and how do you expect those trades people carrying equipment etc to hop on their cycle or walk, REALLY!!! Every new dwelling needs at least 1 vehicle space. What are your proposals with regards to cycling in Hamworthy, and no it's not called Hamworthy Centre, I am born here, and I have never heard anything so ridiculous. How do you propose safe cycling with inadequate roads mass house building which is scandalous. Sending this out with 3 days to read a 63-page document is also a BCP cover up I imagine hardly a consultation for all especially those not engaged online, shameful. there should be a public meeting and if so all building and planning should be halted until this can happen for everyone to be involved this so-called survey is a joke	Noted. Hamworthy Local Centre has been defined in Poole's Local Plan for over 20 years. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD81</b>	"REMOVE" the need for further homes in the area, the currently lay of the land is already overcrowded and the traffic usage at peak times becomes untenable. Why have the council deemed it fit to further increase the dwellings of the area (Hamworthy/Turlin/Upton) to the degree that they do not provide adequate parking or option for this as, has not one thought that with further housing planned that people would not have their own means of transport?	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD82</b>	4;3;3 improve parking for each abode, you can't flood the nearby streets or expect everyone to ride bikes or use public transport. Have you asked or surveyed any of the local residents or businesses? The impact on the surrounding area should be paramount	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD83</b>	Change your approach to parking. Not providing residential properties with parking only increases the developers profit making housing planning denser. It doesn't suddenly lead to people selling their cars!	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD84</b>	Change table 3 page 29 1.75/100 is too low 3/100 or 33/1000 is about right anything less and developers will not build because they know they'll struggle to let . Change table 16 as above 3/100 in zone D. Change page 10 3.2.3 2.5m x4.8 is adequate and a national standard . Change page22 disabled parking the old standard of 2.4 with 1.2m either side is more than adequate. The current parking standards are reasonable to reduce them will just cause problems with cars parking on verges etc	Noted. The parking standards will encourage commuting workers, shoppers and visitors to use good sustainable travel options available. The public car parks will be available to those who choose to travel by car. If there is a departure from the standards, this will require robust and evidence-based justification and therefore the SPD builds in sufficient flexibility to the requirements. Across the conurbation there are varying standards of bay size from the legacy parking standards. The new size requirement for a standard parking spaces of 2.6m x 4.8m caters for a wide range of vehicles and provides some side width to allow for ease of use. Action None.
<b>PSSPD85</b>	Not do it. How we can challenge this to NOT GO AHEAD,	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD86</b>	Why is it ok for the council to have less parking spaces per dwelling than private contractors? I think that there should be at least 1space per household plus a few extra for visitors. It may be that the council can say they are following the guidelines but it's the council that sets the guidelines.... laughable if it wasn't a serious issue. By all means build council housing, great idea but at least think about who is going to live in these homes!!	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action None.
<b>PSSPD87</b>	Where is the parking?	Noted. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD88</b>	Improve. Is it not a little illiberal to try to blackmail people into greener living by forcing them to choose between the council approved lifestyle and affordable housing?	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD89</b>	Change - there must be at least ONE parking space per housing unit.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD90</b>	If you build any homes, each one must have at least 1 parking space per unit built. IMPROVE. With poor public transport in this area, people will want a car to travel to work or shops. And what about the lack of car parking already in this area, where houses don't have off road parking ?. No point having yet another countless amount of cars to park on roads, making the ability to drive down roads if road has parking both sides. A bus much wider than a car. So buses can't get round roads because of bad planning by bcp council .	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD91</b>	Provide adequate parking for everyone	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD92</b>	Change. This is ridiculous, as someone who lives in the town centre and pays to park it is already hard to find a space. It will be nearly impossible, if this is allowed. This is purely down to greed, trying to get as much money for themselves and dont care about the people it will affect.	Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD93</b>	"change" the location of the proposed build at Turlin Moor Rec, the impact of the current residents and wildlife in the area will be irreversible, to not provide parking for majority of the proposed homes is ridiculous. Where are all the residents of the proposed new homes on Turlin Moor Rec supposed to park?	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None
<b>PSSPD94</b>	You need to provide more parking. Even at the expense of the number of properties. You may not like it but most people still travel by car. The public transport is not good enough to allow otherwise.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD95</b>	Think it's a stupid Idea you're not thinking of the community at all your thinking about money. Blandford road is mega busy at times as it is , and so are the roads full of cars	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD96</b>	Improve the parking quantities. How is this acceptable ?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD97</b>	It seems the council are unaware off the mass traffic congestion in hamworthy and Upton. Or the extreme lack of parking for current residents with some households who have to park at least a street away from their residence. Your document fails to suggest how you would resolve this. More to the point it appears your current housing plan will significantly affect the local population having a detrimental effect on their lives.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD98</b>	<p>Change: Dear Sir or Madam, I am writing on behalf of Stelling Properties. We are a local development company with a number of projects in the south of England. We welcome the draft SPD on parking standards in general, as it appears to promote sustainable modes of transport and forward-looking policy making. Our only point of concern is the suggested requirement for 0.5 parking spaces/bed for hotels in Zone A (Table 5, page 32). This seems to be inconsistent with the proposed zero parking for residential, offices and retail in Zone A. We believe that hotels should be included in the zero-parking bracket to promote sustainable methods of transport for visitors. Our recent transport analysis shows an oversupply of public parking in Bournemouth, with hotels uniquely able to enter agreements with operators to provide public parking for those still arriving by car, this would additionally result in better utilisation of public car parks during the evening and overnight.</p>	<p>Noted. Action: Revisit and consider economic impact of change to zero parking for new hotel and guest house development. Whereas Bournemouth may have an oversupply of car parks, this may not be the case in Poole and Christchurch. Additional evidence sought from Tourism to clarify likely parking requirements.</p>
<b>PSSPD99</b>	<p>How do you propose to fill all of your new houses with families that will need cars in order to commute to schools outside of the area? I ask this question because if you propose to add hundreds of houses to the Hamworthy area, you must first provide hundreds more school places. If you cannot provide parking for at least one car per family, I suggest that perhaps you are building too many houses. There would be no harm in providing underground parking for flats and driveways for houses. You must also consider people having visitors. I live in Norton way and only having one spare parking permit for guests is bad enough as a widowed single parent living in a housing association flat that needs support. I would hate to think what it would be like if I could provide NO parking at all for visitors. It's okay though, we fully understand that the people making these preposterous suggestions for housing with no parking or school spaces have obviously never had to worry over such trivial things and so are naturally more concerned with the use of unreliable public transport that you've never had to rely on and the amount of plants on the side of the road (a pretty hypocritical point of view given that you want to dig up most of the green lands we have left to put more houses there instead)</p>	<p>Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD100</b>	<p>Why so few additional spaces? There should be an excess of spaces and many families have 2 cars or visitors It will lead to parking illegally especially as sunseeker staff try to park in any. Spare spaces the parking will be chaotic if not enough pro</p>	<p>Noted. In determining the parking standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD101</b>	Change the ratio of parking places in these developments. Add a substantial number of parking places to all the developments in this draft document. Does BCP Council think that residents do not need tradesmen, carers or visitors or to visit or work in locations where it is not suitable to travel to by public transport? Poole Council experimented with an Eco Village in the late 90's by introducing Travelwise and a car share scheme. This did not work; residents require their own transport and the car sharing scheme was terminated. Parking is already extremely difficult in this area	Noted. The SPD sets out that loading and servicing provision should be provided. The tables mainly state that exact provision is to be agreed with the LPA. Action: Consider referencing section 5 in a footnote to each of the tables and consider diagram example of preferred servicing bays (with lockable bollard to stop residents using them). Section 5 wording could be strengthened to state that applicants must (rather than "should") make provision for servicing and loading in all developments.
<b>PSSPD102</b>	It is ridiculous. Where has this idea come from? There is ZERO infrastructure to support these new houses	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD103</b>	Change c3 table 10	Noted. Action: None
<b>PSSPD104</b>	Add. The occupiers of these properties should be made to sign a legally binding agreement that they will not purchase or have use of a motor vehicle otherwise they will simply block the roads/pavements	Noted. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD105</b>	Change C3, page 32, table 9: to have 0 allocated parking spaces for 1-bedroom flats and studios is not realistic, as Hamworthy is already almost at full capacity with huge amounts of traffic backlogs on a daily basis even on off peak times. Providing no parking, or even 1 parking space for 3 bedroom houses will not work as the people who live in these houses will be forced to park elsewhere which will simply create further traffic build up throughout the entirety of Hamworthy and the length of the Blandford Road. Please reconsider the parking allocation for the plans of these flats and houses. Having these on the main road on the rec field with no parking is going to cause Hamworthy to become even more of a gridlock in the next few years. With the two bridges, especially when they go in and out of service this will cause further issues and having no allocated parking spaces simply should not happen	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD106</b>	Don't do any of it it's going to cause a nightmare for traffic it's all ridiculous	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None
<b>PSSPD107</b>	I am supportive of the Councils proposals. Scrap it and save our green space. I know you purchased land for Upton country park but we still get stung on parking fees there.	Noted. Action None.
<b>PSSPD108</b>	Improve the quality of our roads by reducing the amount of traffic on them. 400 new homes equal 1200 possible more cars in Hamworthy. Hamworthy is not big enough to support this	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. Action: None
<b>PSSPD109</b>	All of it - every home will need at least one parking space and there is no alternative transportation infrastructure in place - bus service is extremely poor and expensive plus the elderly cannot walk or cycle - whole proposal needs a sensible rethink. Where will workers park until the alternative travel infrastructure is in place	Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car and to encourage safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD110</b>	CHANGE the parking allocation, i.e. increase it to provide parking for all future residents and their visitors. I live in Ivor Road and we are already plagued by people parking in front of our drives and obstructing our access. The current proposal will create a nightmare for existing residents. What level of car traffic have you assumed will be generated by this overly dense development? Are you all so enthralled by development greed that you are prepared to forfeit any future votes from existing residents. The disgust at this proposal is palpable!	Noted. The SPD supports the actions of the council's commitments to tackle climate change by prioritising opportunities to walk cycle and use public transport. The planned housing and economic growth to meet needs is expected to generate an increase in traffic, and if unchecked, could give rise to increased carbon emissions, poor air quality affecting public health and safety. Overly generous parking requirements have historically, not helped to deliver the quantum or quality of development expected by our communities. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD111</b>	improve increase the parking ratio to include more spaces	Noted. The zonal approach reflects different accessibility/car ownership levels. The guidance sets out the parking standards by use class. This will help support the actions of the council's commitment to tackle climate change and encourage modal shift to sustainable travel, moving away from journeys by private car. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD112</b>	1.1.8 just because the council want to encourage more walking, biking & using public transport, doesn't mean everyone can! This is just a way around the problems all these houses are going to cause to traffic congestion along blandford road hamworthy & into Poole. every dwelling built should have adequate parking, for residents & visitors. Otherwise the parking of residents will impact the nearest local area because people will need to find elsewhere to park. People won't stop having cars because there is no allocated parking to their property.	Noted. The zonal approach reflects different accessibility/car ownership levels. The guidance sets out the parking standards by use class. This will help support the actions of the council's commitment to tackle climate change and encourage modal shift to sustainable travel, moving away from journeys by private car. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD113</b>	Change your entire anti car outlook. All paragraphs. All these policies seem to have been written by Extinction Rebellion. Please stop this madness, the average citizen has really had enough of these crazy ultra green ideologies.	Noted. The zonal approach reflects different accessibility/car ownership levels. The guidance sets out the parking standards by use class. This will help support the actions of the council's commitment to tackle climate change and encourage modal shift to sustainable travel, moving away from journeys by private car. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD114</b>	Add parking please make sure there is sufficient parking for all new houses/flats that you are preparing to build. I'm sure for the 1,000 new apartments that have no parking, you could make sure there is adequate parking even if it is under the houses/flats. I personally dont want to see all the roads with vehicles parked up on the curbs. Fix this please.	Noted. The zonal approach reflects different accessibility/car ownership levels. The guidance sets out the parking standards by use class. This will help support the actions of the council's commitment to tackle climate change and encourage modal shift to sustainable travel, moving away from journeys by private car. The SPD supports underground and multi storey parking in appropriate locations. It recognises the benefits of basement parking on retaining the

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		quality of the streetscene see section 3.9. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD115</b>	It is difficult to link comments to specific paragraphs as my comments are related to the adopted philosophy behind the paper. Agree to sustainable development. However, without convenient ways of getting to and from housing restricting parking will cause issues. One needs to increase parking ratios and not restrict them. Climate and environmental issues are not solved by banning private transport and indeed will restrict people's ability to travel. The solution to car pollution is improving car design which is happening and commuting. When parking has been restricted in the past, communities experience widespread anti social parking. The cost of adequate alternative means of public transport cannot be sustained by small local communities. Restricting movement is damaging to business, health and well being. People will not go into town centres unless is it easy. Amazon provides a wonderful and hugely rewarding experience and should be encouraged. Where is the UK equivalent?	Noted. The SPD will consolidate three documents into one provides an opportunity to consolidate into one policy document the SPDs of the three previously authorities which no longer represent the approach BCP Council wishes to take. The draft SPD will replace these to reflect current evidence, new national policy, new corporate strategy commitments including obligations to contribute to addressing the impacts of climate change for social, economic and environmental benefits to ensure the planning system actively manages patterns of growth in the BCP area. Reducing congestion, carbon emissions, and improving air quality and public health are at the heart of these objectives and directly linked to the BCP Corporate Plan. There are no reasonable alternative options to consider in this case. Action None
<b>PSSPD116</b>	Improve: perhaps there needs to timelines whereby in the event that new standards are enacted, there is an evolution away from parking everywhere and away from spaces that don't have EV provision (such that eventually all parking including commercial must have EV and only be used by EV. In addition all grounds floor parking needs to be retrospectively screened within flood zones and there is a progression to change parking spaces into say "rain gardens" over time. BCP Council should review its contracts with Neighbourhood Forums, who tend to be NIMBYists or procar (Poole Quay Forum). NFS shouldn't be run by cllrs either	Noted. There is a legally binding target to create a net zero carbon economy by 2050. The government has announced it will bring forward a ban on new fossil fuel vehicles from 2040. although it is looking to accelerating this to 2030, having previously consulted on a deadline of 2035. Action: None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD117</b>	Change	Noted. The SPD will consolidate three documents into one provides an opportunity to consolidate into one policy document the SPDs of the three previously authorities which no longer represent the approach BCP Council wishes to take. The draft SPD will replace these to reflect current evidence, new national policy, new corporate strategy commitments including obligations to contribute to addressing the impacts of climate change for social, economic and environmental benefits to ensure the planning system actively manages patterns of growth in the BCP area. Reducing congestion, carbon emissions, and improving air quality and public health are at the heart of these objectives and directly linked to the BCP Corporate Plan. There are no reasonable alternative options to consider in this case. Action None
<b>PSSPD118</b>	CHANGE How over two developments of just under 800 apartments under SPD reduce parking to 29 spaces.This utter nonsense. I understand the need to encourage different modes of transport but until they are sufficiently supported and adequate to manage and support the new infrastructure etc and the demands of the People who move into these two new developments, there need to be allowances made for young families that wil have cars, people who work further away etc and where is freedom of choice. Also, how can developers be encouraged to improve the PQF area if we restrict car parking.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD119</b>	More parking needs to be added for these new build homes. Otherwise Hamworthy will become a car park of 300+ cars! They all have to go somewhere?	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The SPD supports the actions of the council's commitments to tackle climate change by prioritising opportunities to walk cycle and use public transport. The planned housing and economic growth to meet needs is expected to generate an increase in traffic, and if unchecked, could give rise to increased carbon emissions, poor air quality affecting public health and safety. Overly generous parking requirements have historically, not helped to deliver the quantum or quality of development expected by our communities. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD120	<p>Improve - Whilst I agree that parking standards need to be clarified and confirmed the stated proposed provision of Zero spaces per apartment in Zones A &amp; B are unrealistic and will cause significant disruption to the development and use of the town centres. No parking provision will mean additional parking on the street and potentially unsellable or unviable developments as people will not want to buy a unit without provision. This will constrain development by making ghost developments and not enhance our town. Public transport and the culture of the use of public transport is not sophisticated in BCP. Without trams and a fully integrated network of super highway of cycle routes and buses there is no viable alternative. I agree that in the future this can be so, but this needs automated vehicles to be in full use and the trams etc fully operational - 20 years. At this point a phased redevelopment of car parks can be undertaken, however this proposal may look initially great for developers but this is not what the markets wants and it has the potential to kill areas which have been built out to a high-density without parking provisions. Many of the developments in Poole and indeed in Bournemouth will fall into the hands of people from out of the area - with cars - and although this may not be desirable and I hear the argument we if we discourage them that is not a bad thing as the flats and apartments should be for local people,, I cannot see within the next 20 years that I would ever consider buying a property without parking provisions. We are not London and do not have a core CBD, there needs to be acknowledgement that the whole of BCP is what is described as Zone 3 or 4. Cycling is growing in use but the employment areas of Poole are on the outskirts of the town where it is challenging to get to on public transport as such your core centre developments will not be aimed at these people but those of an age - who have cars. Unfortunately, I can only see bad effects from these proposals. I cannot see that they will help regenerate the centres as it will alienate the existing local inhabitants this is just too much too fast. Just ensure that car parks can be adapted in the future ...Is the purpose of the new car park provisions to encourage development, encourage communities, encourage traffic free areas and encourage low emission transport? Have you consulted with the selling agents to confirm that there is a market for apartment blocks without car parking provisions - what the perception of them and the marketability of them would be?</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD121</b>	Add car parking/ remove houses	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD122</b>	Parking allocations for flats, houses, holiday accommodation, clinics, care home, schools and many other categories have been defined, but no consideration has been given to High-density Development. Densities planned for the Regeneration area are higher than London, with its far superior infrastructure and there is already a lack of green space in the central old town area. Who is it envisaged these properties will be selling to (many of the employees of the existing businesses in Poole will not be selling up their existing properties to move in). Has thought been given to what happens if these units do not sell because there is not a market for them? What will be done to address the existing parking issues, partly associated with existing employees' vehicles which will be exacerbated once these developments go ahead which results in a further loss of parking space currently being used by these employees?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD123</b>	How can you not provide at least one car parking space per property, this just is unrealistic. Too many houses for a small area. The infrastructure will not cope.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD124</b>	There needs to be more parking available	Noted. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD125</b>	<p>Paragraph 3.2.1 change. The parking bay dimension is from decades ago. The width should be at least 2.9 paragraph 3.2.8 change. Grouped parking bays do not work at 6m across. This should be at least 7m. Paragraph 3.2.26 improve. Should add where possible. Most places in the borough you cannot retain structures etc of you park in the front garden. 3.3.6 change. There are many alternatives to the simple but dismal Sheffield stand. Paragraph 3.3.25 improve. What is acceptable?</p>	<p>Noted. Across the conurbation there are varying standards of bay size from the legacy parking standards. The new size requirement for a standard parking spaces of 2.6m x 4.8m caters for a wide range of vehicles and provides some side width to allow for ease of use. A 6m aisle width is sufficient in most situations to allow for adequate turning and manoeuvring space. The visual impact of large areas of hard standing is a planning consideration and often an example of poor design. Sheffield stands are consistently the simplest and most secure form of cycle parking. Other forms of cycle may be acceptable on a case by case basis. Agree the garden cycle section lacks precision. Action: slight textual alterations to improve clarity regarding garden cycle sheds. Insert at 3.3.25 “Low, covered, secure, convenient and attractive ‘bike boxes’ are preferable because they can sit unobtrusively behind garden walls and hedges.”</p>
<b>PSSPD126</b>	<p>Add, to the front page, " Replaces the Dorset residential Car Parking Study (2011). The document states in 1.2.5 "This SPD will replace the following three legacy council Parking SPDs; Bournemouth Borough Council Parking SPD (2014), Borough of Poole Parking and Highway Layout in Development SPD (2011), and the Dorset Residential Car Parking Study (2011)" Why is that not made clear on the front page? Why did I not receive this document, via email, until 8/9/20 when it appears to have been available since 14th September? Four days notice is insufficient. If this document applies to residents other than BCP, why has it not been distributed by Dorset Council?</p>	<p>Noted. This SPD replaces three legacy council Parking SPDs, rather than just one. It is normal practice to set out within the introduction to the document what it will replace, hence this is shown in para 1.2.5. Action None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD127	<p>Change 3.3.6 – Bournemouth University feel that double deck cycle parking storage provides a good quality, space efficient option for future proofing increased demand for cycling provision to support the objectives of the BU Travel Plan. Finding physical space to locate high quality parking facilities which aligns to the draft layout and design guidance in the document will be challenging, especially given the Higher Education cycle parking ratios for HE students and FTE staff outlined in Table 20. We would like the guidance to acknowledge that consideration to use double deck cycle parking storage be considered on a contextual basis of any application. For example, the university cycling demographic would on the whole, not experience any physical issues with lifting at height. The university has concerns around the cost implications of having to provide expensive hydraulic assisted double tier storage. Please consider a review of the wording in section 3.3.6, as the university feels this is potentially prohibitive to delivering plans for enhanced active travel facilities to support the objectives of the BU Travel Plan. Improve 3.3.9 – Further guidance or examples of best practice relating to charge stations for electric bikes would be welcomed. Improve 3.4.4 - Further guidance or examples of best practice relating the provision for electric scooter charging would be welcomed. Add 3.6.4 – The EV provision set out in Table 1 for non-residential development with 10+ spaces will be potentially challenging and will add a significant financial consideration to future developments plans. The university agree that the % of ‘active’ and ‘passive’ bays proposed in Table 1, is appropriate in order to future proof development ahead of the expected transition to electric vehicles. It will be important for BCP to play a role in supporting organisations to access any government/grant funding to fulfil electric vehicle charging provision requirements outlined in the document. Add 4.2 Cars (staff and visitors) Zone A In reference to the optimum parking figures set out for HE in Table 20 (page 37), the university notes the significant decrease in proposed parking ratio for staff in Zone A, which has been reduced to = 0.1 / Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff. The current ratio in the existing guidance is = 0.6 / FTE staff. The university would encourage BCP to ensure a fit for purpose town centre parking strategy is in place to compliment these challenging draft parking standards. Change 4.2 Cars (staff and visitors) Zone C In reference to the optimum parking figures set out for HE in Table 20 (page 37), the university notes the significant decrease in proposed parking ratio for staff in Zone C. The proposal for (HE) facilities = 0.4 / Full Time Equivalent (FTE) staff is a significant reduction form the existing Bournemouth guidance of = 0.6/FTE. The university feels this ratio would be challenging to achieve given the suburban context of the Talbot Campus, although we recognise that the impact of the covid-19 pandemic provides an opportunity to rationalise</p>	<p>Noted. Double deck cycle parking is considered to be less convenient than Sheffield type stands and can discriminate against people with low upper body strength. However, 3.3.6 does make provision for a small proportion of double deck systems to be used alongside Sheffield stands. Action: Paragraph 3. 3. 9 - Consider including examples as suggested. Para 3.4.4. Consider examples as suggested, or add that as yet, no local decision has been made in respect of electric scooters. Revisit Table 20 - cars staff &amp; visitors Zones A &amp; C. Revisit the cycle space requirement given BU 2019 student travel survey findings that the majority of students walk or take public transport. Consider clarifying whether additional reference should be made to engagement and consultation taking place when proposing school street closures - para 5.8.1.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>parking provision due to likely changes to working practices, however it is too early to assess the lasting impact. Change 4.2 Cycle spaces In reference to the optimum parking figures set out for HE in Table 20 (page 37) the proposed secure covered: 0.5/ student is extremely high and potentially prohibitive. The proposed ratio has doubled compared to current Bournemouth guidance. At present only 5% of students travel by single occupancy car journey to Bournemouth University (BU student travel survey 2019). When analysing the 95% of students that choose more sustainable travel modes, the current modal split for cycling is 5%, with the majority of students either walking or taking public transport to get to our campus sites. The university feel the draft cycle space ratios set out in Table 20 present a potential risk to future development proposals given the university has circa 19000 students. The university would welcome a more holistic view of cycle parking quantum/provision across an HE campus site to be considered by the Local Planning Authority when considering future planning applications. It is noted that the provision of bike share bays will not be considered as offsetting the total number of cycle parking spaces to be provided. The university has an agreement in place with the existing local bike share provider to promote bike share to students and staff as a sustainable transport mode to campus. This is support is resourced through the BU Travel Plan. The university also provides land for bike share bays to support the scheme. The university feel that is would be appropriate for bike share provision to be factored into cycle parking provision in the appropriate context. Add 5.8.1 – The university would like to see reference in the document to engagement and consultation with local stakeholders that could be impacted by proposed school streets closures.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD128</b>	<p>Paragraph 4.2 change. All figures and details are highly questionable, aspirational at best. Especially zones A and B. There are insufficient alternatives to using cars. There will not be adequate provision by the time large sites are delivered in zones A and B. There will be considerable car ownership and use. Apart from a few major city centres in the UK there is still limited evidence that car use has significantly decreased to the point where very little or no car parking provision is viable. In the BCP area the level of parking proposed for most if not all categories will cause extreme harm to the centres and areas adjacent. Cars need provision. Table 5 c1 change. A new 75 need hotel on the Quay at Poole would only need 38 spaces for staff and visitors, this will not work. There is in adequate parking in this location now. People drive to hotels. Table 7 c2 change. Insufficient parking allocation. A new 20 bed care home would only need 10 spaces including staff. This is insufficient. Tables 9/10 c3. No car parking provision in zone A will just not work. There are insufficient alternatives to driving in nearly all the zone a areas on the plan map. To think that a 300 home site with no parking provision is not going to work. Zone b provision is also to low. A two bedroom flat has no parking, a five bed house has one space. These are locations that are in many cases done distance from bus routes. Insufficient. Other tables are the same the parking requirement is necessary it doesn't go away. Paragraph 5.12.2 change. If you design out where people are going to park (especially zones A and B) where are people going to park, the are none or very few provided with the new dwelling and anything on road is being actively designed out. It will just move to illegal, double parking etc. Figure 32 shows parking that is being used this is in an area that would have no future provision in this area it is already over parked. It is in walking distance of everything. People will still use cars.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD129</b>	<p>Improve parking provision by raising allocated parking provisions to at least 1 allocated space for 80% of the development properties. My parents live near to the development and this would cause havoc with on-street parking on their road and the surrounding roads.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD130</b>	Change	Noted. No details. Action: None
<b>PSSPD131</b>	All new build flats and houses should be provided with at least one off-road parking space per flat/house.	Noted. Action: None
<b>PSSPD132</b>	Change the infrastructure to accommodate the amount of people, cars and parking. Where are all these households going to park.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD133</b>	Yes I think there should be more areas with more targeted levels of parking, for example, I understand that there is no need to have parking in central Bournemouth, however luxury apartments on the East cliff need parking as they are a fair distance from any shops.	Noted. Action: None
<b>PSSPD134</b>	I live in Bournemouth Road so I need a car but if I lived in Ashley Cross I would not as it is close to the train and shops, I like the idea of cutting car ownership where it is not necessary but the areas need to be more defined.	Noted. The hyperlink to the map on page 27 defines the zones down to address level. This is sufficient to enable users to determine zones for potential planning applications for new development. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD135</b>	The ABCD areas need to be more refined as I live in Bournemouth Road and need a car but if I lived in Ashley Cross I would not need one.	Noted. The zonal approach is set out in section 4 of the document. this shows that the parking standards are applied on a hierarchical zonal basis within the BCP area reflecting different accessibility levels. The hyperlink to the map below figure 26 defines the zones down to address level. This is sufficient to enable users to determine zones for potential planning applications for new development. Action: None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD136</b>	<p>Why are so many homes being built without the proper infrastructure in place - and why are they targeting people who aren't from or working in Poole?! surely this isn't supporting the local people or community. this shouldn't be a town for holiday homes. Why are there not more charging points for electric vehicles?</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Public electric vehicle charging points are available in the BCP area this is outside the remit of the Parking SPD; however, the SPD sets clear guidance for a percentage of EV charging points to be provided in new development. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD137</b>	<p>The question I would like answered is concerning the snatching of this land, designated as open recreational space for the residents of Turlin Moor. We all know the game played is apply for many and then dwindle it down. However, to build on this area will be a crime. I have made comments on FB site regarding this and am appalled that P BC would even consider such a proposal. I also find your personal questions on this form offensive, since I am 80 years old. Think long and hard before you cover this site with tricky tacky boxes.....it can never be returned to recreational use again. No car parking spaces.....unbelievable. The whole vicinity would be like NCP!!</p>	<p>Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD138</b>	At least one parking space per home, it's just not going to work, most people need cars for work, many work outside Poole. Holiday makers with also arrive in cars and need to park. RNLI and Sunseeker workers require car parking too during the day. Perhaps a scheme to allow use of company and church car parks needs to be put in place, so that these can be used during hours when they are usually empty. Many elderly people need cars as cycling walking are not possible.	Noted. The aim of the Parking Standards SPD is to provide detailed guidance for developers and applicants on a range of issues relating to parking. It is outside of the remit of the SPD to provide guidance on the use of private car parks. Action: None
<b>PSSPD139</b>	IMPROVE 22.1 Bournemouth parking facilities IMPROVE 4.1.3 zone B parking proposals	Noted. It is not clear by this suggestion what improvements are being requested. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD140</b>	Change. Please explain where people are meant to park their cars - because there WILL be cars!	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None
<b>PSSPD141</b>	Improve.....look until the infrastructure is properly addressed this survey about new home parking is pointless. Turlin Moor for example needs another access road, Blandford Road consistantly floods due to land heave off the field. If the water services fail there again then Poole town centre WILL be gridlocked AGAIN for several weeks like last time as most of Ham is cut off. From the bridges to the border at Upton and beyond Blandford Road cannot cope with the numbers of traffic at certain times of the day. Building bike lanes there or bus lanes is impractical because the road is too narrow. Please please listen to locals that know the area and speak to us unlike the recently deposed unity alliance. Thank you.	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD142</b>	Provide at least one parking space per house or flat on new developments	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD143</b>	Provide at least 1 car park space for every flat or apartment	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD144</b>	I can't believe any property regardless of it being a studio flat could be allowed to be built with no allocated parking. Given the huge lack of employment in the surrounding area what links to further employment opportunities are you adding to the area. Or are you expecting everyone who wants to work in Blandford or Bournemouth to walk the length of Poole to get a bus or train	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD145</b>	With the lack of public transport infrastructure the parking provision is clearly inadequate There is already a significant lack of parking in the Poole area and these proposals will make the situation far worse The proposal are high-density and this is not reflected in the parking proposals the lack of parking for the new. It is unclear how the new development can be viable for purchasers without the necessary parking provision and whilst I recognise the desire to 'encourage' people to move away from cars, the reality is that people will have vehicles, particularly weekenders so where will they park, simply denying them space is not addressing the issue?	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD146</b>	There should not be a reduction in parking spaces without a massive input of a variety of transport schemes which are affordable.	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD147</b>	Add more parking for those houses to be built. Why is there not planned for 1-2 cars parking per house/flat?	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD148</b>	Every home should have at least one parking space allocated. Not providing spaces is short-sighted, ill-conceived and does not take into account people's practical needs, the future of electric cars, or reality.	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD makes provision for both active and passive EV charging to be provided in new development. Action: None
<b>PSSPD149</b>	Change the decision building in this already restricted area and on a vitally important green space is not being socially responsible or representative of the people in the area, in fact disrespectful of the people that they represent. Why build in this area when there are many brown field sites around Poole that need redevelopment.	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations and on brownfield sites. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD150</b>	Change do not build any more houses. The roads are already gridlocked, can't get into the school's or docs and no a and e absolutely ridiculous. Do not build any more houses in Dorset !!!	The aim of this SPD is to support the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It provides detail on parking requirements for new development proposals with an emphasis on good design and sustainability. It is a comprehensive document to be used by developers and consultants when they are designing new developments. It will be used by officers to assess parking requirements where planning permission is sought for new development. Action: None
<b>PSSPD151</b>	You need to allow more car parking. You need to improve access routes as additional 3000 homes relate to a minimum of 1 car per family and more likely 2. Not sure how they work these figures out but need to review.	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD152</b>	Change 4.2 Optimum Parking figures Table 10 C3 Houses. To suggest that 4-5 bedroom houses in Zone B only need one parking space is ludicrous. Living in a residential area we already have on-street parking as the driveways are not able to accommodate enough cars. We live in a beautiful part of the country, but how are we supposed to be able to get to Kimmeridge for example, without a car? Have you considered the age distribution of the people of Poole - are you expecting the 80 year olds to get on their bikes to cycle to Kimmeridge? I understand the ideals but be realistic or the whole of BCP will just become clogged up with vehicles as people cannot park in their own drives.	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD153</b>	<p>Whilst removing cars from our lives is a great ambition, it is unrealistic to provide zero car parking at new developments in Zone A and Zone B. Public transport and active travel can be encouraged, but the reality is that people need vehicles for their daily lives. People need vehicles for work - manual labourers such as plasters, electricians, service industry all have work related vehicles that they need to park. A zero approach to parking will encourage even more displaced parking in areas in Old Town Poole and East Hamworthy that already have parking issues with workers commuting to the town centre. Having looked at the initial plans for many of these developments, most seemed to include underground car parks. If these can be encouraged this will preserve active travels routes, whilst also maintaining a pleasant street scene. Please explain why parking allocation has been reduced from 0.7 spaces to zero. This consultation is not very accessible, why is it not following the national standard? Further, the background information is 70 pages + and the executive summary doesn't pull out the main points properly. Further this survey - I'm not going to comment on specific paragraphs, or using specific terminology, this is completely unrealistic for a public consultation. All digital services (including consultation) should be compliant with government accessibility standards and the format of this consultation will not meet them. <a href="https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/helping-people-to-use-your-service/making-your-service-accessible-an-introduction">https://www.gov.uk/service-manual/helping-people-to-use-your-service/making-your-service-accessible-an-introduction</a></p>	<p>Noted. The consultation complies with statutory requirements and the council's statement of community involvement. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD154</b>	<p>Change deadline to allow time to read it. 3 days is not democratically fair.</p>	<p>Noted. The consultation complies with statutory 4-week consultation period requirements and the council's statement of community involvement. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD155</b>	CHANGE THE FOLLOWING TO PLENTY OF PARKING TO PREVENT CONGESTION LIKE LONDON. What it means for Poole Old Town and Hamworthy East, the PQF area. Almost zero parking provision on the Regeneration sites; Sydenham's. Planning permission granted for 374 apartments, 369 parking spaces. The proposed SPD reduces this to a total of 28 parking spaces for this development. Between the Bridges; 459 apartments, 264 parking spaces. Reduced to ZERO spaces.	Noted. The consultation complies with statutory requirements and the council's statement of community involvement. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD156</b>	more double yellow lines	Noted. The Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership Action: None
<b>PSSPD157</b>	Reduce all roads to 20mph Roads not A(nn) eg A35. To have traffic chicanes to slow traffic. Dispense with all yellow lines on other roads except at junctions. On wide straight roads such as "the Avenue" put major traffic calming in place (These roads have become race tracks) Outlaw cycles & electric scooters from all "Footpaths" and the costal promenade (do you even know what the word means?). I notice that you do not allow for "delivery van/ lorry", Ambulance" parking on these crowded developments. Nor are you adhering to your "15 minute" walking to 15 minute a bus service. N.B your proposal for "Beach road" flats have a 1hour bus service for 8 months of year and the during the summer are impossible to get on from Westbourne to Sandbanks & vice versa due to "holiday makers"	Noted. These matters are outside of the remit of this Parking Standards SPD. Action None.
<b>PSSPD158</b>	Add:- I would like to add that the whole idea of building these homes is atrocious, given that the roads in the area are already congested without the regular maintenance and breakdown of the two bridges. This is a total failure in planning for the future of the Poole Hamworthy and Upton area. Would not the residents of these proposed homes need to	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	get to work out of town. In order to facilitate this they would need a vehicle, not walk, cycle or public transport for at least 10 miles.	development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations. Action None.
<b>PSSPD159</b>	Parking is a major concern, I live in Lulworth Ave and cars from this development will overflow on to my road which is already congested with Sunseeker employees and park users. Please allow adequate parking. Everyone has cars, make sure they have sufficient parking spaces for their needs	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations. Action None.
<b>PSSPD160</b>	Seriously little or no parking provision for new builds !!! Having lived on Blandford road between the two bridges for the last 22 years we have been waiting for some good news NO PROVISION FOR PARKING IS NOT GOOD NEWS. The local area is already saturated with Sunseeker staff squeezing into any space that becomes available, I like many others have had to have our curbs dropped and the front of our houses paved so we have somewhere to park. With all due respect who would want to buy a home without parking the idea is admirable but not realistic. Q1 Who is your target market for these dwellings Q2 Are you thinking new residents have no vehicles or just park them somewhere else. Q3 Do you think that imposing these restrictions on parking availability would put off building developers and hinder development which is already very overdue. Q4 How can you help with Sunseeker employees as there is obviously not enough parking supplied by the employer, we all know that they are of benefit to the town and local economy but allowing employees to saturate the local community flies in the face with what you are proposing.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations. Action None.
<b>PSSPD161</b>	Bcp parking standards improve to allow 1 parking place per dwelling at least	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD162</b>	Add more parking for residents and visitors in all areas. Each adult generally needs a car so a one bed would need two spaces etc. As more older children are still at home they also end up with a car and then there are visitors. Failure to accept this means that cars then overflow. It is not possible to live in this area without a car and many people now have one per adult in the house/flat	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD163</b>	There is insufficient parking for flats and houses in zones A and B	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD164</b>	Whats the point in a document detailing parking standards when you change the development of new housing on the old power station and Sydenhams sites to have just 28 car parking spaces. Are you going to include a clause when buying an apartment there that they cannot use a car? It will just clog up roads/parking spaces in the area. What is the contingency plan if you find people in those apartments need to have a car parking space further down the line?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD165</b>	No	Noted. Action None
<b>PSSPD166</b>	Change your mind. Too many houses. Too few parking spaces	Noted. The Parking Standards SPD will support actions of the BCP Council's Corporate Strategy to tackle climate change and ecological emergency by helping to prioritise opportunities to walk cycle and use public transport. It also supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, and improve health and wellbeing Action: None
<b>PSSPD167</b>	Need more parking as the reality is that people use cars. Limiting parking will just lead to dangerous or illegal parking nearby.	Noted. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD168</b>	Every House or Flat should be built with at least two parking spaces. If you want to see how not to do it visit Harlow in Essex and see what they did in the 1950s when they didn't take any note of the increase in private car ownership. Its all right saying use public transport but there is a worldwide pandemic on at the moment so private car use will increase not decrease.	Noted. Delivering homes in the right places with reduced parking requirements will protect the built and natural environment, protecting heathland and greenbelt. New communities will have greater connectivity and accessibility to places of work, shops and services either by walking cycling or using public transport. Action: None
<b>PSSPD169</b>	Far too many, no doubt they will look like boxes en mass density in numbers in years to come, become tomorrow's slums! Far too many houses planned as per normal rushing through something hoping no one objects too much. The roads are congested as it is. Why dont you get local residents involved planning properly, not the en mass building plan, make the area somewhere that can last and be a place where people will want to live. Also, leisure areas too, the environment has to be taken into consideration. As we are aware areas that have an area for residents to relax is good. What about building eco-friendly properties, solar panel tiles for energy Is this again going to be included in these plans. All very well building en mass properties. Saving energy is top priority too.	Noted. To contribute to creating vibrant and sustainable communities, housing delivery is directed to the most accessible locations focussed on brownfield sites and maximising opportunities for a range and mix of homes in areas where there will be investment in infrastructure. The SPD recognises the need to plan for development where EV charging will be required. The aim of the SPD is to support the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. Action: None
<b>PSSPD170</b>	change Table 9 C3: Flats - Zone B needs 1 parking space allocation for Studio/1 Bed and 2 Bed. (Especially in the instance of Hamworthy PowerStation site ). Change Table 10 C3: Houses Zone B - 1 bed needs 1 allocated parking space	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD171</b>	Add parking, change number of houses	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD172</b>	Change. How will this work with limited parking spaces and the current traffic within Hamworthy to get into Poole as the bridges are always down for repairs?	The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD173</b>	<p>Improve/change the zone definitions, particularly Zone B, and increase the number of parking spaces available for homes in these areas. Many of the district centres listed (such as Moordown and Broadstone) are miles from a main line railway station, while others (Ashley Cross, Hinton Admiral) are in close proximity. It is therefore unreasonable to expect residents of some of these areas to use the railway, while for many others, bus journeys require multiple changes, cycling is unsafe, and walking is not viable due to the distances involved. Therefore, (like it or not) most residents will have at least one (and probably two or more) vehicles at their home. Inadequate parking standards result in overcrowded streets, and vehicles parked on pavements or close to junctions. Most homes will therefore require at least 2 spaces per property in these areas.</p>	<p>Noted. The parking standards are applied on a hierarchical zone basis, reflecting different accessibility levels and are shown in Fig 28. Zone B covers the district centres as they have good local services, shops and other facilities or are in close proximity to a mainline rail station. The SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None.</p>
<b>PSSPD174</b>	<p>Well a readable document which was clear and easier to understand would be a start! How do you expect people to comment on this?! Oh wait, you don't.....</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to provide detail on parking requirements for new development. It is a comprehensive document to be used by developers, agents and consultants when they are designing new development. It will be used by planning officers, planning committee to determine planning applications. The executive summary conveys the scope of the SPD and throughout the document, the sections have been carefully written to ensure that requirements are clear. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD175</b>	Reduce building density. More houses, with green spaces and less flats	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD176</b>	There isn't enough parking allowance for the proposed number of dwellings. Where do you expect all the cars to go	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements. Action None
<b>PSSPD177</b>	Difficult read. Inadequate parking bays allocated for residents' visitor. Simple diagram needed to clarify allocated visitor parking areas.	Noted. Visitor parking requirements are included in each of the use classes shown tables 3-33. Action: None
<b>PSSPD178</b>	I like the detail about cycle parking. I'd like trailer bikes to be considered as well as cargo bikes. I don't know if they are longer or shorter but for people looking for low-carbon freight transport they are a lot cheaper than cargo bikes and so may become more popular. I know that I don't use mine as often as I would like because of a lack of suitable parking places. I would like to see a hierarchy in the priorities given to parking and use of the different travel options with active travel and support for people with mobility problems getting the most support and focus, then public transport, with private cars being the lowest priority. I would also like to see Green Space being prioritised over car parking. Can we not make sure that future car parks are underground ? I would like to see an end to any additional on-street parking, (and a reduction in existing street parking).	Noted. The types of cycles are shown in figure 11 and cycle parking section refers to cycle facilities for bike trailers. The SPD reflects the national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change. Action: Insert triangular diagram to clearly show the preferred order - walk, cycle, public transport, car. Include text to state: improving the quality, reliability, safety and attractiveness of alternatives to the private car in particular walking cycling and public transport.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD179</b>	You need to have decent Infrastructure before you start building residential homes without parking spaces or put a clause on the buying contract saying the properties can only be bought by non-car owners and people that work in the vicinity. Green living is great in theory, but most people have to travel to get to work places that are not covered by public transport!	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD180</b>	As ever these documents are mind blowingly complex are certainly not intended for those of us ordinary folk who live in Bournemouth, and who regard the council's determination to build more and more flats, rather than family homes, as a nightmare. Of course, flats will house more and more people (and gain more council tax) AND their cars, making Bournemouth one of the most congested towns in the country, but no one really benefits because no major employers seem to be attracted to the area. As the infrastructure: water, sewage etc, how much more can the area take? If a block of flats comprises say 60 individual apartments, how many parking spaces will it have on-site? How many additional spaces on-site for visitors? How many will be expected to park on the road? If there are insufficient spaces then why will it be acceptable to have more on street parking?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD181	Change. Need more parking..I own a house in Carter Quay/ Stabler Way & parking is difficult anyway. Why so few parking spaces and the obvious impact on current local residents?	Noted. It is a corporate objective to encourage sustainable travel. In July 2019, the Council declared its commitment to addressing a Climate and Ecological emergency. This was a fundamental shift in corporate direction to reflect the wider global movement towards taking quicker and more direct action to reduce carbon emissions, including the aim of making BCP Council carbon neutral by 2030 and the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole region carbon neutral ahead of the 2050 national target. A key part of the response to this declaration will be to encourage reduced car travel journeys and promote more sustainable forms of travel (which is also supported by the Government’s recent publication “Decarbonising Transport”). Limiting the amount of parking spaces in development in key areas will contribute to helping reduce car ownership and reduce journeys by car. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD182	<p>It seems to me that this document dramatically changes parking standards for new development - such that there will, if it is affected, be no parking for owners or users of property within the redevelopment areas around Poole Town Centre. This seems an extraordinarily draconian policy given the Council's apparent weakness in more sensibly dealing with the congestion caused by residents here already, in the conurbation today. I can accept that people living and using these development areas must be encouraged to minimise car use for local trips; but I find that the document gives me no information on how the Council is going to ensure its part in making that happen and allowing them to lead happy healthy lives. It seems to me that the Council must do that, too in this documented policy, if it is to make the positive contribution to the future of these parts of Poole and conurbation it wants to do. If these developments are to prove attractive to people, and we want them to, surely, then some accommodation of car users must be made and be made evident in this same documented policy. If people cannot park or garage their vehicles privately then the corollary of this proposed policy is that the Council must, at one and the same time as introducing this SPD, explain the associated actions it will take to secure satisfactory public and private transport arrangements so as to allow people easily to go about their daily lives. Pedestrian and cycle modes can be covered by clear drawings of the proposed arrangements in these planning documents and site-specific ones but the council's policy of support for their priority provision must be adequately explained here too. High quality public transport services are pre-requisites in such areas yet I see nothing here on the Councils' intentions to secure a level and standard of service that will demonstrate to people that they will be able to rely on such services once they are resident. Car clubs can also be expected to be essential pre-requisites; what is the Council doing to ensure their availability in these areas. Moreover, how is it going to satisfy a disbelieving advance purchaser that they will be available? Will there be sufficient parking space given over to these in the common parts of the areas? Private parking for locals and visitors is also necessary if the areas are to work satisfactorily, despite this SPD. Presumably this might be multi-storey over or underground arrangements, on street or parking lot at ground level; but if people are to be persuaded to buy or rent in the area then this provision needs specifying within this document too. While I appreciate this document is not intended for the end-purchaser to peruse; which is the implication of some of my comments above, some of the consequences of this policy will have big effects on the areas concerned, such as provision for private parking, car clubs , public transport arrangements etc. Effects that are</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD provides extensive and detailed layout and design guidance for cycle provision in section 3. Car clubs and car sharing are covered in section 5. Action: Strengthen opportunities to deliver car clubs with greater than 20 units on site provision of at least 1 car club bay will be expected. For developments of fewer than 20 units an equivalent financial contribution towards an existing car club will be sought.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>essential features, inevitably of the final development and therefore essential pre-requisites for the developers themselves to take into account at the design stage.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD183</b>	Where do you expect them to park? Living in Border Road, we'll soon see congestion through the roof. How do you expect to overcome this?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD184</b>	It's crazy that there is so little parking. I understand the want for more cycling and walking, but the majority of people still have at least one car. There are no other options locally for them to be parked. It's going to cause chaos and I doubt seriously there will be many people wanting to buy houses / flats without parking, so they'll end up sitting empty	Noted. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action None.
<b>PSSPD185</b>	None. I am very much in favour of development of Poole and Hamworthy area as much of it has been in decline. I am however concerned that the impact of hundreds of flats without parking allocation will lead to overflows, poor parking and dangerous roads. As a parent and cyclist in Poole, this greatly concerns me.can the planners please advise how many homes will not have parking spaces and where they expect the average 1.3 cars per household to park?	Noted. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action None.
<b>PSSPD186</b>	CHANGE . The area next to the twin sails Bridge, would be better if it was a small corner of housing with a shopping outlet and part marina. This would bring more investors into Poole. I was born here, and our roads cannot cope with more large scale housing as it would eventually put people off coming here. I'm against building more homes	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD187</b>	add: the parking bay width of 2.6m seems a little narrow, wider bays needed in the middle if there are a group of three bays together. I accept the theory of getting people to walk/cycle. However many of these properties will be occupied by young working couples. Where will they work? Certainly not within walking/cycling distance so how do you envisage they will get to work? The current bus service to Turlin Moor is experiencing many problems to the extent there is talk of withdrawing it. The train service from Hamworthy is not very good and people will be reluctant to leave their cycles near to a troublesome area.	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Parking space dimensions are sufficient for the majority of cars. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD188</b>	Please remember that people need to live/ work/ socialise etc etc and that sometimes , a car is the only sensible way of getting from place to place either because of poor bus service availability/ mobility/ time of journey other than by car etc etc. Whilst the aims may be in line with Govt policy and ' inducements' , they ignore how people need to live their lives. Covid of course does not help, but I'm ignoring this as a long term factor - maybe foolishly	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Parking space dimensions are sufficient for the majority of cars. Action: None Action None
<b>PSSPD189</b>	Cars are a fact of life whether for residents, visitors, care workers, delivers etc. The cycle mania following Covid is just a blip deal with it don't shove it down our faces. Minimum 1 space for residential unit large enough for the larger than average family vehicle with electric points for charging (the way ahead eco friendly. Not that long ago in a student block, a group very likely to cycle not own a car, they asked for the unused cycle store to be converted for communal use. Otherwise you will just create parking problems on the streets. Real life against your Utopia.	Noted. Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet the housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD section 3 sets out requirements for EV charging provision in new development. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD190</b>	<p>Improve, I would like to see the dimensions of ALL parking bays increased particularly the width, all vehicles now are much bigger than 30 or 40 years ago, even a mini is no longer a mini size. So I would like to see all bays 1 metre wider than what they are at present, even parked perfectly within bay boundaries it's very easy for car doors to damage the vehicle parked alongside, this must be obvious to all planners and public alike. This does mean less spaces in a defined area but I consider this absolutely vital as vehicles are not going to get smaller, you only need to be of a larger stature or a gust of wind to cause significant damage to a neighbouring vehicle. Supermarket parking is a prime example of this, some have put in a limited number of larger spaces and the disabled and the parent and child bays are fine but what about the majority of everybody else. There should be a legally required minimum.size for all developments and that size must be a metre bigger than they are now, this should be a condition of ALL developments commercial and residential. I consider this a must.</p>	<p>Noted. Across the conurbation there are varying standards of bay size from the legacy parking standards. The new size requirement for a standard parking spaces of 2.6m x 4.8m caters for a wide range of vehicles and provides some side width to allow for ease of use. Action: None.</p>
<b>PSSPD191</b>	<p>Add more car parking</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Parking space dimensions are sufficient for the majority of cars. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD192</b>	<p>Change</p>	<p>Noted. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD193</b>	<p>Change. To build new properties with inadequate parking is nonsense. Public Transport is very expensive and unreliable in the area. Parking will be pushed out to other parts of the neighbourhood creating chaos. How on earth is taking away lovely, green space that people use to relax and walk regularly good and green? Free space is becoming sparse in the Poole area, building on what's left shouldn't even be being considered!</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action : None</p>
<b>PSSPD194</b>	<p>Change - please reconsider building houses on Hamworthy Recreation site, we need open spaces for people to enjoy, exercise and fresh air are key for many people, this has been especially important during 2020. The council should be encouraging exercise so that we do not have so many obese people. Hamworthy Recreation and the Nature Reserve are enjoyed not just by people but also a variety of animals. The roads around Upton and Hamworthy especially Blandford Road can not cope with any more extra traffic, it is already like one giant car park during rush hours. Upton and Hamworthy does not have the infrastructure to cope with that amount of houses and that much more traffic.</p>	<p>Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. Action : None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD195</b>	<p>Is there a tie-in between these standards and the specifications/contractual arrangements for provision of bus services in BCP? It seems pointless to me to designate certain zones without some certainty that existing bus provision is to be maintained and preferably extended. This matters particularly in Zones B and D. Whilst at present, for instance in Highcliffe and Walkford, there is reasonable bus provision connecting to main centres both in BCP and in New Forest District during the daytime, it disappears in the evening. So a comprehensive style of living, including cultural events in the evening, will normally require car ownership as a matter of course. Were the buses to be guaranteed into the late evening, far fewer cars would be brought out onto the road after working hours. Additionally, the bus services that there are are very linear, point to point. Where is the recognition that journeys to work are more complicated than just getting from one main centre to another? Residents will continue to need cars to get to work if their place of work is a twenty minute walk from the nearest main bus service. There is such an intimate connection between bus service provision and car parking at the domicile that I should have thought that the two issues cannot be dealt with separately.</p>	<p>Noted. The zonal approach is applied on the basis of differing accessibility levels. It is assumed that where there is greater accessibility, there will be greater opportunity to travel by public transport, cycle and walk. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action : None</p>
<b>PSSPD196</b>	<p>Add, change and improve a version of this document that does not require the reader to (a) have a degree in urban planning (b) a law degree and (c) the patience of a saint to read every word ! Seriously folks how many actual, ordinary people do you expect to truly read this ? For a start it requires not only high literacy levels, but perfect eyesight AND access to a computer ? In terms of accessibility this document and your consultation process fail at every level. I have no wish to disrespect or belittle the people who created the document - it is obviously a thorough and detailed piece of work, but it is not an "end user" document , rather an excellent Councillor/Officer briefing one. Please work with groups such as Access Dorset and Diversity Abilities as well as with your own communications staff who produce documents for the public to formulate clear and simple material. Break the information down into manageable pieces FROM THE POINT OF VIEW OF THE PUBLIC and put all the statutory/legal information in appendices (with appropriate references in the text). Of course the legal aspect is vital, but people need to understand what changes/new procedures would mean in the real world. Have you thought about making a video/animation to help demonstrate some of the issues ? Bournemouth University has a world class media faculty, you know ! Also what about an audio version - the local Talking Newspaper charities would be a good place to start. I</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD will ensure that that the Council has a single, up to date and consistent framework for parking standards for new developments coming forward in the BCP area. It is a comprehensive document aimed at applicants, agents and developers to ensure that they have the detailed and comprehensive guidance needed to design development which aligns with the BCP Corporate Strategy objectives of contributing to carbon reduction and promote modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel. The SPD has an executive summary which clearly sets out the scope of the document. The consultation accords with statutory regulations and the adopted Statement of Community Involvement. However, we recognise that improving public engagement in</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>know things are very tough for BCP (&amp; the country !) due to coronavirus and I know that there are obvious cost implications to implementing a more accessible format &amp; consultation process, BUT unless plans are available to ALL, we will all lose out in the end.</p>	<p>the future will improve when the Covid 19 pandemic is over. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD197	<p>Exec Summary Para 6: "the availability of car parking can have an impact on how people travel and encourage a modal shift to non car alternatives including walking, cycling and Public Transport" DELETE. Whilst true at destinations (for example the disastrous impact of high car park charges on Poole and Bournemouth town centres) there is no evidence offered to suggest that residential car park provision has this impact. In fact it is only the provision of viable alternative transport methods that can do this. Exec Summary Para 7: "... by behaviour change and ...". DELETE. It is the planners job to ensure that houses and buildings meet the needs of the occupants and users, not to seek to change behaviours and engage in social engineering. 1.1.3 "New communities will have greater connectivity and accessibility to places of work ...." DELETE whole paragraph. No evidence to suggest this bill be true. Just wishful thinking. Look at the new and proposed developments in the Merley/BearCross area where there is no increase practical in connectivity and accessibility either by walking, cycling or public transport 1.1.7 "Accessibility to public transport and local services reduces the demand for car ownership..." IMPROVE. All we can say is that it may reduce the demand for car use. Occupants may have many reasons to still own a car: visiting distant friends and relatives, a change of job to somewhere inaccessible by public transport, shopping expeditions to specialist outlets, visiting sons and daughters at university, going on holiday. I find this assumption that people live their lives within and 800m circle absolutely absurd and we need houses that have the flexibility to accommodate many different lifestyles. 1.1.9 "If policies are not developed to effectively manage the levels of parking associated with a new development, this is likely to intensify existing on street parking pressure". Agreed. The first policy must to ensure that adequate car parking is provided in the first place to prevent the problem. CHANGE to "... developed to effectively ensure adequate levels of parking...") 1.3.1 "Parking is a key component that decides how people travel and how they choose to live". DELETE. Not true, no evidence offered. They choose how they want to live and if that means owning a car then they will choose not to live in Bournemouth, perhaps commuting in to their job instead of living nearby. 2.1.2 "....parking standards... should take into account ....car ownership levels". This standards do not do that. They seek to impose car ownership levels rather than plan to meet them. Table 9 C3 Flats and Table 10 C3 Houses. CHANGE. This document has quoted 53.6% current household car ownership in Bournemouth town centre and 80% car ownership in suburban areas. It has not considered how many households have multiple cars (eg. because husbands, wives, sons and daughters work in different locations). So as a minimum Zone A will require one parking space for every two 1-2HR residences in the top Left hand corner. This shows</p>	<p>Noted: The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. Action: Para 1.1.7. make change as suggested.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>how completely inadequate the figures these table are and how much they do not represent how people live today and will continue to live. The BCP Council will not break the love affair the British people have with their cars. People will not give up the convenience of door to transport at any time and why should they? With the advent of EV the pollution issues will be solved and motoring will become more acceptable. For a planning document to pretend otherwise is to put wokeness before reality. This housing developments will be inflexible to peoples lifestyles and unsaleable to anyone without a car, which discounts the vast majority of the population. We should stop putting the profits of the property developers above the actual needs of real families and people. Much is made of the 46.4% of households in Bournemouth town centre do not own a car. What is the demographic of Bournemouth town centre? What the area being considered? what is the total number of households within the are? how many old people? how many students? etc. Surely the means that any residential new building must provide at least one car park space for every two residences otherwise the impact of on street parking will be disastrous. What are the current parking standards applied to Flats and Houses across the BCP area and how are they different to the proposed? Please provide figures for current car ownership across the BCP area</p>	
<b>PSSPD198</b>	Page 22: The units should be labelled properly: kW, A, V (not kw, Amp, v).	Noted. Action: Make changes as suggested.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD199</b>	Change your plan, add parking, improve peoples lives	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD200</b>	All long winded to protect the developers to not supply any parking if they can help it. EVERY BEDROOM BUILT SHOULD HAVE 1 PARKING SPACE....straight forward rule, 3 bedrooms, 3 spaces etc	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD201</b>	<p>I support encouraging people to walk, cycle and to use public transport. But the policies being followed by BCP and further presented in this plan are grossly naïve. It is not possible to manage parking by only addressing off street parking within the town centre. There has to be a holistic approach that includes management of on street parking. At present we have a complete mis-mash of on street parking and parking enforcement. We have roads with parking restrictions that are not policed by enforcement officers. We have roads with no parking restrictions, which is very unusual, for a town centre location, these prime parking positions are often occupied by the same vehicle for days, weeks and in some cases months. We do not appear to have any resident parking schemes and we do not appear to have any clear joined up policy of charging for on street parking. My comment in respect of this plan in relation to the town centre area is that it has no sound foundation and it is not sufficiently developed to be presented for public consultation. It cannot succeed going forward without ample development of objectives and a strategy to achieve defined objectives.</p>	<p>Noted: The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD202	<p>Change: Section 4 Parking Standards, C3, Tables 9 &amp;10 Flats and Houses. Zone B to have 1 Parking space throughout except 4HR &amp; 5 HR to have 2. Also identify separately provision of Visit spaces, e.g. 0.1 per Flat &amp; House. I would like to see the maximum car parking standards set at what I would describe as a more realistic level (above). My reading of NPPF (2019) is that planning should be such to encourage "active transport" e.g. walking and cycling, reduce the need for private car journeys and also facilitate private ownership of greener powered vehicles, e.g. though electrical charging points and infrastructure. The intention is not to unreasonably deny people the huge benefit of private car ownership. UK Governments continue to recognize the importance of private car ownership to the economy as a whole but this applies equally to the Poole and Bournemouth region. Yes, private car mileage is a great luxury and damaging to the environment and yes it must be reduced, at least until such time as "greener" vehicles are generally affordable. But this reduction must be done carefully and in a way that doesn't cause excessive hardship, damage livelihoods and contract the aspirations and options people now expect. The NPPF (2019) states as one reason for setting maximum car parking standards, that there should be a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network. Q1: Do BCP consider that this applies, for example to the proposed development on the old power station site? Q2: If so, has the required justification been produced, documented and made available to the public for inspection and comment? Q3: Does the justification take account of the significant reduction in congestion that will result from: a) the construction of a link road to the Port, b) the completion of ongoing road works, c) the optimisation of traffic light systems and d) delivery of reliability from the twin sails bridge? A further reason for setting maximum parking standards identified in the NPPF is for optimising the density of development in locations well served by public transport: Q4: Do BCP consider that this also applies, e.g. to the aforementioned old power station site? Q5: If so what is the criteria for "optimisation" used by BCP? For example optimisation is not the same thing as maximisation (of development density), if the residential properties built fail to meet the needs and aspirations of a balanced spectrum of residents or if the demand for such properties is simply too low to ensure full occupation. Q6: Have BCP considered the needs of that part of the workforce for whom private vehicle ownership is essential to job function, for example Doctors, Health Visitors, Care Workers, Tradesmen, Utility workers, Consultants, cross-site workers, inspectors of various kinds, factory workers at out of Town Industrial Estates. Q7: Have BCP considered the needs of residents who require</p>	<p>Noted: The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Full comment</b>	<b>Officer Comment/Action</b>
	<p>visitor car parking spaces for sources of support and family connection, particularly the elderly and young families?</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD203</b>	Improve Parking Allocation. Why so inconsiderate towards local residents?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD204</b>	Yes having lived in the US for nine years the best parking solution was plaza parking for all retail outlets and every apartment complex had parking for all residents at side and rear. I appreciate that you want everyone to use public transport or go on a bike but when you get older you really don't want to get wet or cold cycling or waiting for a bus.	Noted. The overall aim of this SPD is to set out parking standards in new residential and non-residential development to provide clear guidance and certainty to applicants, developers and agents when designing new development. This Parking SPD aligns with the BCP Corporate Strategy objectives of contributing to carbon reduction and promotes modal shift to more sustainable travel to recognise the council's commitment to respond to the climate and ecological emergency. It has been screened for equality impact assessment. Action: None
<b>PSSPD205</b>	Change: there is planning permission granted for various sites in the regeneration area which include parking spaces, albeit it not 1 space per unit but close, the SPD will reduce parking to almost zero parking spaces. We do not have the infrastructure in place to accommodate all of the proposed accommodation and with COVID 19 nobody has faith in the use of public transport. The Canford Heath Park and Ride car park is currently a COVID testing station. Improve: Two of the regeneration sites are currently used as staff car parks for Sunseeker and RNLI, what provision will there be to replace these current car parks. If a reasonable solution for the loss of these car parks is not agreed on, these main employers in Poole may lose their staff or have to relocate to another part of the country.	Noted. The Parking SPD provides detailed and comprehensive guidance to deliver on a range of economic, social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD206</b>	Add carpark spaces, atleast one per house and flat. improve the roads around the area as when it's rush hour it's bad enough now you are adding 3000 new properties, more then three quarters have no parking. Where is everyone supposed to park? Why not add underground parking? Or just put in a car park free for residents!. All side roads will be blocked with cars.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD207</b>	Make parking bays wider than current inadequate standard. If less cars are expected on the roads/carparks then making the spaces wider is sensible, particularly for older folk who find parking and getting in and out difficult. Often cycling and walking is not an option for older people.	Noted. Across the conurbation there are varying standards of bay size from the legacy parking standards. The new size requirement for a standard parking spaces of 2.6m x 4.8m caters for a wide range of vehicles and provides some side width to allow for ease of use. The SPD is not suggesting that every single trip has to be made by bike, or that everyone has to cycle. Instead cycling and walking should, however, be made an easy option for those that want to use it. Action: None.



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD208</b>	<p>Improve C3 Table 9 Flats. Does not appear to allow for residents ability, occupation, place of occupation, etc. No visitors = No Carer visits. No allowance for key or shift workers who may need car when no public transport available. Unallocated parking leads to conflict especially with previous mentioned occupations. Biased towards rich who can afford larger properties. No provision made for disabled parking. Developments of only 1 or 2 Bed flats in some areas would have no parking spaces. Improve 3.6.4 Table 1 Should be 100% Active to avoid conflicts. When are you going to survey residents as why the use a car? Current infrastructure is built around cars etc and until a replacement is planned it is no good creating this type of SPD. No car means no holidays in uK. No visiting relatives. Disabled have to stay at home. No Carer visits. No unsocial hours for workers. No going to weddings, funerals etc. Reverse Beeching cuts.</p>	<p>Noted. Visitor parking requirements are included in each of the use classes shown tables 3-33. The SPD covers disabled parking guidance in section 3 and appendix A. EV Charging provision is considered to be reasonable. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD209</b>	<p>This is a stupid survey that does not work on small tablets such as an iPad. Answer is one long sentence with no paragraph breaks. Cannot easily edit or change. Cannot enter a full post code</p>	<p>Noted. Action None</p>
<b>PSSPD210</b>	<p>Change - the reduction in parking places for the Regeneration area in Poole are, I feel, too draconian. I am sure short-term parking for visitors, Dr.s etc are intended. I know that alternatives to the car need 'the numbers' to make car clubs, public transport, employers providing transport for their employees, etc viable. I feel some permanent spaces are necessary though not the number originally envisaged. I also appreciate Poole High St needs more footfall before it becomes attractive to businesses and decreased car use could help this.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Visitor parking requirements are included in each of the use classes shown in tables 3-33. Action: Strengthen opportunities to deliver car clubs in Zones A &amp; B.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD211</b>	<p>Change 4.2 C3 Table 9 Flats. Does not allow for disabled so breaches Disability Discrimination as a Development of only 1 or 2 bed flats in Zones A or B would have no spaces for disabled residents, visitors or career visits. Does not allow for type of resident or occupation. EG Carers, key works, shift workers etc. Change 4.2.6 Unallocated parking. This approach can only lead to conflict between residents, especially if spaces limited. Discriminates against shift workers etc working unsocial hours. Also leads to conflict if EV bays are used by non EV vehicles. Change 4.1.3 Not all parts of Hamworthy have an adequate local transport provision. Harbour Reach and Carters Quay etc are prime examples of a very poor provision. Change 3.6.4 All bays should be Active.to avoid conflict if provision is lower than actual vehicles. Change 4 Parking Standards. Does not appear to take into account that residents in Zones A &amp; B may have relatives in Zones C &amp; D. Does not address the lack of general transport infrastructure. Until that is improved residents in Zones A &amp; B, especially families, may not be able to take holidays in the UK, visit relatives in other rural parts of the country. it Will be easier to take holidays abroad. Until the rail network cuts/closures of Beeching etc are reversed to enable easy access to all parts of the country most residents will still need cars. All schools are not the same and some children may have to go outside their allocated areas. Parents cannot be in two places at the same time.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD covers disabled parking guidance in section 3 and Appendix A. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD212</b>	<p>CHANGE: Paragraph 4.2 Optimum parking figures. Evidence? Assumptions of likely demand for parking are grossly underestimated. Even if public transport was much improved and however much cycling/walking are encouraged, people still expect to own a car for longer or more complicated journeys. Lack of parking will not dissuade them. Building massive developments with inadequate parking will cause chaos where there is already great pressure.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD covers disabled parking guidance in section 3 and appendix A. Action: None</p>

## Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD213</b>	Change the completely unrealistic parking standards for the central urban areas. As a Chartered Surveyor with 50+ years experience, I know that development schemes only happen if they are financially viable or if subsidised by the public purse (ie: us). Failure to provide on-site car parking will mean that apartments are unsaleable and commercial premises difficult to let. Thus developments will not go ahead and sites in urban centres will remain a wasteland - just as West Quay Road has been for the last decade. Are you living in the real world?	BCP Council has significant housing and other development pressures to meet the long term needs of the area. The right balancing between promoting modal shift and deliverability needs to be reached. In July 2019, the Council declared its commitment to addressing a Climate and Ecological emergency. This has given rise to a fundamental shift in corporate direction and take more direct action to reduce carbon emissions, with the aim of BCP Council becoming carbon neutral by 2030. Action: None
<b>PSSPD214</b>	Is there any consideration being given to the residents of Zone A and the seemingly endless reduction in parking spaces in Zone A. Also this parking problem could be much improved if the council made greater efforts to stop non Zone A permitted vehicles parking in Zone A. Outside the Angel would be a good example.	Noted. Car parking restrictions such as controlled parking zones are expected to be delivered through the Strategic Car Parking Review (SCPR). When completed, this will form a new single strategy for the provision (availability), operation, pricing and enforcement for parking across the highway network including car parks. This is closely linked to the BCP Council Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document and will support the emerging Local Plan to deliver the sustainable growth and provide viable, vibrant and sustainable communities well into the future. It is a corporate objective to encourage sustainable travel. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD215</b>	<p>The many new properties planned in Poole Town centre as well as the expected change of use of building from offices to residential will mean that there is a high-density of habitation. Whilst in an ideal world ( Wriiten by someone where environmental issues are high on my agenda at work and home) we would want to reduce motor vehicles. If we are to make Poole high street a vibrant and busy place with events running there has to be sufficient parking. As a resident of the old town we are constantly reporting illegally parked vehicles on the pavement and outside the guildhall for people who do not have a permit, which limits those spaces for people who have to have vehicles for work. For example my husband travels to visit elderly people to care for their feet - he needs his vehicle and could not provide this service without one! There has to be allowance for caters to who we have seen trying to park so they can take care of their patients.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Visitor parking requirements are included in each of the use classes shown in tables 3-33 Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD216	<p>change. 4.12.. Zone A Houses have regularly 2 or 3 cars per household (they have where we live). these are not used for accessing the town, but for work in areas where public transport does not go. Also, these days houses have more than one person who needs transport to work/ leisure activities, (Nowadays many children no longer leave home due to house prices), where public transport does not go. To remove any parking for new developments in zone A is consigning these people to a very restricted life where they have no freedom of choice, to be able to get to places away from the public for mental health reasons. Or if there is an emergency with remote families etc, they will not have the facility to react quickly. Public transport is still not able to access all areas, not regular, not frequent, not affordable, not reliable, not efficient, still has to go on roads used by other transport, nor is it comfortable nor respectful of personal space, and under current COVID restrictions, low priority transport. Cycles or electric bikes are only good for short journeys, not for shopping outings, nor for accessing distant areas where public transport does not exist. Public transport currently is just for accessing the restricted areas where they serve, nowhere else. by removing the access for people to a car, removes their ability to move freely around the country. Rather, that car parking is prioritised for electric cars where possible. make the new housing developments sustainable and green. Have a direct independent light rail system directly into the centre of town and all areas normally accessed - such as industrial estates, out of town shopping centres, and leisure centres. This can also apply to make a direct superhighway just for bikes. Nobody is going to use a bike in inclement weather when a car is more comfortable, cheaper, immediately accessible, and goes almost everywhere. Also these 'bike only' houses will still need parking for visitors with cars, delivery vehicles for online food and other shopping which will have to become the norm. Until a truly integrated countrywide travel system is put in place, we still need cars. we need all houses at least one car park available. Building under each house will remove the need to use recreational space for parking. The old power station is perfect for this type of construction due to the concrete sub base, and also will keep the houses above any potential rising sea level.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD217</b>	<p>Improve? I was amazed to see the various of cycles in the relevant table (Fig 11) and was wondering how some of the larger versions would fit into proposed cycle lanes of new road improvements eg Wallisdown Road proposed 2 way cycle routes, which look like a disaster waiting to happen. Presumably if car lifts or stackers were used they would only be suitable for ambulant people since elderly or disabled people would need additional room and/or time to offload mobility aids etc. The length oh time to view and comment on such a detailed and complex was totally unsuitable, I only received the email 3 days before the deadline. When calculating zone area dimensions do you take into account the gradient of the route being walked, since this can have a marked effect on both very old or very young legs. Whilst it is a good idea to improve facilities for new build developments with additional cycle storage and car charging facilities for electric cars, since no more land is being provided to facilitate this items, isn't there a danger that the size of the buildings will need to be reduced to provide such arrangements which some occupiers may never use?</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD takes a zonal approach to parking standards reflecting the different accessibility levels in terms of access to public transport, services, shops and other facilities. Zone A Main centres have the highest level of accessibility, with Zone B generally smaller and so on. BCP Council has significant housing and other development pressures to meet the long term needs of the area. Directing development to the most accessible location will reduce the need to travel by car. The right balance between promoting modal shift and deliverability needs to be reached. In July 2019, the Council declared its commitment to addressing a Climate and Ecological emergency. This has given rise to a fundamental shift in corporate direction and take more direct action to reduce carbon emissions, with the aim of BCP Council becoming carbon neutral by 2030. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD218</b>	<p>IMPROVE : 4.2 It appears that there is very little provision for parking for residents. The very large development that is proposed for the Power Station site, West Quay Road and near Poole Quay will result in areas like Hamworthy turning in to parking areas for visitors. It is irresponsible to build so many dwellings without adequate parking provision.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD219	<p>1.1.5 There is no evidence apparent on the ground that restricting parking provision reduces the number of vehicles. This may work in high population density cities but, in Bournemouth, just consumes every metre of roadside. The “quality” of developments is adversely effected by the results of not providing adequate, let alone “generous” parking requirements. 1.1.5 “Quantum” could usefully be replaced by “quantity” (unless some other meaning is intended, in which case it could perhaps be explained). 1.1.8 Car ownership may be declining but van ownership (or custodianship) at home is visibly increasing with the decline of the “builder’s yard” and the increase in home delivery vehicles (eg Amazon, supermarkets) whose drivers operate from home. 1.1.9 It is not clear that the logic here follows: reducing parking provision will increase on-street parking but reducing the availability of on-street parking does not address the ownership of vehicles (including vans). 3.3 As a cycle stand user, I have noticed that some local roadside stands are installed on slopes. Even a gentle slope can make bicycle lock-up a tedious process. This could be simply alleviated by providing a a (very) low stop perpendicular to the stand, sufficient to stop a bicycle rolling away. (4.) The zonal approach seems to assume that those in in the “centre” zones need only to travel regularly to destinations easily connected by public transport. Delivery drivers with vans, taxis and any workers more than a short distances from their place of work will still need personal transport. Example: Person living in Bournemouth and working in Christchurch (which I did for many years). Table 10 (in section 4) seems to defy reality. Affording a house purchase generally demand a couple, both in employment, who generally work separately and often not able to use public transport. Once children are included, one partner will typically use a personal vehicle for “school run” and related child support purposes. Most cases point to the need for two vehicles per house, with more potentially to support older children (as the age for leaving the family home increases, partly due to above affordability issues). Similar comments apply to Table 9. Comments about company-owned, employee parked vehicles (notably vans) apply to these and to Table 12. 4.3.3 Such surveys must include allowance for van ownership (or custodianship) at home from the increase in home delivery vehicles (eg Amazon, supermarkets) and others whose drivers operate from home. Vans are both larger than cars and also present visibility hazards (being generally entirely opaque as well as taller/wider than cars). 5.5 What measures are proposed to bring such clubs into existence? Until they exist, it seems unwise to assume any beneficial effects upon parking demand. 5.9 What evidence is there that such a CPZ does not just move (and increase) parking stress around its boundaries? How will this be addressed? The document does not address the issue of on-pavement parking. This causes difficulties</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD will ensure that that the Council has a single, up to date and consistent framework for parking standards for new developments coming forward in the BCP area. It is a comprehensive document aimed at applicants, agents and developers to ensure that they have the detailed and comprehensive guidance needed to design development which aligns with the BCP Corporate Strategy objectives of contributing to carbon reduction and promote modal shift to more sustainable forms of travel. The SPD has an executive summary which clearly sets out the scope of the document. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>for pedestrians, including damage to pavements as well as restricted walking space. It also gives restricted sightlines as some vehicles park on the road and some on the pavement. Having personally had a vehicle driven quickly at me in the process of parking on the pavement, I also consider it a danger: as driving on the pavement becomes normalised, it becomes less safe for pedestrians. Why not follow the example of London and ban this? There may need to be exceptions for some particularly narrow roads (eg housing estates built without adequate parking space) but much of the conurbation could benefit from this.</p>	



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD220</b>	<p>Improve 1.4.2 the council states it does not control the private car ownership which means that people will still continue to use them . It is not practical to do a weeks shopping for a family and collect this on a bicycle or to go on holiday . The council is removing the individuals freedom of choice or making them park elsewhere in the area which. Causes the parking issue to just be moved else where . Every new property should be allocated one space which will improve the situation. Where do the staff who work at Sunseeker Park in this new area ? At present the only parking is across Poole Bridge in a council car park which is expensive .There is a move to persuade people to drive electric cars and these will still need to be parked somewhere .i believe that the number of houses should be reduced to allow for more open spaces for parking and tree planting . Also if some of the residents in the poole area are elderly they will not be able to cycle as the plans suggest .</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD221</b>	<p>As usual a long winded document that could have been reduced and made a lot clearer.</p>	<p>Noted. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD222</b>	<p>Stop this madness now, streets around will be 1 way and no room for emergency vehicles. BCP should not be in a race to increase rates income at any cost.</p>	<p>Noted. Outside the remit of this SPD. Action None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD223</b>	<p>I would like to commend the Council for taking an active approach to reaching the national target of net-zero emissions by 2050. The Council recognises its responsibility to make the Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole region carbon neutral ahead of 2050 and in making its operations carbon neutral by 2030. Reviewing parking standards to reduce car dependency and increase cycle provisions indeed works positively towards this outcome. In discussing forecourts section 3.2.27 of the draft document states that ‘parking in front gardens should be designed with the retention of existing walls, fences, railings or hedging, the minimization of hard, impermeable surfacing and the provision of sufficiently setback gates and generous planting’. The encouragement of retaining front gardens undoubtably supports climate change adaptation; air quality and flood mitigation; as well as improves neighbourhood streetscape and is thus encouraged. In order to effectively incentivise this, front planting must be positively acknowledged when included in planning proposals. Additionally, upon case by case review parking requirements must be reduced where possible to enable the facilitation of this. Furthermore, necessary landscaping detail should be requested and agreed upon within the application process where possible to avoid delay and secondary prioritisation through condition. It is supported that the Council considers cycle parking ‘a key element of a development’ due to cycling contribution to healthy lifestyles, reduced car dependency and reduced carbon emissions. Additionally, it is supported that the Council notes that cycle parking ‘should not be treated as a secondary issue to be resolved by condition’. In order to successfully execute this is it imperative that planning officers take a proactive and collaborative approach with applicants in order to ensure the correct detailing is provided during the application process, rather than refusing on this basis and missing the opportunity to ensure site improvement and cycle parking provision. It is supported that the Council recommend that ‘cycle parking should be in the most accessible location, above ground and near the main entrance to any development’, but also accept rear and side parking with further guidance. In order to achieve provision effectively it is important that site-specific considerations are taken. The optimum vehicle parking standards for HMOs within both C4 (3-6 residents) and Sui Generis (7+ residents) use classes are proposed to be 1 per HMO regardless of zoning. This is supported, demonstrating action towards reduced car dependency through lowered requirements that should be applied accordingly. In terms of cycle spaces, 0.5 per habitable room is proposed for C4 HMOs and 1 per habitable room for Sui Generis HMOs as optimum levels. In principle this is supported, however a degree of flexibility and case-specific review should be undertaken in order to ensure that requirements are reasonable,</p>	Noted. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>particularly in the Sui Generis case. This would include consideration of the location, pedestrian and cycle infrastructure as well as public transport accessibility.</p>	
<p><b>PSSPD224</b></p>	<p>Improve parking lines by setting out in a herringbone layout to make it easier to enter and leave thus reducing bumps and scrapes on adjacent cars.</p>	<p>Noted. Guidance on designs of parking bays is set out in section 3. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD225</b>	Change the allocation of parking spaces per dwelling. All dwellings need at least one car park space each, increasing in number as the size of dwelling increases. It is ludicrous to assume that just because someone lives in a flat or one bed house they won't have at least one car. If there are no allocated spaces where will they park.....in all the neighbouring roads?	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

## Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD226	<p>I write in response to the BCP Parking Standards SPD issued for consultation in September 2020 and would like to make the following observations: 1. EV charging points 3.6. To provide 100% availability for car charging is an oversupply. This assumes that not only every vehicle is electrically powered, but also needs to be charged every day. Even allowing the 30% initial demand based on 1000 spaces would require very significant investment by the utility companies passed on to customers. There needs to be a graduated provision for charge points allowed and a variation between short and longer term parking. Modern electrically powered and hybrid cars have considerable range capacity, 2. The proportion of types of EV points needs careful consideration. 50Kw units are very expensive to install and run and only really necessary for cars that have travelled some distance and are staying a short while. Staff and most visitor/patients will travel relatively short distances. Staff stay for a shift, many for 12 hours, and patients/visitors for considerably shorter. The fleet vehicles would be charged overnight so again little demand for high power units. There needs to be flexibility on the provision of these units. 3. Note Littledown and The Royal Bournemouth Hospital (RBH) are Zone C business but as these are destinations for people from across all areas of Dorset and not typical business users, this needs to be addressed. Half the hospital is business (staff), half is clinics. This variation needs to be recognised. 4. Note Littledown as indoor sports area receives 4 spaces staff and visitors per 100m2, RBH receives 0.25 per FTE plus 0.25 per bed. Clinics receive 2 spaces per clinic - this is not equitable. As the hospital has many separately identifiable functions there needs to be better consideration of the requirements of patients, visitors and staff. The degree of mobility of visitors/patients does not appear to be taken into account; a sports centre with predominantly "fit" or able bodied visitors should not be given a higher ratio of parking. 5. A definition of the m2 rate needs to be included. E.g. GIA occupied space, does it include plant space etc.? A sports hall and pool for example could be 100m2 but only have a few people in it. The use of differing metrics for differing uses makes straightforward comparisons difficult. 6. The provision of electric charge points for PTW seems slightly low. 7. Has a consultation with the fire and rescue service been carried out, to identify any additional risks with the proposed volume of electric points requested to be installed. This could potentially impact significantly on car park design and adjacencies.</p>	<p>Noted. Section 3.6 clearly sets out the context for the future transition to electric vehicles and recognises that the infrastructure is a developing technology. Action: Insert additional paragraph(s) to clarify that where the applicant can provide evidence to show that an organisation's needs will differ from the EVCI requirements set out in this SPD, it is for decision maker to ensure that this evidence is up to date and robust, sufficient to ensure that it will meet the needs of the business, notwithstanding the corporate commitment to meet the net zero carbon target by 2030.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD227	<p>I object and seek changes to the SPD in relation to Poole Old Town and Hamworthy East for the following reasons; • Parking allocations for flats, houses, holiday accommodation, clinics, care home, schools and many other categories have been defined, but no consideration has been given to High-density Development. Densities planned for the Regeneration area are higher than London, London has an amazing transport infrastructure • The above mentioned area includes some of the major commercial enterprises and employers, including Sunseeker, the Hospital, Lush cosmetics group and the RNLI. Significant parking problems exist in the area as a result of employee’s vehicles. Nearly all of these employers have employees that already park on the proposed building sites, so where these businesses travel plans • The existing acute residential vehicle parking problems in the area. This appears to have been ignored. • Inadequate infrastructure, including public transport. This is worsened by the Covid epidemic, which is undermining the viability of public transport and the confidence of the public. • It is evident that there is a move toward electric vehicles and EV charging points are identified, but there will be very little provision in the area mentioned. • The proposals will have an adverse effect of the saleability of new Apartments/Dwellings. A target market for the developers is the ‘out of town weekenders’. They will want parking. The properties will sell eventually at a reduced value, that is the rule of market forces, but the sales will be delayed. This will result in ambiguity and reason for non-viability from the developers. It will mean more delays from the builders. What is being done to reactivate the Park and Ride for the purpose that it was built??</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD takes a zonal approach to parking standards reflecting different accessibility levels in the BCP area. The optimum parking figures in tables 3-33 show the requirements for most use classes across a range of modes. Action: None.</p>
PSSPD228	<p>The zero parking allocation in tables 9 and 10 for all of zone A and part of zone B is Whilst I can see there there is a requirement to reduce town centre congestion, the aim to offer no parking for new developments is badly thought out and will negatively affect the appeal of such properties. The thought that walking / cycling and public transport being able to satisfy everyone's transport requirements is optimistic at best. out of town or even across the conurbation business travel is not easily achieved without a car, and shopping and moving large purchases is impossible without some sort of parking. The plans do not take into account high-density brownfield site developments like the ones local to me in West Quay Road, and the other side of the backwater channel. You cannot put hundreds of dwellings and people on a site with potentially ZERO or double digit parking allocations and expect the sites to function or be appealing to potential purchasers. It is my understanding that BCP Council are in need of new homes and wish the regeneration sites to be built up, but this looks to undermine that need.</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD229	<p>The purpose of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) are to provide guidance to adopted polices, not to introduce new policies. We are concerned that this SPD has not been produced in accordance with the spirit of the NPPF and planning policy guidance. Even though we welcome proposals regarding increasing the size of car parking sizes and the Council's new approach to no car parking requirements in the town centres, we are mostly concerned that the new requirements set out in this SPD have not been viability tested. This includes policies or guidance or 'preferences' for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Electric Vehicle Charging Points: Para 3.6.1 – 3.6.4 and Table 1: The need for EVC, the requirement for new developments to include charging points for electric cars. This could easily add £3k+ per car parking space and we question the percentages for active and passive ChargePoint provision set out in Table 1. Where did these percentages come from? Are they based on evidence? These figures need to be robustly justified as they can have serious financial implications. Were these percentages and their cost in addition to their ongoing maintenance costs viability tested, against all the other cost requirements of the Local Plan? It is simply not good enough to introduce a new policy without testing its impact on development across housing delivering in the BCP area and simply state in paragraph 3.6.6: "Where communal facilities are provided, considered management practices are expected to resolve".</li> <li>• Preference for Underground Car Parking: Although surface car parking is permitted, it will only "be supported in appropriate locations. For example, locations where a high-quality streetscene is retained". This sentence in paragraph 3.9.1 coupled with the following sentence in paragraph 3.9.3: "Basement parking is often preferable to surface parking as it can reduce the visual dominance of vehicles and can free up green space". Currently, as this is worded, surface car parking will only be permitted if it is designed appropriately. This urban design measure is rather 'subjective', and our concern would be is that it could be used by development management to not allow the option of surface car parking altogether. Underground car park adds significantly to the cost of a development scheme. It costs circa £8k for each under croft car parking space and anywhere between £15k - £25k for each subterranean car parking space and costs increase further if you include car stackers. This would really prevent development coming forward across the BCP Council Area due to serious viability issues. For the delivery of Council housing, which does not make a profit, it would significantly add to build costs even further and would mean that we could not deliver much needed affordable housing. Most importantly, developers will use this preference to not provide affordable housing on site or via financial contributions. From experience, developers will ensure that all car parking is provided subterranean with double stacked car parking to</li> </ul>	<p>Noted. An SPD does not introduce new policy it merely provides additional detail on existing policies. Viability testing is not a statutory requirement of SPD production. The council has a commitment to reducing its own and that of the region's carbon footprint. Increasing the usage of electric vehicle technology is one mechanism to do this in line with the higher-level policies set out in the respective Local Plans encouraging the use of low carbon technologies. The good quality design is a key consideration of parking provision. Underground parking reduces the amount of hard landscaping enhancing the visual quality of a proposal. SPD does not explicitly favour underground solutions but instead seeks high quality design for new developments in line with national and local policies. The viability of providing underground parking is not within the scope of the SPD as that is a site-specific requirement however the general reduction in parking requirements in many locations in the BCP area will be beneficial to scheme viability. The provision of affordable housing is not within the scope of the SPD. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>increase their build cost so that the developers can reduce their overall contributions to affordable housing. • No general Viability Policy: In the absence of viability testing additional costs to development and having noncompliance subject to design, adds significantly to build costs in the BCP Council area and will have a significant impact on housing delivery and meeting affordable housing needs as set out in the NPPF and adopted Local Plan. Design is subjective and does not really take into account the overall financial cost impact to developers or affordable housing providers. Most importantly, this SPD is introducing new policy without any flexibility. Viability is extremely tight across the BCP Council area which is clearly shown in CIL and Local Plan Viability Studies. Although we applaud the Council’s intention to reduce carbon emissions further in new developments, new policy should only be introduced when it is viability tested in addition to other requirements of the Local Plan and tested at Examination in Public, to ensure that BCP Council can deliver upon its Local Plan housing requirements. Therefore, you need a general viability policy in this SPD for a developer, council or registered provider to use to allow for financial impacts to be taken into account when considered against the requirements of other costs set out in the Local Plan as a whole. Please show us the following evidence to support this SPD, if it has been completed: 1) the evidence to support the targets in Table 1 and, 2) the Viability Study - which takes into consideration all requirements set out in the adopted Local Plans including these new proposed policies.</p>	



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD230	Add more parking	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
PSSPD231	You need to change the zero parking spaces as this will not work! In the case of retirement/Senior Living, spaces are needed for daily nurses, Doctors, deliveries, meals on wheels, and visitors. Also NO ONE that purchases one of the new homes should be allowed to apply for street parking permits, as there is already a shortage available in the Old Town area of Poole. Their new postcodes MUST be set so that they cannot apply! Who decide it should be zero parking?! Will the Council make sure no one in these new properties and postcode areas can apply for street parking in the Old Town. Will community car hubs be improved and provided? More parking Enforcement Officer required to patrol and make sure fines issued to anyone breaching parking regulations. Bus services to be improved and made safe even for evening services. If zero parking, then where will recharging station s be for electric cars?	Noted. The SPD provides guidance on visitor car and cycle parking. Tables 3-33 set out parking standards by use class which includes visitor parking requirements. Section 5.9 sets out how controlled parking zones will be used and restricts future residents' access to parking permits. Action: None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD232	<p>Change - add - improve The aim of the SPD is to provide detail on parking requirements for new development proposals with an emphasis on good design and sustainability. And to set out parking standards in new residential and non-residential development. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. The vision and direction is understandable and worthwhile, but the timing and speed of the process is impractical, socially damaging and economically unviable. This SPD is something for the future, perhaps 20 years hence. The SPD makes no mention of the policies /actions that must be implemented to enable sustainable changes in modal transport to encourage people to move away from cars. It takes an idealistic and draconian approach to one element of the issue, without any consideration of the factors that will influence people to change their mode of transport. Parking should never be considered in isolation, especially when a major change in social wellbeing and life style is an objective. The aim to reduce parking should be part of a strategy for a modal shift in personnel transport. The major regeneration sites in Poole, adjacent to the Backwater Channel are designated as Zones A and B. Parking provision for houses and flats in Zone A is zero and in zone B a mix of zero and 1 space. This would result in parking spaces as follows for Major High-Density developments. Sydenham's. Planning permission granted for 374 apartments with 369 parking spaces. The proposed SPD reduces this to a total of 28 parking spaces. Between the Bridges; 459 apartments with 264 parking spaces. Reduced to Zero spaces. Other High-Density Development proposals, including the Quay Thistle/Fisherman's Dock, development of 228 apartments and a 118 bed hotel would provide 59 spaces for the hotel and Zero parking spaces for residents. The Power Station site, in Zone B would provide limited parking for 3 bed flats and some houses. The High-Density regeneration sites are to provide up to 2500 dwellings. The SPD proposes almost no parking provision. Parking allocations for flats, houses, holiday accommodation, clinics, care homes, schools and many other categories have been defined, but no consideration has been given to High-density Development. Densities planned for the Regeneration area are higher than in London, with its far superior infrastructure. The area around the Back-Water Channel, which is the Poole Quays Forum (PQF) Area includes some of the major commercial enterprises, including Sunseeker and the RNLI. Restrictions on parking provision is defined for these major employers, without recognition or any solution to the significant parking problems that exist in the area as a result of employee's vehicles parked in nearby residential streets. Residents and employees of local businesses already face acute vehicle parking</p>	<p>Noted. The council through its Local Transport Plan, Local Plan and highway capital programme will provide the measures, tools and strategies to support the local priorities for safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. The SPD is solely concerned with new developments where a planning application is required. The matters raised are outside the scope of the SPD but as the council progress it's Local Plan, site specific allocations and density requirements can be considered. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>problems in the area. This appears to have been ignored. There is no description of any infrastructure improvements, including public transport. The viability of public transport and the confidence in its use by the public has been seriously undermined by the COVID pandemic. It is evident that there is a move toward electric vehicles and EV charging points are identified, but with near Zero parking spaces there will be very little, if any provision to encourage this form of transport in the Regeneration/PQF area. The proposals will have an adverse effect of the saleability of the new, possibly 2500 Apartments/Dwellings planned for the Regeneration area. Parking for residents and visitors is required. With the lack of parking the properties will sell eventually at a reduced value, that is the rule of market forces, but the sales will be delayed. This will result in ambiguity and reasons for non-viability from the developers. It will result in more delays and inaction from the builders. The Regeneration Area is in urgent and desperate need of investment, with ‘bricks and mortar’ to provide new homes and vitality to this significantly important part of Poole. This has to be the first priority. Plans for changes in transport choices are necessary, but need to be comprehensive, realistic and beneficial to the community. The proposed SPD does not address these serious issues. Is there a comprehensive plan for a shift in modal transport? Has any consideration been given for parking provision in the Regeneration Area, where very high-density development is planned? What about the current acute parking problems in the Old Town and surrounding area of Sunseekers, the RNLI and other commercial enterprises?</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD233</b>	Can there be specific wheelchair bays, for actual wheelchair users. These need to be wider and longer for wheelchair users. Standard disabled bays can generally be normal width and length.	Noted. The SPD requires consideration of safe storage and charging points for electric wheelchair users. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD234</b>	It is almost unbelievable that such drastic reduction in parking consideration in this document could even be thought of, let alone time spent on incorporating such absurd proposals, buried into this exceptionally detailed and over worded document that the residents have been asked to read through and comment on! The effect on the current new development proposals in the Poole Quay, lower Hamworthy and Turlin Moor areas will be catastrophic. Whilst it is excellent to consider and encourage the community to exercise more, using bicycles, walking and other sports, plus encourage the use of public transport services, the plain fact is that cars are here to stay. Whether they are conventional petrol & diesel fuelled, hybrid or fully electric versions, cars will always be in demand and any new homes proposed with zero or drastically reduced parking availability will be difficult to sell. I believe that all properties should have a minimum of one parking space, per dwelling, preferable two, especially if families are involved and also to accommodate their friends and family visitors! To conclude, because I firmly believe that the current infrastructure in the Poole centre, all of Hamworthy and lower Upton areas is woefully inadequate for today's demands and has been pitifully neglected in the past twenty or so years, I believe that no further large developments should not be given approval to go ahead until some significant improvement to the infrastructure in these areas has been planned and approved! Even when both bridges are fully operational, serious congestion is quite common on weekdays at morning and evening rush hours, and the ferry terminal and/or Sunseeker disgorging times! Due to insufficient notice and publicity of the document and it's deadline, I did not have time for further comments! To conclude, because I firmly believe that the current infrastructure in the Poole centre, all of Hamworthy and lower Upton areas is woefully inadequate for today's demands and has been pitifully neglected in the past twenty or so years, I believe that no further large developments should not be given approval to go ahead until some significant improvement to the infrastructure in these areas has been planned and approved! Even when both bridges are fully operational, serious congestion is quite common on weekdays at morning and evening rush hours, and the ferry terminal and/or Sunseeker disgorging times!	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD235	<p>The Talbot Village Trust (TVT) is supportive of much of the SPD, particularly its focus on tackling climate change and prioritising opportunities for walking cycling and public transport use. Car ownership is growing more slowly than in the past and access to public transport increases the use of non-car transport for commuting purposes. TVT agrees that rigid and overly generous parking requirements historically have not helped to deliver the quantum or quality of development expected by our communities. TVT supports the Zonal approach to parking standards, particularly the introduction of Zone C – Business hubs. TVT supports the desire to ensure that these locations do not become car dependent, and that BCP will seek to enhance the attractiveness of public transport and active travel in these locations. We note the Transforming Cities Fund Sustainable Transport Corridors and Cycle Highways (specifically S6 and C2), and consider it integral to the success of the Parking SPD that projects such as this are delivered in tandem to ensure that people benefit from opportunities to travel sustainably. Add: “BCP recognises that parking restraint and management is one side of the mode-shift equation and must be accompanied by public investment in public transport and active travel to provide people with opportunities to travel sustainably. BCP will play a lead role in promoting such schemes and look favourably on planning applications with a sustainable transport focus.” TVT supports the use of Optimum car parking standards. There is a balance between providing too much car parking which encourages excessive car usage, and not enough car parking, which can cause congestion and off-site issues. The standards proposed represent “a summary of best available evidence.” Improve: We note that 4.3 discusses variation from parking standards, thus providing a policy basis for deviation from standards. Whilst we support the identification of Zone C for Business hubs, we consider that there needs to be a more explicit recognition that there is significant variation in accessibility even within these zones, and that there are some locations where car and cycle provision that deviates from standards will be more appropriate for the development itself. We agree with the principles in 4.3.2, but consider that it should be more positively worded to accept that local circumstances, such as greater public transport accessibility and strong active travel routes, can represent a reasonable basis for proposing more appropriate parking levels which better serve the travel requirements of a specific site. This could include reference to NPPF Para 105. This would provide developers with confidence that BCP will positively consider evidence-based proposals which deviate from prescriptive standards but better contribute to meeting the wider aims of the SPD. This links with the reference in 1.1.5 to the failures of rigid application. Cycle parking is a key element of a development, and TVT supports the principles of the SPD in relation to</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing and employment needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Recognise the need for flexibility in applying standards and appropriate variations. Where required, the SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking provision appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. Note the emphasis on cycling and appropriate cycle parking provision. Action: Make partial changes.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>provision for cyclists. This includes making the locations of cycle storage attractive, accessible and safe. We appreciate that Sheffield stands represent the optimum provision, and that double deck facilities can be challenging for some users. We agree that there are situations where it is appropriate to provide a proportion of spaces as double deck, particularly as there are good examples where these work well. We also recognise that there are a range of adapted cycle types and that it is necessary for developments to design for these at an appropriate level. Whilst we support the aims and the need for cycle parking to be attractive to support uptake, we note that there are likely to be instances where the rigid application of the SPD cycle parking standards results in a significant level of space, including at ground floor, being needed to accommodate cycle storage. This could have unintended consequences for development proposals and could compromise quality in other areas. Our comments above regarding the need for flexibility in application of standards therefore also stand in relation to cycle parking. TTV has no specific comments regarding car parking dimensions. We note that there are likely to be circumstances where land availability and other constraints can impact on parking layout. Improve: We therefore support Para 3.2.8 which recognises that Swept Path Analysis can be used to assess parking layout including oversized bays reducing the need for manoeuvring space, but request an explicit confirmation that this will be accepted by BCP in reviewing layouts. TTV supports the aspiration to future proof development for the expected transition to electric vehicles, and agrees with the need to incorporate charging points in all new developments. EVs are a developing technology, and increases in range of vehicles are likely to mean that charging at home, rather than workplace or other non-residenti</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD236</b>	How will there be enough parking for the houses/apartments when most people have two cars per property	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD237</b>	Change 3.6.4 this will add a considerable cost to new developments and unknown what the uptake in electric charging cars will be in the coming years. Change 3.9.3 as the cost of this will severely impact the development of affordable housing; where will this cost be met as the rent charged will not increase just because there is undercroft parking. Tables 9 3C and 9 10C - improve - in reality there will be cars and unless in zone A and there is no alternative, in zone b if there are no local parking restrictions then people will have cars and will just park on local roads and congest these.	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Full comment</b>	<b>Officer Comment/Action</b>
<b>PSSPD238</b>	Change density of buildings no consideration has been given to High-density Development. Where are all the vehicles going to park. We are plagued now with people that work on the Docks and holiday makers leaving their vehicles down our road	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD239</b>	no consideration has been given to High-density Development. This huge density of building will cause even more problems where we live. Already a total shortage of parking from both workers and visitors to the docks and industrial areas in Poole	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD240</b>	<p>Parking Standards - Supplementary Planning Document Draft for consultation September 2020 Comments submitted by East Dorset Friends of the Earth</p> <p>1. We welcome the aim “to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible.” However, we regard this consultation as premature; the Local Plan for BCP is still under formulation and has yet to establish a strategic framework for transport and land use planning which incorporates the recognition of a Climate and Ecological Emergency (CEE).</p> <p>2. For example, para.1.1.5 recognises the potential for future development to stimulate growth in vehicle movements, and result in damaging consequences for health, the environment and the local economy. The solutions provided are sometimes sensible, though limited. However, they still operate in a strategic vacuum, of transport and land use policies yet to be formulated and opened to public scrutiny. The priorities must be for the Local Plan to define growth areas which are sustainable in a CEE, and to identify how it will achieve a modal shift to active travel and public transport. Only then can parking policies be designed which support those objectives.</p> <p>3. If the aim is to encourage reduced car ownership (para. 1.1.7), then development control policies must limit the number of parking spaces for new development and seek to reduce the number for existing development. This is not the same as setting standards for parking design</p> <p>4. In general, the intentions of Section 3 are commendable, but the actual detailed proposals could be better thought through. . We welcome the recognition that larger cars need larger parking spaces (Section 3) – but these larger vehicles tend to be more polluting and less energy efficient than smaller ones and should not actively be encouraged.</p> <p>5. We do not support the comments about on-street parking (para. 3.2.22) and dropped kerbs (paras. 3.2.15 - 3.2.16). On-street parking actually encourages increased car ownership (many sites also have off-street parking which goes unused or accommodates 2nd or 3rd vehicles in single family households. Together with this, forcing on-street parking, by reducing dropped kerbs, simply acts to reduce the desirability and safety of active travel. There is a need for policy to aim to reduce on-street parking, especially where off-street parking is available, and to reclaim the streets for walking and cycling.</p> <p>6. Visibility splays (paras. 3.2.20 - 3.2.21) are often useless where on-street parking is widespread, as parked vehicles obscure visibility, forcing vehicles of block pavements as they attempt to exit off-street parking.</p> <p>7. We welcome the proposals on requiring cycle parking in all new and redeveloped sites. However, there is no recognition of the fact that ALL cycle parking needs to be covered, given the nature of UK climate and the needs to ensure security. Sheffield-style stands are only suitable as parking for short-stay cycle parking. Large</p>	<p>Noted. There is a great need for a consolidated BCP Parking Standards SPD to standardise the requirements across BCP, ahead of the BCP Local Plan, in accordance with the Corporate Strategy, the NPPF and existing adopted Local Plan policies. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>sections of existing surface and multi-storey car parks (especially ground level) should be redesigned as cycle parking – see Section 3.9). The matter of electric bikes and scooters needs to be considered; ie. not just mobility scooters. 8. The policy does not consider enforcement. A major factor affecting walking and disabled movements is parking on pavements. Similarly, illegal parking and double-parking are increasing, partly as a result of the growth of home-delivery vehicles (See Section 5). We recognise that this is principally a police matter – however, it could be tackled using by-laws and enforcement by traffic wardens (paid for out of fines). 9. Section 4, Parking Standards, fails to consider a key factor which has major implications for strategic policies for the Local Plan: cost of parking. At present, policies actively redirect vehicle travel to out-of-town retail and business locations by encouraging large amounts of free parking (section 4.2). At the same time, Town Centre locations are declining, due partly to high parking charges. The effect of town centre parking charges is not to encourage modal shifts to public transport and active travel; instead, it encourages travel to other locations, which is a major contributory factor to high levels of car ownership and traffic congestion. Policies to “level the playing field” are needed: whether this is stricter limits on parking availability outside town centres, requirements for businesses to contribute to alternative public transport options, or equalisation of parking fees and time limits, is debatable. 10. We welcome the comments on supporting car sharing. We feel that a review of private hire vehicle licensing is also needed, to see where shared use of such vehicles can be encouraged. “Shared taxis”, using dial-and-ride and phone apps, can provide links to main public transport routes, and is a common feature of many cities world-wide. This could contribute significantly to modal shift away from private cars and increased use of public transport.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD241</b>	<p>Overall I am supportive of these plans, and in particular the stated desire to 'reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible'. The further statements pertaining to 'manage the increasing number of vehicles' (1.1.18) and 'levels of parking' (1.1.19) are particularly welcome. I fully support the underlying concept that motor vehicle parking must be managed and restricted as part of a wider planning approach to meeting these ends, I would also like to add my particular support to the requirements detailed in paras 3.2.15 - 2.3.19 (and accompanying images) regarding use of entrance kerbs instead of dropped kerbs, maintaining the level of the footway, and perpendicular crossovers. These are crucial for enabling safe and comfortable use of footways, in particular by older people, children, those with various health issues impacting mobility. In addition to the above, below are some specific 'add' and 'improve' responses. Add to 3.3.8 reference to cycles adapted for disabled users, and tricycles. These share several traits with cargo bikes, including often being freestanding when parked but requiring a stand to be locked to. Add to 3.3.10 requirement pertaining to circumference of turns expected to be performed by someone pushing the CDV into or out of the parking facility to ensure turns are not so tight as to restrict access. Adjacent structures (walls, waste disposal etc) can inhibit this. Add in either 3.3.19 or 3.3.20 reference to maintaining the transparency of plastic panels where used. Environmental conditions can cause these to dull or otherwise become opaque, making it hard to see inside the cycle store from outside. This limits natural surveillance and can also be off-putting to users due to perceived increased risk of social danger. Improve the coverage of the Bournemouth Town Centre Zone A parking areas (4.1.2 and accompanying map) to extend northwards on both sides of the A347 up to Cemetery junction. These areas (St Valeries rd, St Winifred's rd, St Anthony's rd, Cavendish Rd, Dean Park Rd, &amp; adjoining minor roads) are within an MSOA with the joint lowest car ownership in BCP (28% of HH with no car or van, according to last census (E02003188 : Bournemouth 017)) as well as being within 6 mins walk of Town Centre, so are suitable for lower levels of parking to for new developments to encourage non-car travel as per the existing Zone A area. Consider extending Zone A coverage to entirety of all MSOAs with a HH car/van ownership level below 75% (according to 2011 census E02003188, E02003190, E02003192), in order to prevent future development undermining this preferred state. Add to 3.6.7 a specific reference to ensuring that the provision of on-street EVCI must not encroach on active travel infrastructure (eg pavement/cycle lanes). There is a usability and comfort issue for such infra in addition to 'highway safety issues'. Improve cycle parking provision for C3 Houses</p>	<p>Noted. Accessibility to shops and services are limited in this proposed extension to Zone A. Add to 3.6.7 as suggested. Improve cycle parking (tables 9 &amp; 10) as suggested. Increase cycle parking provision as suggested.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>and Flats (Tables 9 and 10) of 3 bedrooms and above to 2 per unit in Zones A and B. A 3 bed house in Central Bournemouth (Zone A) or Winton (Zone B) should not have fewer cycle parking spaces than the number of car parking spaces provided for the same house in say Muscliff (Zone D) Add in 3.3.18 some provision for developments over a certain size to have suitable space provided for virtual cycle hire bays. This will enable visitors and residents without personal ownership of a bicycle to still choose this mode.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD242</b>	Change: Chapter 4, Tables 9&10. The idea that extremely high-density housing developments might be built in Poole Old Town with ZERO parking provision for residents or visitors is impractical. Demand for on-street parking already exceeds supply in the Old Town. In our development of 11 townhouses (Poplar Close) there are 14 cars owned by the residents of eight properties. One resident cycles occasionally. There are daily visits by tradesmen, delivery firms, cleaners and healthcare workers. The need for car parking provision is evident; a development of more than 400 flats a few hundred metres away without any parking provision is unthinkable.	Noted. There is a great need for a consolidated BCP Parking Standards SPD to standardise the requirements across BCP council area. Robust evidence has been gathered to provide clear justification for the proposed parking standards and guidance within the SPD. This aligns with national and local policy, benchmarking with other cities, and best practice research. Action: None
<b>PSSPD243</b>	At least one of road parking space per flat or two per house	Noted. Outside the remit of this SPD. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD244	<p>CHANGE The purpose of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPD's) are to provide guidance to adopted polices, not to introduce new policies. We are concerned that this SPD has not been produced in accordance with the spirit of the NPPF and planning policy guidance. Even though we welcome proposals regarding increasing the size of car parking sizes and the Council's new approach to no car parking requirements in the town centres, we are mostly concerned that the new requirements set out in this SPD have not been viability tested. This includes policies or guidance or 'preferences' for: CHANGE • Electric Vehicle Charging Points: Para 3.6.1 – 3.6.4 and Table 1: The need for EVC, the requirement for new developments to include charging points for electric cars. This could easily add £3k+ per car parking space and we question the percentages for active and passive ChargePoint provision set out in Table 1. Where did these percentages come from? Are they based on evidence? These figures need to be robustly justified as they can have serious financial implications. Were these percentages and their cost in addition to their ongoing maintenance costs viability tested, against all the other cost requirements of the Local Plan? It is simply not good enough to introduce a new policy without testing its impact on development across housing delivering in the BCP area and simply state in paragraph 3.6.6: "Where communal facilities are provided, considered management practices are expected to resolve". CHANGE • Preference for Underground Car Parking: Although surface car parking is permitted, it will only "be supported in appropriate locations. For example, locations where a high-quality streetscene is retained". This sentence in paragraph 3.9.1 coupled with the following sentence in paragraph 3.9.3: "Basement parking is often preferable to surface parking as it can reduce the visual dominance of vehicles and can free up green space". Currently, as this is worded, surface car parking will only be permitted if it is designed appropriately. This urban design measure is rather 'subjective', and our concern would be is that it could be used by development management to not allow the option of surface car parking altogether. Underground car park adds significantly to the cost of a development scheme. It costs circa £8k for each under croft car parking space and anywhere between £15k - £25k for each subterranean car parking space and costs increase further if you include car stackers. This would really prevent development coming forward across the BCP Council Area due to serious viability issues. For the delivery of Council housing, which does not make a profit, it would significantly add to build costs even further and would mean that we could not deliver much needed affordable housing. Most importantly, developers will use this preference to not provide affordable housing on site or via financial contributions. From experience, developers will ensure that all car parking is provided subterranean with</p>	<p>Noted. An SPD does not introduce new policy it merely provides additional detail on existing policies. Viability testing is not a statutory requirement of SPD production. The council has a commitment to reducing its own and that of the region's carbon footprint. Increasing the usage of electric vehicle technology is one mechanism to do this in line with the higher-level policies set out in the respective Local Plans encouraging the use of low carbon technologies. The good quality design is a key consideration of parking provision. Underground parking reduces the amount of hard landscaping enhancing the visual quality of a proposal. SPD does not explicitly favour underground solutions but instead seeks high quality design for new developments in line with national and local policies. The viability of providing underground parking is not within the scope of the SPD as that is a site-specific requirement however the general reduction in parking requirements in many locations in the BCP area will be beneficial to scheme viability. The provision of affordable housing is not within the scope of the SPD. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>double stacked car parking to increase their build cost so that the developers can reduce their overall contributions to affordable housing. CHANGE • No general Viability Policy: In the absence of viability testing additional costs to development and having noncompliance subject to design, adds significantly to build costs in the BCP Council area and will have a significant impact on housing delivery and meeting affordable housing needs as set out in the NPPF and adopted Local Plan. Design is subjective and does not really take into account the overall financial cost impact to developers or affordable housing providers. Most importantly, this SPD is introducing new policy without any flexibility. Viability is extremely tight across the BCP Council area which is clearly shown in CIL and Local Plan Viability Studies. Although we applaud the Council’s intention to reduce carbon emissions further in new developments, new policy should only be introduced when it is viability tested in addition to other requirements of the Local Plan and tested at Examination in Public, to ensure that BCP Council can deliver upon its Local Plan housing requirements. Therefore, you need a general viability policy in this SPD for a developer, council or registered provider to use to allow for financial impacts to be taken into account when considered against the requirements of other costs set out in the Local Plan as a whole.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD245	<p>This is a joint representation made by Churchill Retirement Living and McCarthy and Stone Retirement Lifestyles Ltd, both of which are locally based and together are the largest providers of Retirement Housing for sale. They are therefore very well placed to comment on the proposed SPD as it relates to requirements for retirement housing IMPROVE: Table 8 C2: Sheltered housing (specialist elderly person’s accommodation). The standard in this regard takes the approach of labelling all specialist elderly person’s accommodation as falling within Use Class C2 and then basing the standard on employees rather than residents As advised by the PPG addition “Housing for older and disabled people” (June 2019) such housing covers a wide range of accommodation from simple age restricted accommodation including retirement living/sheltered housing with little care or staffing but where some (but not all) residents can be expected to be car drivers, through to Extra Care development where some care and more staffing is provided. It is therefore too simplistic to base parking requirements for all forms of elderly persons housing on staffing. For such forms of development, any application of standards should be based on the parking needs of residents with some consideration to staffing. It is noted too that presently this is the same standard as proposed to be applied to residential care homes. The approach there may well be correct as staffing levels will be high and residents needs, very low It is therefore most strongly recommended that parking requirements for these form of development are best left to the evidence of the applicant and based on the exact type of development which is proposed and is locational characteristics. If this is not regarded as acceptable, it is suggested that a range be presented between 0.33 and 0.75 spaces per apartment (which are likely to always be one or two bed). This should allow for discussion and negotiation within that range as individual applications come forward. It is also suggested that reference should not be made here to Use Class as this will only serve to complicate discussion and negotiation. As the PPG confirms, some specialist housing will fall within Use Class C3 and some within Use Class C2. It must be noted too that it would be wholly erroneous to apply to apply the C3 dwellings standard to those forms of specialist housing that do not provide care. From the Representors substantial experience, the average age of residents on occupancy where care is not provided is still in the mid to late 70’s and many will not be car drivers. Where care staffing is provided, many of the core staff will be locally employed and may not be car owners and have the need or the means to drive to work . Therefore it is not necessary to provide significant levels of parking for staff. CHANGE. Section 3.6 Electric Vehicle Charging It is noted that this effectively requires that every new residential building with an associated car parking space must have at least one</p>	<p>Noted. Despite the advice within the PPG on housing for older and disabled people referred the use of a standard based on staff relates to the likely higher non-car use by future occupiers than the general population. specialist care providers are able to provide additional site-specific information to justify a variation of their parking requirements through the SPD. Section 3.6 clearly sets out the context for the future transition to electric vehicles and recognises that the infrastructure is a developing technology. Action: Insert additional paragraph(s) to clarify that where the applicant can provide evidence to show that an organisation's needs will differ from the EVCI requirements set out in this SPD, it is for decision maker to ensure that this evidence is up to date and robust, sufficient to ensure that it will meet the needs of the business, notwithstanding the corporate commitment to meet the net zero carbon target by 2030.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>EVCP. However, the Government's preferred option is to introduce a new functional requirement under Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations, which was expected to come into force in the first half of 2020 but is awaited . The inclusion of EVCP requirements within the Building Regulations will introduce a standardised, consistent approach to EVCP in new buildings across the country. On this basis, it is contended that a policy should not be introduced that at seeks to pre-determine or anticipate other legislation that may or may not be brought forward where it is unsupported by Development Plan policy. (NB: the Councils' Carbon Neutrality Strategy whilst laudable is not development plan policy). It is suggested therefore that this section should be deleted or amended to "encourage" only, as there is no policy justification for a requirement</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD246	<p>Section 3 - Electric Vehicle Charging: It is noted that the Council’s proposed provision of EVC points will be applied to new development (paragraph 3.6.4). This is accepted and should not be retrofitted to apply to existing car parking spaces. In reality, the operators of holiday parks will need to install charging points to meet customer expectations and needs that will, inevitably, change over time. If they do not install them customers may choose to spend their holiday breaks elsewhere where such facilities are available. This ability to respond as the demand increases will mean that expenditure can be phased and directed proportionate to need, with money spent when required rather than being invested many years too early, potentially at the expense of some other, perhaps more pressing, projects that require funding. We therefore request that some flexibility is allowed for to respond to holiday park and project-specific requirements of development, where this can be justified, and to accommodate changing technology over time. Accordingly, we suggest the following amendment is made to paragraphs 3.6.4 and 3.6.5: “3.6.4 The Council requires applications for new development or material change of use to provide EV charge points that comply with Table 1, unless an alternative approach can be justified to meet the specific needs of development and respond to changes in technology over time.” “3.6.5 The EVCI charge requirements increase in line with the number and intensity of usage as set out in Table 2, unless an alternative approach can be justified to meet the specific needs of development and respond to changes in technology over time.”</p> <p>Section 4 - Parking Standards: Table 11 proposes the parking standards to be applied to “holiday accommodation”. This is defined as Use Class C3 (Dwelling-houses), and described as “holiday flats, self-catering apartments and serviced apartments.” On the basis of this classification, the draft parking standards would not apply to purpose-built rental or static caravan holiday units within holiday parks or holiday resorts. This type of holiday accommodation is wholly distinct from any form of C3 residential use class development and is not comparable to the other types of seasonal holiday lets referred to in Table 11 that could also be used as dwellings. It is narrowly restricted to holiday use and can only be occupied while holiday parks and resorts are open. The units typically are used for short term lets of typically three, four or seven days at a time, by any family or group. The draft SPD should therefore clarify that parking standards for ‘other uses’ (not within the distinct use classes described in the document) should be applied on a case-by-case basis depending on the nature of the proposed development.</p>	<p>Noted. Action: Consider further clarification that for other uses (not within use classes described) EVCI will be applied on a case by case basis depending on the nature of the proposed development. (See also ID 226)</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD247	<p>Change - Parking zones figure 28: The boundary between Zones B and D around the Penn Hill local centre is drawn along North Lodge Road, placing the local centre itself in Zone D. The drawing of the boundary down the centre line of the road leads to an anomalous situation where properties on one side of the road are defined as being more sustainable and having a significantly lower parking requirement than properties on the opposite side of the same road, despite both properties having essentially the same access to sustainable transport and facilities. It would therefore be appropriate in this and other areas for boundaries not to be drawn down the centre line of roads. The inclusion of the Penn Hill local centre within zone D is despite Penn Hill Avenue itself being a bus route, and there being a bus stop at Penn Hill Corner which offers regular bus connections. Not only is there a bus stop within the local centre itself, the local centre is within a 350m walk of Bournemouth road, which is itself a bus route which incorporates a greater frequency of services. The local centre is also within 600m of Poole Road, which offers frequent bus connections to both Poole and Bournemouth, and within 650m of Branksome Railway station. The 2019 National Design Guide defines a walkable area as one with facilities within 10 minutes walk. Therefore as these sustainable transport options are within such a walkable radius of the local centre it is appropriate to incorporate it within the more sustainable areas with lower parking requirements. The Penn Hill local centre is therefore highly sustainably located. It currently incorporates a mix of uses including retail, bars, restaurants and residential flats above the ground floor level. The ability to make appropriate and optimum use of sites in the area is currently constrained by the parking availability and the need to comply with parking standards which would be significantly less onerous were the boundary moved a short distance to incorporate the local centre. Making that change would facilitate ongoing investment in the area, delivering enhancement to the existing buildings to deliver additional housing and allow greater flexibility in terms of the development which may be delivered. That will, in turn support the vitality and viability of the local centre and the range of businesses located there. Doing so would not undermine the sustainability of the location and would encourage residents to make better use of the sustainable transport options which exist in the locality.</p>	<p>Noted. Action: Redefine all of Penn Hill Local Centre into Zone B.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD248</b>	<p>General comment - In 2019 BCP Council rightly declared a climate emergency that, on its own, demands a shift in the way that we travel, and think about movement. BCP's Councils proposed Parking Standards SPD is an honest step towards recognising that we need to use policy at a local level to have a positive impact on the environment and the places we live and work. The nature of car ownership and usage has been changing as has the number of young people learning to drive (down 20% in the past 10 years) and we need to adapt and move with the times. The pandemic has offered us a once in a life time opportunity to hit reset and to think about how we live, work and travel. As an urban designer it is often frustrating how we prioritise the storage of vehicles over the creation of good urban placemaking. These policies at a wider level provide the opportunity to reduce car dependency, help improve air quality, reduce obesity and provide young people more freedom to move about their neighbourhood safely. At a site level they afford the opportunity to increase density, provide more affordable homes, increase open space and to reduce the amount of paved areas that is required- thus reducing the heat island effect. This SPD is a step in the right direction and these measures to reduce car ownership in urban areas need to be balanced with a positive set of policies to implement and support walking, cycling and public transport across the conurbation.</p>	Noted. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD249</b>	<p>In general, we support the principles and objectives of the draft SPD and welcome this updated guidance to clarify the approach to parking provision for developers. We request that design guidance be changed to more closely align with the IStructE Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car parks (Fourth Edition, 2011) [which is referenced in section 3.9.1 of the SPD], in order to ensure efficient use of land, as detailed below. While we support the objectives to reduce reliance of car travel by restricting car parking provision, the standards for Zone A in particular (essentially “car free” development) do not appear to take account of existing car ownership levels and travel patterns in the town centre, which are still significantly reliant on the car. Nor do they consider commercial viability impacts, particularly the saleability of larger dwellings and office space without secured parking provision. We therefore request that these standards be relaxed, as detailed below.</p> <p><b>INTRODUCTION &amp; CONTEXT</b> 1.1.7 ADD to the note on Census 2011 statistics, that even for Bournemouth Town Centre there is currently a significant reliance on travel by car, with an average of 0.69 cars per household, 39% of residents driving to work and 55% of workers driving to work.</p> <p><b>LAYOUT &amp; DESIGN GUIDANCE</b> 3.2.1 CHANGE minimum width to 2.40m; or ADD allowance to reduce minimum width to 2.40m for long-stay or mixed car parking areas with limited vehicle turn-over and/or allocated bays for regular users. 3.2.2 and 3.2.5 CHANGE minimum offset to 0.30m and make this a requirement for side clearance only. [Note that in 3.2.1 it says that 4.8m is sufficient length for a range of everyday vehicles to use without overhanging.] 3.3.6 CHANGE third sentence to: Nonetheless, a proportion of high quality, hydraulically assisted double deck systems can be used alongside Sheffield type stands in a limited number of locations, such as railway stations, student accommodation and dense town centre developments with large cycle stores catering for a range of users. 3.3.10 and 3.3.23 IMPROVE these sections to allow flexibility to provide basement or upper level cycle stores within buildings, provided these have step-free access. As an example, the London Cycle Design Standards say: “Where cycle parking is inside a building, it should have step-free access, wide doorways and spacious corridors. Accessing the parking area should involve passing through no more than two sets of doors, with a recommended minimum external door width of 2 metres. Lifts or shallow gradient ramps should be provided to any basement cycle parking. To accommodate all types of cycle, lifts should have minimum dimensions of 1.2 by 2.3 metres, with a minimum door opening of 1000mm, and any door to a cycle parking area should be automated – push button or pressure pad operated.” 3.6.4 / Table 1 CHANGE the proportion of “active” chargepoint provision required in residential and non-residential development with 10+ spaces to 20%.</p>	<p>Noted. Accessibility to public transport and local services reduces demand for car ownership for commuting purposes. Census data demonstrates that car ownership and method of travel to work varies by location, tenure and number of habitable rooms. In Bournemouth Town Centre, car ownership is at its lowest with 46.4% of households without a car. Car ownership is also growing at a rate slower than previously. In addition, measures such as car clubs can reduce car ownership. Where required, the SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking provision appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. The Parking Standards support the delivery of development that will be necessary to meet housing needs and other economic, social and environmental priorities in the emerging BCP Local Plan. EVCI will apply to new development. Disabled parking requirements are set out in para 3.7 and in accordance with best practice guidance shown in appendix A. Action: table 9 and 10 change cycle parking requirements to reflect higher provision for 3+ bed flats in Zone A. Strengthen opportunities to deliver car clubs in Zones A &amp; B.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>3.6.4 / Table 1 ADD to the definitions to clarify what standards of EV provision will be applied to existing and proposed public car parking that does not specifically serve a particular use class. PARKING STANDARDS 4.2.1 IMPROVE description of “optimum parking”, as the standards (particularly for Zone A) do not appear to reflect “likely parking demand”, but rather reflect a policy position to manage demand by restricting supply. 4.2 Table 9 and Table 10 CHANGE Zone A car parking standards to include parking provision for 3 bed+ flats and houses 4.2 Table 9 and Table 10 CHANGE Zone A cycle parking standards to reflect higher provision for 3 bed+ flats and houses OTHER CONSIDERATIONS 5.5 IMPROVE car club and car sharing recommendations to include incentives to provide car club and car sharing bays as part of “car free” schemes in Zone A. 5.9.3 IMPROVE to provide more clarity on the requirements for how many (if any) disabled car parking spaces need to be provided for “car free” schemes (eg Residential development in Zone A). Please provide additional justification for parking standards that require “car free” residential and office development in Zone A, how this relates to existing car ownership levels and travel patterns in the area, and how this is supported by strategies for investment in public transport, walking and cycling and public car parking.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD250	<p>Change: Parking Zone Map Bournemouth Churches Housing Association (BCHA) wishes to request a change to the Parking Zones map to better reflect the actual sustainability of sites and their access to sustainable transport options. The map largely draws boundaries between parking zones along the centre lines of roads. This leads to the anomalous situation whereby two sites on the opposite sides of the same road essentially are classed as having different levels of sustainability and have differing parking standards despite having identical accessibility to public and sustainable transport modes and in many cases being highly sustainably located. One such site affected by that situation is BCHA's site at St Swithun's House, Christchurch Road. The site is located on the corner of Christchurch Road and Gervis Road and is classified as being within parking Zone D yet properties directly to the north are within zone B and to the West are within Zone A. There are bus stops within 150m of the site heading westwards into Bournemouth town centre and directly opposite the site heading eastwards towards Boscombe. The site is also within 650m of Bournemouth Railway Station, well within the 800m walking radius which is defined within the National Design Guide as being the defining factor for a walkable distance. In this regard the site is actually far more sustainably located than the sites to the south and east which, despite being geographically further from main public transport routes and Bournemouth Station, fall within parking Zone A which implies that they are more sustainable locations, and therefore benefit from greatly reduced parking requirements. The parts of the East Cliff area to the south of Christchurch Road are also broadly similar in their physical character to the areas to the north which are within zone B. It is therefore suggested that in general rather than drawing the boundaries between parking zones along the centre line of roads as at present, that they be drawn along the rear boundaries of properties fronting onto that road. That would better reflect the true sustainability of sites and eliminate the anomaly of a site on one side of the road being classed as significantly less sustainable than one directly opposite side of the same road despite them having the same access to sustainable transport opportunities. In the specific case of St Swithuns house, it would be appropriate to include all properties on the southern side of Christchurch road within parking Zone B, given that the zone extends to the north. It would also be appropriate to consider extending parking zone B to incorporate the remainder of the east cliff between Manor Road and Boscombe Gardens. Doing so would not only remove this general anomaly but would release a key constraint which has previously blocked the delivery of beneficial development of much needed social housing on the St Swithuns house site - the need to provide high levels of parking to meet a parking standard which does not reflect the true sustainability of the site, to provide for</p>	<p>Noted. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: Review zone boundaries with other zone change suggestions. Boscombe between Lansdowne and Boscombe to include BCHA and the pier,</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>residents where car ownership levels are likely to be low. BCHA welcomes the more flexible approach to parking standards which the draft SPD introduces within the sustainably located parts of the town. BCHA is currently exploring opportunities to redevelop or enhance existing sites in order to provide social housing to meet the continuing and significant needs for affordable housing across the council. However in order to achieve optimum levels of development and affordable housing delivery it has been necessary to incorporate relatively high levels of parking, which often means costly basement or under croft parking arrangements to meet a parking standard that is not well aligned to the particular demographic of the residents. One such example is 10 Suffolk Road, where BCHA has secured a resolution to grant planning permission for a new apartment block. However in order to meet the parking requirements it is necessary to deliver two storeys of basement parking. Not only is this costly to delivery for a registered provider of social housing but can compromise the appearance and design quality of the building. The ability to better tailor parking levels to the expected end-users of the scheme will allow for more affordable housing to be delivered and for that affordable housing to be delivered as part of high quality and attractive developments.</p>	



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD251</b>	<p>Upton and Hamworthy are already packed during rush hour. Blandford road is rammed full of cars and is the only way in or out of the area. Having hundreds of other cars/residents will make the situation worse, not to mention the eyesore and noise from living right next to the proposed site. Housing targets have to be met though, which is more important than the fact that no-one who lives here actually wants this to happen. As for the proposed site by the electricity substation and the twin sails bridge, who's bright idea was it to plan to build a load of houses without parking? Are these plans formulated on the assumption that these new residents will happily get rid of their cars for the "alternative transport options". Hubris, sheer hubris and presumption in the need to meet targets. Change plans to build on Turlin rec, and for goodness sake add parking for people with cars in the other proposed sites.</p>	<p>Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD252</b>	<p>Yes, Parking spaces, at least 2 for each property. How are people supposed to get their shopping home, have stuff delivered, have visitors, find jobs and schools in the vicinity they don't have to drive to?</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD253</b>	<p>It is crucial that the BCP Parking Standards are realistic and reflect retailer requirements, and do not prevent significant inward investment and beneficial economic development by retailers, including Aldi, through standards that make sites and development unviable. It is, however, recognised that other forms of transport, other than the private car, should be promoted to encourage sustainable forms and patterns of travel, particularly given the announcement of the ‘Climate Emergency’. Furthermore, it is important that the BCP Parking Standards SPD builds in flexibility to allow for the ever-changing demands of the economy, technology, retailers, and customers. This is to ensure that policies and standards support investment and economic development, as well as reflecting the needs of the local population and characteristics of the local area. This is particularly the case given the current situation with the COVID-19 pandemic, and the Government’s approach to boosting the economy. New Aldi foodstore developments improve the retail offer and consumer choice in the area, keep spending local and reduce the need to travel further afield, provide local employment opportunities, and deliver beneficial economic development. Table 18 Class E: Retail of the draft BCP Parking Standards SPD sets out the parking standards for Use Class E. These draft parking standards would result in unviable development for Aldi within the BCP Council area, through wholly inappropriate standards that would mean totally insufficient numbers of parking spaces. The resultant level of parking derived from the draft parking standards is considered to be significantly below the requirements of a typical Aldi foodstore. This is also likely to be the case for other foodstore retailers proposing future foodstore developments in the Council area. A typical new Aldi foodstore usually requires at least 100 car parking spaces. We are also aware that modern proposals for other discount foodstores typically propose in excess of 100 car parking spaces. It is therefore considered that the draft parking Standards for Retail currently proposed in the BCP Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document should be re-considered to better reflect retailer and customer requirements, and encourage beneficial economic development that would trigger much-needed inward investment and not unnecessarily prevent such potential development opportunities. Parking standards for retail should be more flexible and be derived from similar sites in similar locations. The availability of appropriate nearby customer car parking is a crucial part of a discount foodstore’s business and operation and is key to their commercial viability. Development sites with a lower level of floorspace or a reduced level of car parking often represents a significantly compromised trading position, that could render a scheme unviable. Aldi requires new stores to have adjacent car parking to cater for customers who choose this mode of transport. Having an insufficient number of parking</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative, safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. Action: Table 18 Class E Retail parking standards have been amended to increase Zone B requirements from 1 space to 3 spaces per 100m2 floorspace and reflects the same parking standards as Zone C requirements. Section 5.1 loading and servicing has been updated to make clearer the operational servicing requirements. Consequential alterations made to the loading servicing sections of Tables 3 to 33.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>spaces can lead to highways issues, including cars circling the car park waiting to find a parking space, and sometimes queues of cars waiting to enter the car park at the busiest periods. This could cause further issues to the surrounding transport network. Appropriate parking standards are therefore required to prevent this from happening. Notwithstanding, the local nature of many of Aldi’s stores naturally encourages high levels of pedestrian shoppers and users of public transport. It is also actively encouraged by Aldi.</p> <p>Furthermore, cycle stands are provided, close to the store entrance and under cover where possible, for natural surveillance and to make them attractive to users. The level of parking proposed in Table 18 of the draft BCP Parking Standards is considered to be significantly below the requirements of a typical Aldi foodstore. The availability of appropriate nearby customer car parking is a crucial part of discount foodstores operation and business model and is key to their commercial viability. Should these proposed parking numbers be adopted, any future Aldi foodstore development on sites in the BCP Council area would represent a significant compromise to the business and are likely to be commercially unviable due to an insufficient number of parking spaces. BCP Council could therefore miss out on significant inward investment and beneficial economic development by Aldi. The draft BCP Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, therefore, should be re-considered to allow sufficient, appropriate, and realistic parking numbers for future foodstore developments. Aldi consider that parking standards for retail should be more flexible and be derived on requirements that are based on similar sites in similar locations.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Full comment</b>	<b>Officer Comment/Action</b>
<b>PSSPD254</b>	I would like you not to build on green spaces. I thought the government plan was to go green! How do you expect to build houses on Turlin Moor recreation field with no parking, people will have cars as they are not in a town centre. So can you answer for those that have cars where are they going to park them?	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD255</b>	Improve - If we had a public transport service as good as London or other metropolitan areas, then going some way to implementing a parking scheme may be possible. But we do not have the infrastructure and people need cars to enable them to access parts of the authority.	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD256</b>	<p>Improve All Paragraphs. COVID We need more parking facilities for motor vehicles - for Residents (most will not cycle) COVID few will use Public Transport. We need more parking facilities for motor vehicles for Visitors (very few will cycle) COVID We need more parking facilities for motor vehicles for Delivery Drivers (they do not cycle) COVID We need more parking facilities for motor vehicles for Tradespeople (try carrying tools, ladders etc on a cycle) COVID We need more parking facilities for motor vehicles for Health Visitors (most will not cycle)</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD provides detailed and comprehensive guidance to deliver on a range of economic, social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD257</b>	<p>It is ridiculous it is not going to work there is nowhere for the cars to park!! Why would you do it??? Theres not enough space for any more houses on this community</p>	<p>The Parking SPD provides detailed and comprehensive guidance to deliver on a range of economic, social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD258</b>	Improve There is not enough room for houses, let alone cars. I feel that the Hamworthy area will be destroyed by such a lot of houses, especially without parking	Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The Parking SPD provides detailed and comprehensive guidance to deliver on a range of economic, social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD259</b>	Improve parking provision for all flats and houses within Zones A & B Page 32 - C3 dwellings in Tables 9, 10 & 11 Lack of parking facilities within Zone A will destroy the town centre Lack of parking provision with new builds within Zone B will cause untold problems with on street parking, already a huge issue in these areas. How are elderly people, still able to drive and valuing their independence, not able to walk 15 minutes to a bus stop and wait for a bus, particularly when the weather is bad going to manage ?	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD260</b>	Add parking spaces. There are already too many cars in Hamworthy and nowhere for people to park. This will cause more havoc on the roads. More traffic jams. Not enough schools doctors etc. Only one road in and out and bridges not always in use. Very angry !!!	Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None
<b>PSSPD261</b>	Would like an indication on timescales for implementation	Noted. The SPD will proceed through the statutory stages, scheduled for adoption in January 2021.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD262	<p>A. INTRODUCTION 1. Most members of the Town Council would agree that Christchurch, particularly in the Priory Ward, suffers from an acute parking problem. Obviously much of this is due to fact that the Burh has developed over the centuries and with the growth in car ownership (and therefore individual freedom to choose the mode of travel) since 1950 the problem has worsened. 2. However not all problems are due to the historic development of the Burh. Many problems have arisen because of government policy, particularly under the labour government 1997-2010. Those councillors who sat on CBC's Planning (Control) Committee in its various manifestations will well remember planning applications, which Members wished to reject, having to be approved because the then Highways Authority Dorset County Council would raise no objection to plans providing only one, one between two households, or in extreme cases no off-road parking at all. 3. One example of this which may be offered relates to a development in the former Purewell and Stanpit Ward of Christchurch Borough Council. An application was made for the development of a piece of land on the western side of Burton Road immediately adjacent to the A35. Planning (Control) Committee refused the application on highways grounds that as insufficient parking was being provided cars as would be parked on Poppy Close itself and also on Burton Road between the A35 and Everest Road. The application was approved on appeal and costs were awarded against the Council. Visits to the area after 5.00 p.m. - or even during the daytime – will demonstrate that the Borough Council's fears were justified. 4. There are also parking difficulties in the town centre. Longer term parking (i.e. during the working day is provided in e.g. the "Waitrose" car park but the shortterm and shoppers car parks at Saxon Square, Mayor's Mead, Willow Way, the "Pit Site" and the former Magistrates' Court car parks are heavily used. Christchurch market, on a Monday, attracts many retired people who would be unable – or in the present circumstances unwilling - to access the town by public transport. Similarly, in the holiday season there is heavy pressure on parking in Christchurch. 5. It can therefore be argued that so-called "Demand management" measures (more properly termed rationing) will have to be very carefully applied in Christchurch as the net effect of these measures is to restrict the supply of parking without actually reducing the demand. B. METHODOLOGY 1. Any considered response to the emerging SPD must take the form of a. Consideration of the principles on which the policy is based; b. Consideration of individual proposals. 2. It must also be borne in mind that our responsibility as elected Councillors is first and foremost to our Burh, and then to our individual Wards. Individual Councillors are of course free to submit their own comments, both at this stage and in later consultations. 3. Where there are divergent views on the council are every effort has been made to</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD reflects both national and local priorities to reduce the need to travel by private car by encouraging behaviour change and reflecting the need to find alternative, safe, sustainable and cleaner ways to travel where possible. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. It is outside of the remit of this SPD to set out the requirements under the prior approval procedure as this is determined under the GDPO 2015. Action: None</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>indicate this and to provide some indication of these views. Where no comment is made the District Council should assume that the Town Council is content with the item. C. COMMENTS IN PRINCIPLE 1. The underlying principle of this SPD is the desirability of the governments are announced policy to achieve a “zero carbon” economy and lifestyle” by 2035 at the latest. It must be pointed out that while some members of the council warmly support this policy, others are much more sceptical. 2. Similarly, the principle set out in Para 1.1.4 (“to tackle climate change and ecological emergency by helping to prioritise opportunities to prioritise opportunity to walk, cycle and use public transport .”) while welcomed in itself as increasing supply of public transport and therefore increasing choice arouses concerns that this is to be done by deterring use of private transport – even electric cars. It has long been felt in certain political circles that clean and of choice and therefore freedom to behave in an unplanned way is disliked by many town planners. 3. The reference in Paragraph 1.1.5 to “overly generous parking requirements” does nothing to contradict this view. Many councillors with experience all development proposals coming to the appropriate to planning control committee would believe that the parking requirements introduced by Sir Eric Pickles in the 2010 government simply barely meet expectations or, indeed, requirements. 4. A further concern for local councillors is the view, implicitly accepted in the document, that commuters would prefer to use public transport if it were available. While this is indeed accepted by some Councillors there is also concern that in the actuality the Covid 19 pandemic will actually increase the demand for private transport. 5. Following from this there is the question of our electric vehicles. There are undoubtedly problem and at the moment with electorate by in that while the range is increasing the time at taken to charge the vehicle is not necessarily diminishing. Wider concerns that this may lead to power rationing in the evenings are not relevant to this discussion, and nor are concerns are over the pollution caused in the extraction of lithium. 6. In general the Council welcomes increased provision for electric vehicles, as this in itself or why didn’t see individual choice. The council would draw to the District Council’s attention the provision in Bavaria of on- street charging facilities where are the parking spaces are reserved for parking and recharging of electric vehicles. 7. The Council would point out that in the Burh there will be as a result of schemes approved by BCP Planning serious loss of parking. The “Pit Site” and Magistrates’ Court site will be lost as a result of the development of the former Police Station site and the private parking for shoppers at 1 High Street will be greatly reduced. Such efforts to mitigate this loss as have been made are heavily criticised by both Town and District Councillors. 8. To summarise this point, the Council welcomes this SPD and would support it where it seeks</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>to expand the individual choice. While some members of the Council might well come restrictions, it is felt that overall the Council is disturbed by and is reluctant to support proposals for restriction on citizen’s rights to choose the mode of transport they find most appropriate to their own needs. Some members of the Council are particularly disturbed by the regretful tone in which it is admitted that the Council has no power to restrict private vehicle use. D. COMMENT ON POINTS OF DETAIL 1.1.3 – The Council welcomes the commitment to ensure that new communities will have “greater connectivity” but takes the opportunity to stress that this should not be done by restricting the use of the private car. 1,1.4 – It is appropriate to note that the Council has so far not accepted the concept of “climate emergency” and indeed it is a concept to which some Members are very much opposed. 1.1.5 – in addition to the point already mentioned is worth noting that the stronger growth in home working as a result of Covid may reduce the demand for workplace parking. 1.1.7 - The Council would point out that this could well be a function of lower income and lower affordability of households In the town centres rather than a diminution of desire for car ownership. 1.1.9 – The Council would point out that these policies are restrictive and will also require enforcement, and this is not always effective: the Council would cite the problems in Grange Road in Christchurch where a RPS has been introduced and is regularly defied. 1.1.10 – While the Council would strongly welcome this commitment, it is forced to point out that some of the schemes approved in Christchurch by BCP since 1 April 2019 have not met this criterion. 1.3.2 – Many members of the Council would disagree that public transport is necessarily active transport. Taxis and bus services only promote minimal walking and can greatly inconvenience individual members of the public. 2.1.3 – The Council draws attention to the statement in 2.1.3 that “maximum standards should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary.” The Council does not necessarily accept that this case has been made for our town. 3.2.1 et seq: Members of the Council are particularly concerned that parking standards it should take into account the increased size of cars. Many car parks were built in the 1970s or 1980s before the growth of SUV use and a far greater width of cars today. Councillors are concerned that the dimensions set out in 3.2.3 of 8’6” may not always allow for three SUVs to park side by side without impeding access to or egress from the middle vehicle. 3.2.1. The Council would point out the Government’s commitment to ensuring that all new streets are tree-lined. This could restrict space for on-street parking and could also (depending on the tree) result in damage to vehicles parked there from tree sap. 3.2.22 et seq: "Parking should be located to the rear or side of the development" The Council welcomes and commends this policy.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>“Where the only option is to locate parking in front of a building, it should be enclosed by a high-quality front boundary treatment. For example, a low wall or hedge.” This should also be sympathetic to other planning considerations such as impact upon heritage assets such as listed buildings, conservation areas within the vicinity too and should respect the locality and character of the street-scene and area. 3.7.4 – While the Council welcomes defined and proper provision for disabled users it would point out that providing on-street parking will require enforcement to be effective. The Council would also suggest that in appropriate places suitable provision must be made for the use, accommodation and charging of mobility scooters. 4. 2.7 refers to “The standards apply to all categories of development for which Planning Permission required...” There needs to be some clarity here about permitted development rights. The GDPO grants planning permission by operation of law, rather than through the assessment of a planning application and the subsequent grant of a planning permission upon “application”. The query is whether the SPD here is strong enough so as to capture those developments which have permitted development rights (i.e change of use from office to residential) where there may not be enough parking in terms of the residential standards outlined in the SPD. It would fall then to the developer to argue that “planning permission” is not required as they have permitted development rights granted to them by operation of law (i.e it is not required). This also needs to deal with GPDO rights as well for the “prior approval” issues that such PD rights through up and the “light touch” approach of the Prior Approval process. Some Prior Approvals for example allow for the Highway assessment process to be undertaken by a planning officer; for the avoidance of doubt surely the SPD here should make it clear to a planning officer that the SPD is a factor for these types of applications (prior approvals) to the Planning Authority. 4.2.8 – Many Members would not wish to see zero car parking provision for commercial use in those parts of the Burh allocate to Zones A and B. By attention has already been drawn to the diminishing amount of parking available in Christchurch Town centre. It might well be argued that this policy, by making life difficult for employers to attract staff or for attracting shoppers to the area, may well conflict with other policies designed to ensure the viability of the town centre as a place to work, shop and relax. Table 10C – Many members believe that these figures are hopelessly unrealistic. If earn a two-bedroom house is likely to attract two cars for the inhabitants. Thus, if the policy is to encourage skilled workers to come and live in Christchurch (or in greater Bournemouth) the situation is almost certain to arise where one member of the family may indeed work locally but the other will work away. Examples are known whereby a family moved to the area where the wife worked locally but the husband taught</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>in the suburbs of Southampton. In addition, the children in 2- bed homes are likely to require their own cars, as will visitors. In a modern economy it is in everyone’s interests to ensure a high degree of mobility of labour: these severe parking restrictions will impair such mobility. E. CONCLUSION There are many points in this document which the Town Council welcomes. However, it is known that several Councillors feel that this document is views the situation through “green-tinted spectacles”. There is a concern that the restrictions on the individual choice opposed in this document may in fact be counterproductive and may cause many travelling members of the public to view the entire “Green Agenda” with that very considerable concern.</p>	
<p><b>PSSPD263</b></p>	<p>Response to the Consultation has been emailed as this site will not accept formatted documents nor more than 5000 characters.</p>	<p>n/a</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD264	<p>ADD parking spaces, ADD Space for Clinics/Dentists etc, ADD Emergency Parking Spaces for Ambulances etc. I think its terrible that you let a BCP Document go out with such a glaring spelling error... (D R A F T is NOT the way to spell D A F T) As providing no parking spaces will NOT stop parking, it will only stop regulated parking. What does Pizza/Fast food delivery do? What does Ambulances do? I could go on, but would people listen?</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD265</b>	<p>Clarify - 1.1.5 - what evidence is there that reducing off-road parking spaces reduces cars / car journeys? Clarify - 1.1.5 - what is the 'quantum of development expected by our communities'? how determined / who speaks for 'our communities'? How does BCP ensure that a government model of 'quantum' does not compromise the 'quality of development expected by our communities'? Improve - 1.1.8 - check the hypothesis that if 'rate of growth in car ownership is decreasing' and 'council has a responsibility to manage the increasing numbers of vehicles' - whilst the rate of increase in car ownership might be slowing, the number of cars are still growing, so surely to manage the potential impact on highways, our council's planning policy needs to ensure that there is more off-road parking provided for all developments...? Improve 1.1.9 - Is this saying that 'effective management of the levels of parking associated with a new development' means we need more off-road parking in order to not intensify existing on-street pressure? If so, why not call a spade a spade? Add - 3.3.4 - fully support that cycle parking must be in a well-lit location Change - 4.2.4 - parking spaces should be rounded up not rounded (potentially down) to nearest whole number Improve - 4.26 - what enforcement is there of unallocated parking? How does BCP ensure that a 'sop to the Planning Board' where developers make promises about parking being unallocated is seen through? It is common practice for such developments to subsequently appear in an estate agents marketing as 'benefiting from an allocated parking space' Change - table 10 - a 4+ bedroomed house in Zone B needs just one parking space.... really...? Change - table 12 - one parking space (residents &amp; visitors) per HMO in all zones - really? how can this be sufficient? surely this will almost inevitably put strain on on-road parking...? Change - table 31 - it is delusional to think that purpose-built student accommodation will mean that students park in public car parks and therefore there is a nil requirement for parking on the development site. This assumption is as grounded as poppycock. I would like to understand the evidence behind this assertion as my gut belief is that a student bringing a car to our area will find somewhere to park on-road (increasing pressure on our highways) and the chances of he / she paying to use a public car park are very slim at best. Add - 5.10 - add weight to statement that visibility at accesses should be maintained / improved - there are too many accident blind spots at junctions, so anything to reduce these is welcomed Add - 3.2.24 to 3.2.28 - cross reference Queen's Park &amp; Charminster Neighbourhood Forum draft Design Code General - give greater emphasis to parking enforcement. Some car drivers are simply discourteous - parking on pavements or on double yellow lines. Need to ensure that parking standards apply to everyone. Improve - table 13 - requirements for clinics (parking spaces per clinic room) seem out of kilter with dwellinghouses parking</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing and employment needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. The Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>requirements - how have these been arrived at and what confidence is there that these are not excessive? improve - para 4.1.2 to make explicit that the 400m zone around district centres should be measured by pedestrian route (as opposed to how the crow flies) as this is the only measure that can make sense when discussing walking distance to a bus stop. change - para 4.2.4 to round up parking space requirements (as opposed to 'round to nearest') add - clarification to para 4.2.6 to expand on how BCP will enforce 'unallocated parking' and not allow developers to promise this to the Planning Board and then go on to advertise flats for sale as if they had allocated parking</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD266	Improve - actually provide parking?!	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective.</p> <p>Action: None</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD267	<p>Parking standards by Use Class Tables 9 &amp; 10 CHANGE the number of parking spaces in Zone A from 0. This is completely ridiculous!! There is no available on street parking in Hamworthy as it is, let alone 5 new developments with no parking. I am totally for sustainable transport options and for less holiday homes, but zero parking ... IMPROVE And if keeping the parking at 0 in Zone A, then the NCP surface car park could be built as a multistorey car park to enable nearby parking with permits. IMPROVE Public Transport: you can't expect residents and visitors to the town to give up cars without improved public transport. More frequent buses that access more places, go later to places like Corfe Mullen and Wimborne. And for buses to come further down near the quay, that are on the Wilts &amp; Dorset service provision, not expected to pay a separate fare for the Route 1. Poole Quays Forum had a travel interchange at St Mary's pub. This would bring buses closer to Poole Quay, opening up the lower High Street and the Quay, and the new proposed quayside developments in the Regeneration Area in Zone A. IMPROVE Parking car parking and access for visitors to housing developments. eg Carter's Quay, Harbour Reach, Poole Quarter. There is no free visitor parking. IMPROVE town car parking charges to enable visitors to the town at night. In Bournemouth it is so refreshing to have free parking near the town hall after 6pm or 8pm on a Sunday. I am in agreement with Poole Quays Forum, of which I am a member and have been since before 2012. Parking allocations for flats, houses, holiday accommodation, clinics, care home, schools and many other categories have been defined, but no consideration has been given to High-density Development. Densities planned for the Regeneration area are higher than London, with its far superior infrastructure. The PQF area includes some of the major commercial enterprises, including Sunseeker and the RNLI. Significant parking problems exist in the area as a result of employee's vehicles. The existing acute vehicle parking problems in the area. This appears to have been ignored. Inadequate infrastructure, including public transport. This is worsened by the Covid epidemic, which is undermining the viability of public transport and the confidence of passengers. It is evident that there is a move toward electric vehicles and EV charging points are identified, but there will be very little provision in the PQF area. The proposals will have an adverse effect of the saleability of new Apartments/Dwellings. A target market for the developers is the 'out of town weekenders'. They will want parking. The properties will sell eventually at a reduced value, that is the rule of market forces, but the sales will be delayed. This will result in ambiguity and reason for non-viability from the developers. It will mean more delays from the builders. I have answered your consultation after finding it really difficult to sit and read through a 63 page document. While some of my comments have not been</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	made to directly correlate with specific parts of the SPD, they are valid points none the less.	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD268</b>	No mention of bus passes for parking.	<p>Noted. This could be considered on a case by case basis, rather than a specific reference to bus passes in lieu of parking requirements set out in the tables.</p> <p>Action: Consider adding a short paragraph to Section 4 Variation from standards</p> <p>'We reserve the right to determine the provision of bus passes in lieu of car parking, in similar terms to the way car clubs are considered in lieu of parking, depending on type, size and the scale of development and on a case by case basis.'</p>
<b>PSSPD269</b>	Thank you for providing details of the above the content of which is noted and upon which South West Water has no comment.	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
<b>PSSPD270</b>	<p>I had lost the will to live by page 12 and for there to be 62 pages is so typical of Local Authorities creating, at vast expense of time and money, endless reams of bumf that ultimately serve no purpose - e.g. pictorial pictures of numerous bikes.</p> <p>Just get on and do what your officers are hopefully trained in and make simple, rational decisions that are available to the public.</p> <p>This document needs be no longer than FIVE pages at most.</p>	<p>The SPD is a comprehensive document to provide further detail on parking requirements to support Local Plan policies. It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and covers the issues the relevant issues that developers need to know to meet the requirements of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Action: None.</p>
<b>PSSPD270</b>	I note that there is currently a live consultation for the Parking Standards SPD. The SPD states that for any developments not listed in the document, the LPA should be contacted to discuss the proposed parking standards. I wondered whether you could put me in touch with someone who could tell me whether the parking standards for sui generis builders' merchants has changed? Also, is this the only stage of consultation on the SPD? When are BCP Council scheduled to adopt this document?	<p>Noted. Use class is unchanged. Adoption is scheduled for January 2021. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD272</b>	<p>In your planning review you mention PTW (Powered Two Wheelers). This appears to be aimed at electric powered two wheelers, but I can see no mention of motorcycles and scooters powered by the internal combustion engine. Or have I missed something? The use of conventional motorcycles and scooters should be encouraged in order to reduce traffic congestion and as a result reduce emissions caused by traffic jams. The sales of this type of vehicle is increasing. The number of motorcycle parking bays should be extended and be much better signposted than at present. Thought should be given as to whether a motorcycle should have to pay. Remember there is no secure place to put a parking ticket on a motorcycle. Security devices should be fitted into the designated parking area to enable the owners to lock up their vehicle. Many of these motorcycles command the same price as a car and can be easily stolen.</p>	<p>Powered Two Wheelers are motorcycles and scooters. Provision of these vehicles is encouraged, and adequate provision is typically sought as part of new developments. The document lists two approaches for securing PTWs.</p> <p>Action: Clarify PTW text as being related to motorcycles and scooters. Examine case for clarifying electric scooter requirements referred elsewhere in document.</p>
<b>PSSPD273</b>	<p>I am contacting you as a resident of Heath avenue in Oakdale,BH15 3EJ. I have spoken to many of my neighbours about the traffic calming measure in the Oakdale area which we support. I have a child of 10 who attends Oakdale Junior school and walks to school. We are wondering why Heath avenue was not considered as a candidate for road calming measures given it is used by cars taking short cuts heading to Wimborne rd. These cars have to travel on the wrong side of the road given cars can only park on the one side due to the double yellow lines on the “north “ side of the road. As a result cars turning left or right into heath avenue from Wimborne road are faced with vehicles coming towards them on the wrong side of the road and at the same time pupils walking or cycling to Stanley Green infants school ,Oakdale Junior school and the Parkstone grammar school. The issues have resulted in some vary near misses due to drivers being distracted as pupils cross in front of them. Is it possible for you to consult with the residents of Heath avenue about similar measures being used to calm the traffic using the road?</p>	<p>Noted. Outside of the remit of this SPD.</p> <p>Action: Pass information to Traffic Management Team.</p>
<b>PSSPD274</b>	<p>Like all Christchurch residents we trust when reading what BCP has in store for us is encouraging , please endeavor to restore life into our Town . Please give sensible consideration to our Towns future store owners , encourage us residents &amp; visitor's to want to shop here . Instead of using car park tariffs as a cash cow that's killed off butchers bakers and candlestick makers . Let's see the back of charity stores &amp; boarded up plate glass windows . Our lives in your hands , also your Votes are in your hands . Above our Towns centre clock it reads " Where Time Is Pleasant " Please restore that feeling again.</p>	<p>Noted. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD275</b>	Having skirted through your consultation document, 62 pages long, it would appear your parking requirements are based on the level of housing need and economic growth. Firstly we think your level of housing need is overestimated, with mass unemployment and the unwillingness of banks/building societies to lend money, it will be very difficult for people to get on the property ladders, which fuels the movement between houses. Secondly, economic growth will be in the doldrums for many years, post Covid-19, in fact the ability to work from home will have a knock on effect. Therefore, we do not believe the demand for car parking will be on the levels you have predicted.	Noted. The SPD is a comprehensive document to provide further detail on parking requirements to support Local Plan policies. It is a material consideration in the determination of planning applications and covers the issues the relevant issues that developers need to know to meet the requirements of the Local Plan. Action: None.
<b>PSSPD276</b>	Please can you clarify the actual size and specifications for a parking spot on a new park home development.	Noted. The size of a car parking space is referred in Section 3.2 on page 10 onwards. The provision of parking for a park home is not a clear cut as it is dependent on a number of factors, principally which use class the proposal is considered to be or that of the land it is sited upon. In addition, the accessibility of the site, its location and also the future occupier needs. Consequently, the council considers any such application on a case by case basis and does not have a required standard. Action: None
<b>PSSPD277</b>	My main concern is any changes that could be made to CPZs and RPS as set out in 5.9 - 5.9.4. RPS should be issued only to residents of particular roads and not become available for anyone to obtain, for a location near to their place of residence.	Noted. Action: None

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD278	<p>The following comments are made in respect of the BCP Parking SPD Consultation. I have put my comments in a letter simply because there was not enough room to make meaningful comments on the consultation questionnaire. The comments are in relation to the parking zones map and in reference to the questionnaire would come under the headings 'add' and 'improve'. The parking zone approach is welcomed but there are anomalies and improvements/additions required. The zones are designated to reflect the areas which are considered to be the most sustainable by way of proximity to a town or district centre or relative to high frequency bus routes. Zones A and B appear to be designated to reflect the hierarchy of centres. The zones however miss out areas currently considered to be well located due to proximity to a high frequency bus route. The obvious omissions are; - • Poole Road between Bournemouth and Westbourne • East Cliff south of Christchurch Road between Bournemouth and Boscombe • Christchurch Road – Iford • Castle Lane</p> <p>Other key transport routes are identified within the respective Adopted Local Plans. The adopted policies identify these routes as being important to encourage the shift towards more sustainable travel and intensification of residential accommodation along the key routes which are considered to be sustainable locations is a key part of the spatial strategy. Examples of the key routes are Castle Lane, Wimborne Road, Columbia Road and Wallisdown Road. Some of these areas are as sustainable as some of the areas that have been included within Zone B. The areas shown as being key transport corridors and sustainable locations within both Bournemouth and Poole Local Plans should also be identified within the parking zone map as being Zone B. If the Council, for whatever reason, do not think these areas to be as sustainable as Zone B or to justify no parking then they should be Zone B (2) or similar designation. These zones will have half the requirement of Zone D. They will therefore be considered as being between B and D in terms of sustainability credentials. To put this into context it does seem anomalous that a location on a key transport corridor such as Columbia Road has the same parking requirement as a location such as Throop or Hengisbury Head. The zones should reflect transport corridors. A failure on the point of the Council to do this will result in disputes where a location immediately adjacent a transport corridor and Zone A or B will be claimed as being as sustainable as the adjoining location. Identification of the further zone as discussed above will affect a wider area but will close off any future disputes and arguments. A further anomaly is the areas between Winton, Charminster and Springbourne. Between these identified Zone B areas are slight gaps and again it is considered that while less sustainable than Zone B these areas will be more sustainable</p>	<p>Noted. In determining the parking zones and standards, the underlying principle was that areas which already or potentially have high accessibility and lower car ownership would be expected to adopt more rigorous parking standards. Action: Review zone boundaries to confirm key routes are reflected correctly.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>than the majority of Zone D areas and they should therefore also be designated as Zone B (2) status, i.e. half the requirement for Zone D. In essence, the parking requirements or zones should reflect the entire spatial strategy in terms of key transport corridors and not just the centres. Other key transport routes are identified within the respective Adopted Local Plans. The adopted policies identify these routes as being important to encourage the shift towards more sustainable travel and intensification of residential accommodation along the key routes which are considered to be sustainable locations is a key part of the spatial strategy. Examples of the key routes are Castle Lane, Wimborne Road, Columbia Road and Wallisdown Road. Some of these areas are as sustainable as some of the areas that have been included within Zone B.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<p><b>PSSPD279</b></p>	<p>Dorset HealthCare is responsible for all mental health services and many physical health services in Dorset, delivering both hospital and community-based care. It is the biggest provider of healthcare in Dorset. Dorset Healthcare serves a population of over 750,000 people and employ around 5,000 staff, covering a wide range of expertise and specialisms. Its staff provide healthcare at over 300 sites, ranging from village halls and GP surgeries to mental health inpatient hospitals and community hospitals - as well as in people's homes. Dorset Healthcare's services include: · Dorset's 12 community hospitals and minor injuries units; · Adult and children's community health serves (physical and mental); · Specialist learning disability services; and · Community brain injury services. In BCP, Dorset Healthcare's main sites comprise: · Kings Park Hospital, Boscombe · 11 Shelley Road, Boscombe · 49 Alumhurst Road, Westbourne · St Ann's Hospital, Poole · Alderney Hospital, Poole · Fairmile House, Christchurch</p> <p>Dorset Healthcare welcomes the move to create a new parking SPD that will replace the legacy parking SPDs in Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole and which complies with the National Planning Policy Framework and will promote sustainable transport. However, it is concerned that some aspects of the draft SPD, as currently worded, could unnecessarily restrict the delivery of improved health care facilities, that they could negatively affect staff and visitors working at/using those facilities and that they are likely to result in unnecessary additional financial costs to Dorset Healthcare. While the principle of progressively reducing private car usage in favour of more sustainable modes is a sensible one, if it is not delivered hand-in-hand with a clear strategy for investment in public transport, bicycle and walking infrastructure, there is a risk that traffic congestion and parking problems will not be resolved and may in fact become worse. Parking standards The proposed parking standards for hospitals (Use Class C2) are: In the Bournemouth Parking SPD (2014) parking standards for hospitals are not specified and it is necessary to "contact the local highway authority". For clinics and health centres (former Use Class D1) staff and visitor car parking is benchmarked at 3 spaces per treatment or consulting room. In Poole the Parking and Highway Layout in Development SPD (2011) parking standards for hospitals (C2: Residential Institutions) are 22 car spaces per 1000m2 floor space / 100 beds and clinics and health centres are 3 car spaces per consulting room. It is caveated that in 'Zones 1 &amp; 2' a reduced optimum parking guideline figure shall be used that discourages over-provision of commuter parking and is sufficient to meet the parking needs of the development without causing or adding to parking or highway safety problems in the locality. For Christchurch the Dorset County Council Non-Residential Parking Guidance states 1 car parking space per 4 staff and 1 space per 3</p>	<p>Support noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. The SPD sets out where variations from standards will be acceptable. As such the SPD is sufficiently flexible in terms of parking standards for hospitals and EVCI where robust evidence and supporting justification can be provided to support reduced provision. Action: None.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>visitors for Hospitals and for clinics and health centres 2 spaces per consulting room plus 1 space for every FTE staff. It is caveated that for larger sites the level of car parking should be explored and quantified through a transport appraisal or assessment. Dorset Healthcare is concerned that the proposed standards would in some cases unnecessarily reduce the amount of on-site car parking permitted and that they do not sufficiently recognise the various functions of different healthcare facilities and the travel characteristics of the patients, visitors and staff associated with them. Not all patients and visitors will be able to travel to Dorset Healthcare sites by public transport or other sustainable modes for reasons of health or appointment times. Staff car share models may also be negatively impacted. As more care is delivered within the community both Dorset Healthcare staff travel distances and car usage will increase. Clinicians require access to cars to effectively transport equipment and deliver treatment to patients, often in their own homes. Limiting on-site car parking at hospitals, clinics and health centres could make this process more difficult, time-consuming and potentially more stressful for Dorset Healthcare staff. There must be sufficient flexibility in the parking standards to allow for changing clinical models. Notwithstanding the above comments, Dorset Healthcare recognises that appropriately-planned levels of onsite car parking will encourage those staff, patients and visitors who are able to do so to travel by sustainable modes. However, in order to encourage this shift where it is feasible to do so and to prevent people from reverting back to private car use, it is essential that there is also investment in public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure. Dorset Healthcare acknowledges that it may need to contribute to this on a site-bysite basis where it is necessary to mitigate the impact of specific development projects. However, BCP-wide investment from BCP Council and the local bus companies will be fundamental to achieving modal shift. An alternative approach, as is currently the case in Bournemouth, is not to specify parking standards for hospitals and for this to be discussed and agreed on a case-by-case basis with the Local Planning Authority based on appropriate evidence / justification e.g. transport assessment and travel plan. For clinic and health centres it would be helpful if the standards were expressed as a minimum, therefore allowing increased provision where this can be appropriately justified through evidence-base work. Electric vehicle charging Dorset Healthcare objects to the proposed electric vehicle charging provision requirements. It is extremely concerned that the percentage of active and passive provision required could lead to unnecessary additional costs. The potential impact on Dorset Healthcare's already perilously marginal on-site power supply/agreed demand should not be underestimated. This will in all likelihood lead to significant charges being</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>levied to the Trust by the District Network Operator for breaching its agreement. This is a further financial risk and demand that will affected already finite resources. In addition it also creates a potential situation where the only option becomes Dynamic Power Sharing, which does share the power amongst the EV charging demand, however results in the unintended consequence that EV's are not reaching their capacity charge therefore affecting journey ranges possibly impacting upon patient care. The proportion of EV points also needs careful consideration and should be approached with flexibility in mind. The larger 50Kw units are very expensive to install and run. We question if these EV points are required where parking demand is from vehicles that have only travelled a relatively short distance and will not be staying for long e.g. a large proportion of staff and visitors. The guidance for EV provision needs to be more flexible. The cost of the required EVCP active installs and passive infrastructure required could add significant costs to future Dorset Healthcare projects. It may also be to the detriment of other environmental/sustainable initiatives, which should be avoided.</p>	
<p><b>PSSPD280</b></p>	<p>Remainder of Planning Potential's submission received by email (letter) - type in by hand...</p>	<p>Rep recorded in full - see ID 253</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD281	<p>1 As stated at paragraph 10 of the relevant report to Cabinet “the draft Parking Standards SPD will support existing legacy authority Local Plan transport policies” Relevant policies being supported by the Consultation SPD, by reason of Saved Policies, date from the turn of the century. For the avoidance of doubt its purpose is also, as stated at paragraph 1, to “support the emerging Local Plan”. 2 It appears that the Consultation SPD is a cut and paste exercise to embed the current Bournemouth Parking SPD (2014) (“the Bournemouth SPD”), with some minor amendment and changes in semantics rather than substance, into a changed environment. 3 Thus the Consultation SPD’s core purpose can be identified at paragraph 4.2.1 - as seeking to accommodate “the likely parking demand requirement” (sic) incorporating that car-led demand unchecked into its optimum/standard Tables. 4 Thereby this Consultation SPD extends the emphasis of the three previous authorities on promoting and accommodating the use of the car, to the detriment of other forms of transport. 5 The Consultation SPD recognises at paragraph 1.1.5 that: “Rigid and overly generous parking requirements historically have not helped to deliver the quantum or quality of development expected by our communities” and then proposes embedding rigid and overly generous parking requirements in the most sustainable locations. The paragraphs following “4.3 Variation from the parking standards”, being brought forward from the Bournemouth SPD heading 3.3, are essentially part of the disproportionate conditionality which had the effect referred to in paragraph 1.1.5. 6 The change from the Bournemouth SPD “benchmark” to the Consultation SPD “optimum” is semantics not substance. As is clear from eg at heading 4.3, this “optimum” is simply a synonym for a rigid and inflexible “standard” 7 Further, the definition of zones is carried forward from the Bournemouth SPD conjoining Town and District Centres with their hinterland; thus failing to promote or exploit “transport corridors” (1.2.5) or the recognition of “sustainable transport corridors” (1.1.2). The current consultation on the NPPF clearly points to requiring a more finessed approach with sub-areas (eg paragraphs 2.10 and 3.24). 8 It is only on new development that BCP can effectively apply the target, stated in the Cabinet Report, as: “Limiting the amount of parking spaces in development in key areas will contribute to helping reduce car ownership and reduce journeys by car.” The contrary is achieved by requiring high levels of car parking particularly in those areas “that also are shared with the area’s high frequency bus routes”, where (the Cabinet Report recognises) “BCP is experiencing worsening congestion”. 9 Rather than accepting that “(t)aking a progressive approach to reducing parking standards will help to achieve modal shift” the Consultation SPD is regressive in its approach by providing for “the likely parking demand requirement” in its zonal Tables, which harks back to the legacy</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing and employment needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Changes suggested to include reference to Gear Change are welcomed along with highlighting the wider shifting national policy landscape. Recognise the need for flexibility in applying standards and appropriate variations. Where required, the SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking provision appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. Note the emphasis on cycling and appropriate cycle parking provision. Action: Make partial changes. Insert reference to DfT Gear Change policy document. Review zone boundaries alongside other responses.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>documents of a previous era. Sustainable transport corridors can be key areas. 10 Having summarised at paragraph 4.2.1 "the best available evidence regarding the likely parking demand requirement", the Tables that follow incorporate and endorse that demand for car parking with no attempt to promote modal shift. 11 The Consultation SPD Executive Summary recognises that: "Car parking can occupy a great deal of space and can have a negative impact on the appearance of development and the efficient use of land." Promoting proposals to accommodate "the likely parking demand requirement" rebuts that recognition and cannot be said to respond to national policy, such as NPPF chapter 11 "Making effective use of land". 12 DfT Gear Change (July 2020) page 26 sets out current government policy as follows: "We will ensure that all new housing and business developments are built around making sustainable travel, including cycling and walking, the first choice for journeys .....While many local plans already say the right things, they are not always followed consistently in planning decisions." 13 The current NPPF Consultation has confirmed (at paragraph 3.6) that "a revised and consolidated Manual for Streets" will shortly be published. Active Travel England will be grading highway authorities on these issues. 14 Current government policy is neither reflected, nor referenced, in the Consultation SPD. The purpose of the SPD (as reported to Cabinet) is to "support existing legacy authority Local Plan transport policies" by accommodating "the likely parking demand requirement" for motor cars and to use this to "support the emerging Local Plan". 15 It is unfortunate that the LPA should see fit to seek to enshrine legacy policies preempting the current BCP Local Plan. Prima facie, the emerging local plan may say the right things but will fall squarely into the concern of "Gear Change" that government policy will not be followed in planning decisions. As appears clear from national policy this will negatively impact directly upon central government funding for BCP. See suggested amendments in red.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD282	<p>Forelle Estates is a long established property management company based in Poole. The company owns a sizeable portfolio of commercial and retail property both within the administrative boundary of BCP Council and the surrounding areas. Our client is keen to ensure that the council's new parking policy continues to recognise and support the needs of business. Our client welcomes the publication of a single Parking Standards SPD, which provides consistent guidance for new development across the conurbation. Our client also recognises and supports the overarching objective of the SPD to encourage sustainable development, with an emphasis on promoting increased cycling and walking and other new sustainable modes of transport. However, this objective must be balanced with the current transport needs of business, particularly those located outside of the town centres, where reliance on the car and private motor vehicles often remains and continues to offer the most viable form of transport. In this respect our client wishes to ensure that the new SPD includes sufficient flexibility to respond to the specific needs of business operators, to enable them to remain competitive and provide sufficient parking provision to meet their operational needs and those of their customers. The document should also reference the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on travel behaviour, which is likely to result in a combination of short and longer term structural changes. These are likely to include more people working from home, different demands on work space and at least in the short-term, less shared trips using public transport. These factors are likely to influence both travel demand and business needs in an increasingly difficult economic period. We have set out our detailed comments on the SPD below.</p> <p>1. Introduction This chapter is very focused on the parking demand and the needs of residential development. We suggest that it should include at least a paragraph on other forms of commercial and retail development, recognising their specific needs for some parking infrastructure in order to remain viable and cater for differing accessibility needs.</p> <p>Para 1.2.3 We suggest a further bullet should be added to the key objectives stating: 'to encourage sustainable travel whilst also recognising the specific needs of commercial, retail and other businesses.'</p> <p>4. Parking Standards The SPD identifies four hierarchical zones across the conurbation, which reflect their differing accessibility levels. Whilst this approach is accepted, the zones downplay the disparity of accessibility by other modes of transport to the car between Zones A and B, and Zones C and D. Zones C and D are generally inaccessible by train and suffer from infrequent and indirect bus services. On this basis greater flexibility over parking provision in new development is required in these locations, until more viable alternative modes of transport are available. Forelle Estates have reviewed the proposed car parking standards and are concerned that some of the stated</p>	<p>In para 1.2.3. the first bullet point recognises the need to balance the needs of different users to encourage well designed places to live, work and visit. The parking standards will encourage commuting workers, shoppers and visitors to use good sustainable travel options available in Zones A &amp; B. The public car parks will be available to those who choose to travel by car. If there is a departure from the standards, this will require robust and evidence-based justification and therefore the SPD builds in sufficient flexibility to the requirements. Action None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>'optimum' parking figures may discourage developers or operators from coming to the area. In particular the proposed standards for offices (Class E) within Zones C and D appear particularly low (between 2 and 2.5 spaces per 100m<sup>2</sup> of development). Based on their experience of the local market and tenants' requirements Forelle Estates suggest a more realistic 'optimum' figure would be 1 space per 20m<sup>2</sup> of development. Although it is recognised that the frequency and accessibility of public transport is generally better in Zones A and B, some office developments will still require on-site spaces for staff and visitors. An optimum figure of 1 space per 50m<sup>2</sup> of development is therefore considered to offer a more practicable figure in these locations and will help them to remain competitive.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD283	<p>I am writing on behalf of Poole Communities Trust, a community led charity aiming to promote economic and community growth, particularly in disadvantaged neighbourhoods within Poole. We do this through the development of community facilities, creating places where people have the chance to thrive, including health and wellbeing facilities, community cafés, nurseries, activity clubs, etc. which respond to local community needs. Currently, we are involved in three community projects at the Branksome Centre, Turlin Moor and Bourne Community Hub. We are responding to the Parking Standards SPD Consultation as we recognise the impact that parking can have on our environment; the way people travel and on the services we provide. We welcome the Council’s approach to bringing all aspects of parking together across one strategic document and the emphasis on good design and sustainability. We agree with the key objectives of the SPD (point 1.2.3, page 6), particularly the encouragement of more travel on foot, bicycle and bus to improve air quality and health and wellbeing. There are two main concerns we would like to highlight: 1. The zonal approach to parking standards particularly in Zone D 2. The term ‘standard’ and use of the word ‘optimum’ to describe parking figures Zonal Approach We support the council’s emphasis on reducing car parking in locations where there is a high degree of accessibility to public transport services, shops and other facilities. We believe the most significant measure to encourage sustainable travel patterns is to limit the amount of parking provision. Our community centres are situated in well integrated locations serving the local population within easy walking, cycling and bus routes. They are linked with other facilities, such as local shops, allotments, playing fields, schools, etc. However, the zonal approach in regards to Zone D (red) is described as suburban/rural. Both Branksome Centre and Bourne Community Centre, in particular, are located in this Zone which means the parking standards which would apply under the SPD for any new development, would be significantly higher than required considering how these centres are used. The definition of Zone D (4.1.6) in the SPD document iterates a generalised approach and that ‘less accessible areas are where car ownership is at its highest’. This does not apply to all areas in Zone D. The facilities we are providing are in prominent, accessible locations for the community they are serving. The fact that the facilities are in residential areas with traffic calmed streets, encourages local people to walk and cycle to these centres. So the community centres, when you consider who they are serving, are actually located in more accessible areas not ‘less’. It is also debateable whether car ownership in these more disadvantaged areas is the issue when the cost of car usage for many is a determining factor. For example, at Bourne Valley Community Centre most of the time there is only one car in the car park belonging to the manager of the pre-school;</p>	<p>Support noted. Action: Harmonise Tables 23 and Table 24 due to similar uses to serve local communities. No change to zone descriptions as areas of BCP not within Zones A, B and C contain both suburban and rural locations.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>staff and visitors of all the facilities here tend to live nearby and walk, cycle or catch the bus. We agree with the Council’s policies on efficient use of land, prioritising sustainable modes of transport, climate emergency and connecting communities but believe the proposed approach to Zone D parking standards for community facilities as shown in Tables 14 and 23 are counterproductive. As we move forward and change and rebuild our community centres, we need to be creating areas for green spaces, biodiverse multifunctional spaces for the community to use, not large areas of tarmac, encouraging car use. We would ask that the Zonal approach of the SPD be reconsidered to reflect the nature of local community uses; how local they are and who they are serving when considering parking provision especially in Zone D. The Term ‘Standard’ and the use of the Word ‘Optimum’ Whilst we understand the need for clarity and a consistent approach when assessing parking needs, the use of the term ‘standard’ often means this becomes the benchmark for assessing development. The danger of presenting the car parking figures as ‘optimums’ is that it could be interpreted as the best figure to aim for but from what perspective? If the SPD truly wants to encourage sustainable modes of transport, tackle climate change and improve our health and wellbeing, then the emphasis should be on rewarding developments that can demonstrate how they can reduce the need for car parking. The document does give plenty of examples of this but ultimately our fear is that the term ‘parking standards’ and the figures presented as ‘optimums’ will make it more difficult to assess each situation on its own merits. We think the document should emphasise ‘guidance’ and not standards. Maybe this should be considered in the title of the document.</p>	



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD284	<p>Parking Standards Paragraph 3.2.22 of the SPD advises against providing on plot parking located to the front of a property. However, it is Persimmon’s view that well designed parking to the front of the house enables a more efficient use of land and optimise the use of land to meet as much of the identified need for housing as possible in line with Paragraphs 122 and 123 of the NPPF. In a highly urbanised and constrained Green Belt locations such as BCP, seeking higher density development and maximising the development potential of sites will be key. There are also practical reasons for frontage parking in terms of convenience for residents, particularly those that may experience mobility issues, and discouraging on-street where people opt to park outside the front of their properties rather than negotiating rear parking courts for example. In Persimmon’s experience, not providing allocated bays (as is proposed in paragraph 4.2.6 of the SPD), exacerbates on-street parking to the detriment of good street design (as is cautioned against in paragraph 5.12.2 of the SPD), and has a significant adverse impact on the sales values that can be achieved for new properties thereby impact negatively on development viability. It is also noted in paragraph 4.2.6 that it is the Council intention to use conditions to ensure that unallocated car parking remains in perpetuity. It is questionable whether this meets the necessary test for a condition. It is also recommended that the SPD is amended so it is clear whether the number of spaces, as set out in Tables 3 – 33, should be regarded as a minimum or maximum requirement.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Charging There is a concern that the Council is seeking to introduce new planning policies in relation to electric vehicle charging points through SPD contrary to guidance set out in the PPG/NPPF and/or without them having been subjected to the necessary scrutiny and testing. Planning Practice Guidance (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 61-008-20190315) is clear in that SPDs do not form part of the development plan, cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan, and should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development. It is clear that new local planning policies should only be brought forward through Development Plan Documents, and the role of the SPD is to simply provide further detailed guidance in respect of policies that are already set out in adopted local plans. In the BCP Council area the adopted local plan comprises the various DPDs of the former Boroughs of Bournemouth, Christchurch and Poole. The policies of each local plan cover separate areas of BCP (i.e. policies affecting the former Christchurch area cannot be applied in the former Poole area). This distinction in the operational area of separate local plans is important as neither the Christchurch nor Poole local plans include policies relating to electric vehicle charging. It is only within the Bournemouth Local Plan that reference is been made to ‘encouraging’ the provision of</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD encourages parking to be located to the rear or side of development to minimise the visual impact of car parking on the street scene. However, it is sufficiently flexible if the only option is to locate parking at the front. Planning conditions for unallocated parking in perpetuity meet condition tests when they are relevant, enforceable, precise and reasonable. The EV requirements will contribute to addressing the council's corporate strategy priority to lead communities towards a cleaner, sustainable future that preserves our environment for generations to come and develops an eco-friendly and active transport network. The implications of the council's commitment in 2019 to address a climate and ecological emergency has wide ranging implications for all the council's operations, policies, strategies and plans. Nationally, the Road to Zero Strategy and Transport Decarbonisation Plan encourages electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new development. Local Transport Plans are statutory documents which set the strategy for the areas transport system. All preceding Local Authorities adopted LTP3 which has five strategic goals (i) support the economy (ii) reduce carbon emissions (iii) improve safety, security and health (iv) promote equal opportunity and (v) improve quality of life. Requiring EVCI contributes to achieving those goals to deliver the vision for a low carbon transport system for Poole. NPPF (para 105) (e) clarifies that parking standards should include</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>electric vehicle charging points (Policy CS17 refer) – there is no requirement to provide these. In light of the above, and without the policy basis to do so, it is not appropriate for SPD to require the provision of electric vehicle charging points in the former areas of Christchurch and Poole. Within the Bournemouth part of BCP, the SPD should make clear that electric vehicle charging points are to be encouraged, and are not strictly required. Section 3.6 of the SPD sets out considerable detail regarding the provision of electric vehicle charging including the location, quantum and specification of vehicle charging points. All these elements represent a development cost, and it is not just the provision of the charging points. but the associated infrastructure that needs to be considered as well. For example, developments that require a high number of charge points at a high power specification, may require the provision of one or multiple sub-stations so that all charging points are capable of being used concurrently (alongside all other energy demands on a development). This adds further development costs that have not been considered by the Council. Viability testing of local policy requirements and standards is a fundamental part of Local Plan development that would be subject to scrutiny through consultation and examination of the Plan. The Council has failed to provide considered the effect of these requirements on development viability. Notwithstanding, the introduction of the new policy in relation to the electric vehicle charging through the SPD circumvents this important viability testing process adding unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development contrary to planning guidance.</p>	<p>adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in and ultra-low emission vehicles. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD285</b>	<p>As a resident of Moorside Road, the parking in our road has become increasingly hazardous, numerous calls to the council regarding this situation over a number of years by many residents but to no avail. Turning into Moorside Road from Wareham Road, has become more dangerous with cars parked right on the entrance giving no space to pull in if a vehicle is coming out of the cul de sac. More cars are increasingly coming in the cul de sac to park, leaving vehicles all day to go to work. Also we have had cars just left for over a week at a time. Obviously as there is not enough parking at Bakers View, we end up with the overflow ie white vans included. I live at number **, the vehicle's that decide to park opposite our house two to three cars, then makes it dangerous for me to get in &amp; out of my drive safely, thus hoping nothing will come round the bend while I am doing so. Winter time is even more hazardous as vehicles are parked &amp; left due to icy conditions. So, they can carry on with their lives, making it increasingly difficult again for residents. Also, children use this road to cut through to the footpath to the school at the bottom of the hill. Hopefully we can have a positive outcome to an increasingly dangerous situation.</p>	<p>Noted. The SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking, appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. It will be used by developments for designing new proposals and by council officers to ensure parking requirements are met. Action: None.</p>
<b>PSSPD286</b>	<p>Please note our objection to the proposed thrust of this Supplementary Planning Document if it is intended to be given any force within the foreseeable future. We have been content with proposed developers “consuming their own smoke” when considering the amount of parking that may be generated by the needs of the development and its occupants : to suggest that, because of its location, any development will not require any parking spaces is anathema at this stage. In this connection we see the primary driver for reducing the need for car-parking spaces as the abolition of transport deserts in the urban areas, the provision of reliable, frequent and weather-resistant public transport facilities in locations that are acceptable to our various communities and not deprivation of car-parking facilities that will only exacerbate the existing problems that should not be ignored. Also we do have concerns about the mooted safety of pedestrians (of any age group) arising from encouraging silent vehicles (cycles and electric scooters / cars) in our busy congested urban area. It is understood use of available car-parking spaces is improved by the echelon layout since vacant spaces can be more easily identified.</p>	<p>Noted. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Electric vehicles will help to deliver on priorities within the BCP Council Corporate Strategy and assist in reducing carbon emissions. Nationally, the Road to Zero Strategy and Transport Decarbonisation Plan encourages electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new development. The SPD complies with the NPPF and in particularly para 105 (e) which clarifies that parking standards should include adequate</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
		provision of spaces for charging plug in and ultra-low emission vehicles. Action: None
<b>PSSPD287</b>	<p>Would you please make sure there is street parking for the disabled over the whole conurbation? Thank you. 1. You mention disabled parking, presumably this will be in a sufficient no. of places really to help the disabled? That is, near whatever they want to do. Also, I believe there are an increasing no. of disabled people, so we would need more than at present. NB blocking off roads does not help the disabled who may end up being parked further from where they need to be. 2. I believe the general amount of parking in BCP maybe is insufficient for all the visitors, particularly in these Covid times when people are coming to BCP rather than going abroad. Will there be an increase e.g. in the town centres?</p>	Noted. Disabled parking is a requirement for new developments and set out in para 3.7 and in Appendix A. Action None.

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD289	<p>In my view any residential development in any zone should have as a minimum 100% “passive” provision for electric car charging. It is absolutely the way forward and 7 or 22Kw “active” charging should be available to at least 50% of the households to charge overnight.</p>	<p>Noted. The provision ensures 100% provision with an appropriate mix of active to passive. The EV requirements will contribute to addressing the council's corporate strategy priority to lead communities towards a cleaner, sustainable future that preserves our environment for generations to come and develops an eco-friendly and active transport network. The implications of the council's commitment in 2019 to address a climate and ecological emergency has wide ranging implications for all the council's operations, policies, strategies and plans. Nationally, the Road to Zero Strategy and Transport Decarbonisation Plan encourages electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new development. Local Transport Plans are statutory documents which set the strategy for the areas transport system. All preceding Local Authorities adopted LTP3 which has five strategic goals (i) support the economy (ii) reduce carbon emissions (iii) improve safety, security and health (iv) promote equal opportunity and (v) improve quality of life. Requiring EVCI contributes to achieving those goals to deliver the vision for a low carbon transport system for Poole. NPPF (para 105) (e) clarifies that parking standards should include adequate provision of spaces for charging plug in and ultra-low emission vehicles. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD290</b>	<p>From the study /proposal for the development of parking standards, it becomes apparent that you are living in a vacuum, totally ignorant of the Bournemouth residents' needs! You approve of new housing &amp; multiflat developments and instead of setting as a prerequisite the provision of at least 1 parking space per dwelling, you suggest that the existence of public transportation or cycling facilities in the vicinity are sufficient to cancel and override the need for parking spaces! MISTAKE NUMBER 1! Further, in all your public speeches, while trying to attract voters, you express your deepest concern on the environment! What an irony! Because immediately after you have been elected, you do anything in your power to damage the environment and I will give you a simple example that shows how you are doing it! MISTAKE NUMBER 2. In Bournemouth area, particularly in zone B, there are whole streets with detached or semi-detached houses. Instead of offering them Resident Permit Schemes (RPS), allocating them a space for on-street PARKING in front of their house, you force them to destroy the whole of front garden and to cement it to create a parking space!!! By doing it, you have done your best to destroy the environment, cement has replaced a green garden!!! And at the same time by doing it, you have automatically eliminated any on-street parking, because a driveway has to be built for vehicle's access into the private forecourt! My suggestion? Think before you act and choose very carefully your consultants!!!</p>	<p>Noted. Section 5.9.3 sets out that developments with very low or zero parking will not have access to residents permits as it is counterproductive, except in very special circumstances such as for disabled users. Action: None</p>
<b>PSSPD291</b>	<p>With reference to the above I dont need to read a large document to protest very strongly about these latest plans from this council. Also the questions asked were very offensive. Peoples gender, religion or any other personal questions have nothing to do with the subject. Firstly I dont think the general public has been informed about this. I have only just seen it on Facebook as have many others with only a few days to respond. It seems this council has little regard for its residents. It seems that hamworthy is to become a giant car park. Most homes have more than one car and with 3000 homes planned for an area that is bursting already I really cant see what the hell you are thinking. I live by the field on turlin moor where you plan to build 400 homes and parking for said homes is high on my agenda when we finally get the consultation we were promised in September. There will be much opposition to this but I know the residents that actually live here will not be listened to.</p>	<p>Noted. The site referred to in Turlin Moor is an allocation for development in the Poole Local Plan (2018) which will be carried forward in the emerging BCP Local Plan. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. Action: None</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD292</b>	<p>I have tried to read this but can't work out how many parking spaces must be allocated to each flat in a new development or HMO. My feedback and concern is that property developments in our conurbation or indeed HMO's have enough parking space allocated as this has not happened in Boscombe West (I've lived in area 15 years now) where on street parking is under a huge amount of pressure. Car ownership is usually much higher than outlined in your plans as most flats will have at least one car and it is rare to find off street parking in residential properties here which causes issues between neighbours, dangerous parking and with public transport use decreased due to Covid and attempts to get people to cycle more, this will be a tricky balance. Would welcome some clarity on actual numbers</p>	<p>Noted: The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. This is a corporate objective. A Strategic Car Parking Review is being undertaken to implement appropriate on-street parking controls to support the reduced car parking levels set out in the SPD. The SPD is based on best practice and robust evidence including levels of car ownership. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD293	<p>As the Government’s adviser for the historic environment, Historic England is keen to advocate for the conservation and enhancement of BCP’s heritage assets, historic streetscapes and wider townscapes, landscapes and seascapes as part of positive plan-making for sustainable development. Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2019 requires local planning authorities to set out a positive strategy in plans for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment, including those heritage assets most at risk through neglect, decay or other threats. We note the purpose of this SPD is to set out cycle and car parking standards for new residential and non-residential development in terms of numbers, design and layout. Without care in its positioning, design and materials, on and off-street parking can have negative impacts on the significance of heritage assets, e.g. damage archaeological sites, and their settings, e.g. listed buildings. The character and appearance of wider historic streetscapes and conservation areas, may also be adversely affected. With the exception of one brief reference to the provision of cycle sheds being unlikely to be acceptable in some conservation areas and where Article 4 directions are in place (paragraph 3.3.25), the SPD appears to be silent on how these parking standards should be applied in relation to BCP’s historic environment. To address this, we would like to see a new section introduced into the SPD to explain how the parking requirements are to be integrated with the conservation and enhancement of BCP’s historic environment. In some cases, the ability to vary the parking standards may be necessary in order to conserve the significance of heritage assets, including settings, as well as the character of historic streetscapes and wider areas, and on occasion to help find solutions for heritage at risk. Historic England has published relevant advice in Streets for All (2018), as well as in Managing Significance in Decision-Taking in the Historic Environment (2015) and The Setting of Heritage Assets (2017). There may also be local SPDs and other guidance that may be of assistance to applicants and decision-makers. Your local authority conservation and archaeology staff would be well placed to advise and help provide additional text for the SPD.</p>	<p>Noted. It is outside the scope of the Parking Standards SPD to set out circumstances where standards can be varied due to their impact on heritage assets and important trees. Officers with specialisms in the historic environment would deal with LB applications and be consulted on applications in Conservation Areas. However, reduced parking requirements particularly in the town centres, where there is generally a high concentration of heritage assets will help to preserve these important assets and keep them in use, particularly on constrained sites and where there are important trees. The ability to develop car free in the town centres will enable better development that preserves the character of the area. Action: None.</p>



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD294</b>	<p>Overall: • The draft SPD is welcome, and we support the objectives therein. • We strongly oppose standard car parking bay dimensions of 4.8m x 2.6m; favouring 4.8m x 2.4m for the reasons outlined below. • Throughout section 3 it is unclear as to the types of developments that it applies to, with exceptions etc jumbled. Greater clarity is required. • Commend the prominence given to cycle parking but are surprised to see hydraulic double racking discouraged. We would recommend a blended solution where double racking is employed. • Additional comfort is required to demonstrate that the quantum of EV equipped and enabled spaces is feasible and viable across a range of scenarios particularly for the outer zones. • The optimum parking standard for flats and houses should be presented as a range in order to deliver choice, aid product distinction and encourage higher delivery rates, which might otherwise be constrained by market saturation of homogeneous products. • Mechanisms for ensuring the delivery of car club spaces in zones A and B should be developed. • A pragmatic approach is required where properties sit on the edge of identified zones. Detailed comments: 1.0 INTRODUCTION 1.1 Background This section provides helpful background. This section should be more explicit in acknowledging that higher densities will generally be achieved through taller buildings, either above existing built form or through re-development. No additional surface area is created, and whilst undercroft parking can take us so far, it is increasing pushing developers to look at multi-level parking. This is often costly and inefficient because of the need for vehicle ramps or lifts. It also creates tensions with the desire to deliver active street scenes. This section should also acknowledge the reduced propensity to travel owing to home working, online shopping and delivery services. 1.2 Purpose of the document The key objectives listed at 1.2.3 are supported, they are aligned with those of the constituent Development Plans and Local Transport Plans. They are suitably ambitious but crucially deliverable. We are pleased to see BCP Council remedy the current misalignment in parking standards across the single urban area. Whilst there is logic in presenting optimal car parking standards, we would rather see these expressed as a permissive range to provide some flexibility for individual circumstances. Expressing cycle standards as a minimum is supported as this creates a range and, within reason, no harm is likely to arise from over-provision. 2.0 POLICY CONTEXT 2.1 NPPF This section is supported noting that the current standards generally pre-date the NPPF and refer to PPG13, so are out of kilter with current guidance. 2.2 The Local Development Plan No comment. 3.0 LAYOUT AND DESIGN GUIDANCE 3.1 Introduction No comment. 3.2 Cars The current standards are misaligned. It is evident that there has been incremental creep in the size of vehicles being catered for, which has</p>	<p>Noted. Across the conurbation there are varying standards of bay size from the legacy parking standards. The new size requirement for a standard parking spaces of 2.6m x 4.8m caters for a wide range of vehicles and provides some side width to allow for ease of use. the requirement for overhanging and offset for bays in relation to solid objects recognises historic poor design and inadequate layouts resulted in underused spaces and additional on-street parking pressures. the use of appropriate tracking information again reiterates the need for well design parking layouts with tolerance for varying driver standards and abilities. The purpose of the SPD is to support the delivery of development by providing detail on parking requirements to meet housing needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that flats and other high-density development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Double deck cycle parking is considered to be less convenient than Sheffield type stands and can discriminate against people with low upper body strength. However, 3.3.6 does make provision for a small proportion of double deck systems to be used alongside Sheffield stands. Public electric vehicle charging points are available in the BCP area this is outside the remit of the Parking SPD; however, the SPD sets clear guidance for a percentage of EV charging points to be provided in new development. Recognise the need for flexibility in applying standards and appropriate variations. Where</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>led to the Bournemouth area applying a standard of 5m x 2.6m in contrast to the Poole area applying the conventional standard of 4.8m x 2.4m. I note that the draft standards propose 4.8 x 2.6; So one might argue a compromise. However, in the interest of promoting the effective use of land, we would recommend that minimum dimensions be set at 4.8m x 2.4m catering amicably for smaller cars which are aptly suited to urban areas (typically having smaller engines, taking up less carriageway space and generating lower emissions). Should individual developers wish to instate larger spaces in response to the market they can. Figure 1 should be amended accordingly. Extending the length of spaces by 0.5m where they abut a solid object, such as a wall, is supported. The dimensions for parallel parking bays are supported, in so far as these dimensions are likely to obviate obstruction to the footway or carriageway. Ensuring that parking spaces do not abut building lines where windows are provided at ground floor level (as set out at para. 3.2.4) is supported. We concur that landscape buffers provide for a more harmonious relationship and help to protect amenity. The need for a 0.5m buffer where a space abuts a solid object or a footpath (as set out as 3.2.5) is considered desirable, but more palatable if the standard width is reduced to 2.4m. The 6m aisle spacing (as set out at paragraph 3.2.6) is well ingrained and understood. We are unsure as to whether it is reasonable to apply 0.5m buffers to any tracking to allow for driver error as there is a danger that adding precaution upon precaution grossly inflates the required area, but we will leave it to those better qualified to determine whether this is the case. We concur with the evidence on use of garages and the proposed dimensions of 7m x 3m which also facilitates an element of storage. Marking out visitor spaces, as advocated at para 3.2.12, is supported as it aids legibility. The clarification of driveway cross-over design is helpful, as is that on the requisite pedestrian visibility splays, thereby avoiding the need for protracted negotiation. Whilst the aim of paragraph 3.2.22 is supported, we believe that this primarily relates to new detached or semi-detached dwellings rather than terraces, blocks of apartments or commercial developments where a short run of parking spaces along the frontage might present a suitable solution. This of course needs to be carefully designed to avoid long runs or runs on opposing sides of a road than can unduly exaggerate their impact upon the street-scene. We would recommend expanding this section accordingly. Paragraphs 3.2.23-3.2.27 are fully supported, as they are invariably in the interest of good design. 3.3 Cycle parking We are pleased to see added emphasis given to cycle parking; the health benefits of cycling, promoted through secure storage and convenient access, should not be overlooked. Paragraphs 3.3.1-3.3.4 are fully supported. We are aware that applications with cycle parking forward of the front building</p>	<p>required, the SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking provision appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. Action: Slightly textual alteration in conjunction with other amendments to improve clarity. Review zone boundaries with other suggestions. Strengthen text to provide opportunities to deliver car clubs for developments in Zones A and B with greater than 20 units on site provision of at least 1 car club bay will be expected. For developments of fewer than 20 units an equivalent financial contribution towards an existing car club will be sought.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>line have on occasion been resisted owing to their prominence within the street scene notwithstanding the fact that this presents a convenient location. I trust that paragraph 3.3.3 will prevail in future. Whilst we recognise that Sheffield type stands are BCP Council’s preferred solution, we are disappointed to see the installation of hydraulically assisted double decked stands discouraged. Whilst paragraph 3.3.7 correctly asserts that wider aisles are required, meaning capacity doesn’t simply double, efficiencies can be realised through having two parallel rows with a shared aisle. Figure 12 should be amended to show such a scenario. In our experience, such arrangements are well received in apartment blocks and should not be discounted so readily particularly as part of a blended offer. We are greatly encouraged to see additional facilities for cyclists being considered under paragraph 3.3.9. Similarly, we support 3.3.10, as some such considered design measures are essential for convenience, thereby promoting use. The basis of the maximum 10m path length (as set out at paragraph 3.3.11) is unclear and might not be possible in all scenarios, such as the conversion of existing buildings to apartments. It is respectfully suggested that this should be the aim in new builds, but that flexibility be afforded in the case of conversions, conservation areas and Listed Buildings – some recognition to the challenge is made at para 4.2.4. We were also not convinced that 10m could be achieved in all new residential developments (for instance where sheds in rear gardens are to be used) and that this could have unintended consequences for densities. I don’t believe that this is the intention so the wording might just need tightening up. The guidance on dimensions and standards is helpful, although figures 19 and 20 are illegible. Is there a contradiction between the guidance at para 3.3.14 and para.3.3.24 in the requisite spacing for Sheffield stands; the first referring to 1m the second 1.2m?</p> <p>3.4 Scooter facilities We are pleased to see consideration given to alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>3.5 PTW We are pleased to see consideration given to alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>3.6 Electric vehicle charging We are pleased to see prominence given to the provision of suitably equipped and enabled spaces. We would request some comfort that the feasibility and viability of the provision set out in table 1 has been tested across a range of development scenarios – akin to those tested as part of CIL examinations.</p> <p>3.7 Disabled parking requirements The principles of parking for those with additional needs are well ingrained and understood. Notwithstanding this it is still considered that the standard dimensions be reduced even if this is accompanied by an increase in the marked access zone. Figures 22-23 should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>3.8 Parking for people with young children The principles of parking for those with additional needs are well ingrained and understood. Notwithstanding this it is still considered that the standard dimensions</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>be reduced even if this is accompanied by an increase in the marked access zone. Figures 24-25 should be amended accordingly. 3.9 Underground and multi-storey parking We are pleased to see consideration given to the incorporation and design of multi-storey parking and associated access arrangements. 4.0 PARKING STANDARDS 4.1 The zonal approach is supported where underpinned by evidence and opportunity. With respect to the latter, locations such as Branksome Train Station and the full array of identified local centres (such as Creekmoor and Lilliput) should be included even if the boundary is drawn more tightly e.g. 200m to reflect their reduced draw. Where properties are situated in close proximity to the edge of a zone, for example the southern side of Kings Avenue in Christchurch a pragmatic approach will be required to applying optimal parking standards as properties are within zone D but adjacent to zone A – the SPD does not include make reference to transitional approach on the edge of zones, i.e. cascading from A through to D. We commend BCP Council for publishing a link to a detailed map allowing easy identification, a particular deficiency in the previous Bournemouth Parking Standards SPD that left everyone guessing. 4.2 Optimum parking figures. In smaller developments the principle of rounding up disproportionately distorts the level of parking, so having regard to 4.2.4 could the usual rule of anything over 0.5 needs rounding up? With reference to Table 9 C3 flats; it is considered that the optimal standard for zone A should be expressed as a range of 0-1 and for zone B, 1-3 habitable rooms (i.e. studio – 2 bed flat) should also be expressed as 0-1. The aim being to provide for a choice of properties and therefore broaden market appeal so that BCP does not inadvertently displace investment to other cities and towns such as Southampton. The need for choice is particularly important where market saturation is likely to prove a challenge to the speed of delivery, such as in Poole Town Centre. For larger blocks of flats, it is considered important, particularly in zones A and B to provide short stay loading and servicing bays, to facilitate moving in and out, delivery of bulky items and facilitate deliveries given the propensity for online shopping. With reference to Table 10 C3 Houses; it is considered that the optimal standard for zone A should be expressed as a range of 0-1 and for zone B, 1-2 habitable rooms (i.e. studio – 1 bed flat) should also be expressed as 0-1. Again, the aim being to provide for a choice of properties and therefore broaden market appeal so that BCP does not inadvertently displace investment to other cities and towns such as Southampton. The need for choice is particularly important where market saturation is likely to prove a challenge to the speed of delivery, such as in Poole Town Centre. Within zones A and B it is most likely that any parking provision will need to be secure or on-plot, thus most likely allocated. This is conducive to the requirement for EV equipped and enabled spaces.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>With reference to Table 30 Sui Houses in multiple occupation; the differentiation between C4 and setting of 1 cycle space per habitable room + 0.01 Public visitor space per habitable room is fully supported. To do otherwise would seem counter to the ideals of the SPD and frustrate the ability of residents to travel by this means. With reference to Table 13 E Clinics, health centres etc; it is our experience that this category masks a huge spectrum of operations and that the standards can significantly exaggerate the quantum of car parking required. Regard has to be had to the intensity of the operation and patient turn-around times. However, we accept that the standards cannot cater for every scenario and present an optimum so a departure could be supported where justified. 4.3 Variation from the parking standards Subject to affording greater flexibility in the parking standards for C3 dwellings in zones A and B, by means of presenting the optimum standards as a range, this section is supported. 5 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS 5.1 Loading and servicing No comment. 5.2 Shared parking We are pleased to see reference made to shared parking, which could be facilitated through a parking management plan is the way envisaged by para. 5.22 5.3 Mobility scooters No comment. 5.4 Coach and minibus No comment. 5.5 Car clubs and car sharing We welcome the commentary on car clubs and their complementary role (as set out at para 5.5.5). Whilst we can see the benefits of subscribing to a single operator, it should also be beholden on the Council to ensure that this offers best value. There would not appear anything requiring car club bays in new development. Whilst this might well be intentional and acknowledge the need for flexibility; this could be a requirement together with short stay loading bays where proposals for flatted and housing schemes in zones A and B incorporate surface parking (noting that we have recommended an optimum range). This would ensure that opportunities to deliver car clubs / car sharing schemes either now or in the future is not lost. 5.6 Holiday accommodation No comment. 5.7 Drainage No comment. 5.8 School Street No comment. 5.9 Controlled parking zones and resident parking schemes No comment. 5.10 Visibility at accesses No comment. 5.11 Road adoption No comment. 5.12 Street design Footnote 16 is missing. Appendix C(i) We welcome the clarification of parking survey and assessment. The text at 4 of page 58 contains a minor typo: ‘peal’ rather than ‘peak’. It is respectfully suggested that this sentence should continue to state ‘... where practicable’ in order to avoid undue to proposals put forward outside of the peak periods. Appendix C(ii) This provides helpful clarification. Appendix C(iii) The standard proforma is helpful. Appendix C(iv) The worked example is helpful.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
<b>PSSPD295</b>	Each flat should have a minimum of 2 parking spaces per flat as unless there is single occupancy (given the cost of renting or buying) people will often need to share accommodation and hence will need more than one space. There is also a need for visitors' spaces say one space for 3 flats.	Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing and employment needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. Action: None.



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD296	<p>As WJG have developed extensively in Bournemouth and are keen to explore future development opportunities in the town, we retain a key interest in emerging planning policy and guidance and set out our comments below. WJG’s comments on the Draft SPD are relating to the overall strategic aims of the SPD and specifically to the revised approach to parking standards which the Group fully supports. Our response is set out around the key themes within the SPD document. Zonal Approach WJG supports the zonal approach on which the parking standards are applied on a hierarchical zonal basis within the BCP area, reflecting differing accessibility levels. WJG agrees that within ‘Zone A – Main Centres’, there is high accessibility to public transport, services, shops and other facilities, as well as car ownership being a lot lower than the BCP average. WJG therefore agrees that the current stringent car parking requirements should be significantly relaxed, and zero car parking should be promoted. This is consistent with town centres and cities throughout the country where local authorities have taken advantage of these benefits and promote moving towards zero car parking in such areas. WJG fully supports BCP Council’s policies on moving towards a lesser reliance on private cars and promoting car free developments within developments in Zone A, specifically in respect of residential, student accommodation and commercial developments within this zone. WJG also notes that the previous (and currently adopted) parking standards have acted as an impediment to development within the main centres. This is due to the substantial cost associated within providing basement parking, which is the approach which has been required to deliver car parking to meet the adopted Car Parking SPD standards. By removing the previous onerous car parking standards within the main centres, WJG considers that this will ‘unlock’ the redevelopment of sites within the main centres. Parking Standards Car Parking WJG is entirely supportive of the new draft parking standards and fully welcomes the proposed changes. The parking standards of zero provision in Zone A for ‘C3 Flats’ and ‘C3 House’ is entirely appropriate and reasonable given the urban town centre location and proximity to the public transport, services and shopping facilities. WJG is also fully supportive of the parking standards set out for ‘Sui Generis Student Accommodation’ in Zones A, B and C which is ‘Nil: use public car park’. WJG is also fully supportive of the introduction of Zone A zero car parking for commercial and retail uses, and agrees that this will encourage commuting workers, shoppers, and visitors to use the strong sustainable travel options in these locations. This will certainly assist the Council’s aims of tackling climate change and a low carbon future. Cycle parking It is noted that cycle space provision is requested at 100% provision (i.e. one secure covered cycle space per unit) for ‘C3 Flats’ and ‘Sui Generis Student Accommodation’. Whilst WJG are encouraged</p>	<p>Noted. The Parking SPD supports the delivery of development to meet housing and employment needs and other economic social and environmental priorities. It is expected that development will be delivered in highly sustainable locations that are well served by public transport, shops and local services. This in turn will enable the implementation of infrastructure to facilitate active travel, benefit air quality, improve health and wellbeing and tackle climate change. Recognise the need for flexibility in applying standards and appropriate variations. Where required, the SPD encourages high quality and well-designed parking provision appropriate to the type and scale of development within its context and location. Note the emphasis on cycling and appropriate cycle parking provision. Double deck cycle parking is considered to be less convenient than Sheffield type stands and can discriminate against people with low upper body strength. However, 3.3.6 does make provision for a small proportion of double deck systems to be used alongside Sheffield stands. Underground parking reduces the amount of hard landscaping enhancing the visual quality of a proposal. SPD does not explicitly favour underground solutions but instead seeks high quality design for new developments in line with national and local policies. The viability of providing underground parking is not within the scope of the SPD as that is a site-specific requirement however the general reduction in parking requirements in many locations in the BCP area will be beneficial to scheme viability. Action: None.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>to see the BCP Council promoting sustainable transport options to be included as a requirement within new development, instead of car parking, WJG questions whether 100% cycle provision would in fact be necessary in all new development, particularly in Zone A which are highly accessible, close to bus stops and train stations and indeed with walking distance to facilities, shops and services. WJG acknowledges that some level of cycle parking will be required, but questions whether a blanket approach for 100% provision is appropriate in all circumstances. From our experience on PBSA developments for example, the actual use of the communal cycle parking is typically around 25% or 0.25 cycle parking spaces per resident. The Council’s existing cycle parking requirement of 0.35 cycle parking spaces is entirely appropriate in this regard. We also contend that it is appropriate for a mixture of cycle racks to be provided. Two-tier stands are now widely used across multi-occupancy residential and student accommodation developments, given that they are space efficient, and allow spaces (typically at ground floor levels) to be better used (e.g. for communal space, retail units etc). There has been mention within the Draft SPD that two-tier stands may be difficult to use, which we do not consider to be correct. The lower levels are accessible by all and the higher levels have mechanisms (e.g. they are sprung loaded) to ensure that they are similarly easy to use. Whilst we appreciate that it is appropriate for visitors to use Sheffield stands, stands for more permanent cycle storage need not be Sheffield stands. Compliance with National Planning Policy and Guidance WJG agrees that new development ought to make the best and most efficient use of previously development land, particularly in accessible town centre and urban locations. This is in line with the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) which promotes urban intensification in built up areas as well as near to public transport facilities, and similarly replicates the thrust of the approach suggested by the recently issued Planning White Paper. WJG believe that in these locations, development should be maximised, and car parking should be minimised, particularly as town centres are where public transport links are at their strongest, and walking/ cycling are practical and reasonable options. Climate Change and a Low Carbon Future WJG agree with the Council’s strategic aim of encouraging more travel on foot, by bicycle, by public transport or using low emission vehicles to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and benefit air quality. WJG also agree that a key way of promoting this change, tackling climate changing and the ecological emergency is by helping to prioritise opportunities to walk, cycle and use public transport, through new planning policies or guidance such as the Draft SPD. WJG acknowledge that the parking strategy in the Draft SPD (i.e. moving towards zero car parking) is a step change from the current policy position but is a key route to lead</p>	



Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>communities towards a cleaner and sustainable future. Basement Parking WJG notes that the Draft SPD states that “basement parking is often preferable to surface parking as it can reduce the visual dominance of vehicles and can free up green space”. Whilst this may be correct in terms of landscaping design and aesthetics, basement parking is expensive and have huge financial implications for a scheme. Such costs can quite often render a scheme unviable. Therefore, WJG suggests that caution is applied within the SPD when referring to or encouraging the inclusion of basement car parks within new developments. The overall approach should be a move towards zero parking within town centres and other highly accessible locations. This would result in no purpose for basement car parking within new developments within these areas.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
PSSPD297	<p>Our principle comments are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· We are very supportive of the aim to efficiently manage parking associated with new development and the impact this itself can have on on-street parking. Therefore the impact of new development needs to be implemented in a manner which does not cause an overspill of parking onto the highway;</li> <li>· We support the zonal approach but consider that sustainable public transport corridors reflected in the Poole Local Plan should be applied in terms of parking levels along these corridors. Accordingly, a Zone E which reflects these public transport corridors though be added;</li> <li>· We would like Appendix C (iii) to be extended to the sustainable transport corridors reflected in the Poole Local Plan. If poorly delivered, the proposals have the potential to create very serious operating and commercial difficulties for bus operators. By extension, passenger convenience could be seriously reduced on many routes affected, and this would serve to dissuade the highest possible use of public transport. Buses can reduce the overall level of traffic in the town centre, improve air quality, and give better access to goods and services.</li> </ul> <p>General Comments and Policy Context We are supportive of the policy aims to create cleaner, sustainable communities, a dynamic region, and empowered, engaged and included community. We are very supportive of the aim to efficiently manage parking associated with new development and the impact this itself can have on on-street parking. Therefore, the impact of new development needs to be implemented in a manner which does not cause an overspill of parking onto the highway network though the implementation of CPZ's and RPS's as part of new developments. Bus running time from between Poole and Bournemouth has increased over the last ten years - this is partly due to congestion and partly due to inappropriate parking on the highway and so this SPD needs to reflect this growing problem. We wholeheartedly support the approach of the SPD to encourage more travel on foot, by bicycle, by public transport or low emission vehicles to improve air quality.</p> <p>Parking Standards and Zonal Approach Overall we SUPPORT the zonal approach but consider that sustainable public transport corridors reflected in the Poole Local Plan should be applied in terms of parking levels along these corridors. We note the national policy context where local parking standards should take into account accessibility, mix of use, availability for public transport et al. Accordingly, we note and support the concept set out in the Poole Local Plan of “sustainable transport corridors being 400m either side of a road where 4 buses per hour (each way) or within 500 metres radius of a rail station ” (Policy PP33). We consider that this element needs to be taken into account in terms of development with appropriate reduced parking levels in new developments along these corridors and should be set out in this SPD and the emerging BCP wide local plan. Sustainable transport corridors will</p>	<p>Noted. Recognise support for the zonal approach subject to confirmation on the full inclusion of sustainable transport corridors. Welcome the support on the greater emphasis on active travel and public transport. Action: Include only sustainable transport corridors within Zone B that have high accessibility to shops and services.</p>

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

Comment ID	Full comment	Officer Comment/Action
	<p>only be a success if parking along such corridors is controlled and enforced as well as suitable bus priority arrangements are put in place to ensure reduced journey times compared to now. Accordingly, we consider that the zonal approach should be extended to a zone E which reflects these public transport corridors. This will support the approach of this SPD noted above but also the planning policies of BCP relative to new development per se. Appendix C (ii) – Example of unsuitable locations for on-street parking We note the examples of unsuitable locations for on-street parking, in particular we welcome and thank BCP for including bus stops (for appropriate distances approaching and beyond the boarding point, subject to the requirements of the local highway authority and bus operators), bus lanes and speed cushions but would also reflect that this needs to be extended to the sustainable transport corridors reflected in the Local Plan and as set out above.</p>	

Appendix 1 –Table of comments and responses

<b>Comment ID</b>	<b>Full comment</b>	<b>Officer Comment/Action</b>
<b>PSSPD298</b>	<p>Thank you for providing Highways England with the opportunity to comment on you're the current draft Parking Standards SPD. Highways England is responsible for operating, maintaining, renewing and improving the strategic road network which in this case comprises the A31 trunk road and its associated junctions. Having reviewed the consultation document we would offer only one comment and that is in relation to Section 5.10 Visibility at Accesses. It may be helpful to make clear that with regards to an access onto the strategic road network, access visibility will be determined by the standards within the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges, and the acceptability of any access proposals will be subject to approval by Highways England as the strategic highway authority.</p>	<p>Noted. A small section of the strategic road network managed by Highways England is within BCP area. Other policies are in place to ensure appropriate standards for design to be followed. Action: None.</p>