



Solihull
METROPOLITAN
BOROUGH COUNCIL

Solihull Local Development Framework

Vehicle Parking Standards and **Green Travel Plans**



Preface

This Supplementary Planning Document elaborates on Policy T13 (Car Parking Provision) of the Solihull Unitary Development Plan 2006.

At the end of January 2005 the Council's Cabinet Member for Regeneration approved a draft version of this document for consultation purposes. Consultation was carried out during February and March 2006. A summary of the consultation process, including who was consulted, responses that were received and modifications that were made, is included in this document.

The final document was approved by the Cabinet Member for Regeneration on the 31st of May and was adopted by the Council on the 8th June 2006.

The document has been subject to a Sustainability Appraisal and the final Sustainability Appraisal Report is available separately from the Forward Planning Team (see contact details on back cover).

Supplementary Planning Document

Vehicle Parking Standards and Green Travel Plans

Contents

	Page
Introduction	1
Background	1
Implementation	2
Residential Development	3
Town Centres	3
Employment Land	4
Airport and National Exhibition Centre	5
Travel Plans	6
Parking for the Disabled	6
Accessible Locations	7
Parking Standards	8
Design Criteria	10
Appendix: Consultation Statement	11
List of Consultees	13
Responses to Consultation	15

Introduction



The purpose of this Guidance is to set out the Council's vehicle parking standards and provide guidance on their implementation. The standards should be read in conjunction with advice leaflet 5/95 on parking for the disabled (Department of the Environment Transport & the Regions). Vehicle parking standards are important in enabling developers and applicants, when submitting planning applications, to establish what the vehicle parking requirements will be. This may have a bearing on road safety and amenity and on the amount of land within a development that needs to be dedicated for parking purposes.

This SPD has been confirmed by the Regional Planning Body as being in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS). Work is under way to consider regional parking policy as part of a review of the RSS. This SPD may therefore need to be reviewed in the light of any change in regional policy.

Background



Car parking standards can assist in achieving government land use planning objectives that seek to:

- Reduce the need to travel, promote greener forms of transport with less reliance on the private car, facilitate multi-purpose journeys and ensure that everyone has access to a range of facilities.
- Facilitate and promote sustainable and inclusive design and the efficient use of resources.

The availability of vehicle parking has a major influence on the means of transport people choose for their journey. Limiting the amount of car parking in new developments is essential as part of a package of measures to promote sustainable travel choices. In appropriate circumstances this can be achieved through Green Travel Plans to promote access to developments by public transport, walking and cycling.



Vehicle parking can also take up large amounts of space in developments and can thereby reduce densities. Parking standards can therefore influence development densities and the efficient use of land resources and can potentially enable greater flexibility in design and layout.

The Council's Unitary Development Plan 2006 sets out the main land use policies and proposals for the Borough and acknowledges that standards will need to be set to reflect those contained in national guidance. The Plan proposes that these will be published through a supplementary planning document (SPD). Accordingly, this SPD sets



vehicle parking standards that reflect those set in the annex to PPG13 (Transport-March 2001) as maximum standards for broad classes of development. The SPD elaborates on PPG13 standards by embracing a broader range of use classes than PPG13 and by providing standards for a variety of development size thresholds.

Implementation



Minimum standards previously adopted by SMBC are hereby superseded.

In developing and implementing vehicle parking standards the Council will:

- Seek to ensure that the level of parking to serve individual developments will promote sustainable transport choices.
- Encourage shared or communal use of parking, particularly in town centres and as part of major proposals where peak levels of use do not coincide.
- Take care not to discourage development from locating in town centres or otherwise threaten investment in them. Town centres and other accessible locations provide opportunities to reduce levels of car parking but the Council will seek to ensure that town centre locations remain attractive to investment.
- Require provision for car parking for the disabled in accordance with advice leaflet 5/95 on this subject (these will be the only minimum standards).
- Require developments to fund, where appropriate, on street vehicle parking controls in areas adjacent to major trip-generating development to ensure that the limitation of off-street parking does not lead to on-street parking pressures.
- Normally require provision for safe; secure cycle parking in developments and appropriate provision for motorcycle parking. This should be addressed in transport assessments. Where appropriate the Council will expect communal provision in residential apartment developments.
- Take account of the need to service the development efficiently and safely.



In assessing car parking requirements to serve development proposals the Council will have careful regard to any related planning policy or advice including:

- Better Places to Live by Design (ODPM companion guide to PPG3)
- New Housing in Context (SMBC SPG November 2003)



Residential Development



Current planning guidance links parking and design and recognises that car ownership varies with age, household type, the type of housing and its location. Circumstances are outlined where significantly lower levels of off street parking should be adopted are as follows:

- Town Centres and other locations readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport.
- Housing for the elderly, students and single people where demand for parking is likely to be less than for family housing.
- Building conversions where off-street parking is less likely to be successfully designed into the scheme.

Parking standards will be expected to reflect the required emphasis on securing sustainable residential areas. Proposals resulting in higher levels of off-street parking, especially in urban areas, should not be adopted.



The Council will have regard to the above guidance in applying standards for residential development and tighter standards will apply in town centres and other highly accessible locations. This principle will also apply in developments that are built for types of households that have less need for provision for space for parking. In developments where visitor parking is necessary, this should be provided on a shared basis.

Town Centres

The government aim though PPS6 is to promote the vitality and viability of town centres by:

- Planning for growth and development of existing centres
- Promoting and enhancing existing centres by focusing development in centres and encouraging a wide range of services in a good environment, accessible to all.



Strong town centres are considered by government to be a means of promoting more sustainable patterns of development, ensuring that locations are fully exploited through high density mixed-use development and promoting sustainable transport choices, including reducing the need to travel and providing alternatives to car use.

PPS6 is supported by 'Planning for Town Centres: Guidance on Design and Implementation tools'. Regarding parking, the guidance advises:

- Large amounts of surface level parking are likely to detract from the overall appearance of a development and its surrounding area and are unlikely to maximise the development potential of available land.



- Parking and servicing should be carefully located within developments to minimise visual impact. Parking should normally be at the rear, underneath or above new development.
- Surface parking should be conceived as part of the overall landscape proposals for the development and should link into the wider area. Multi-storey parking should be carefully designed and be well integrated with its surroundings. Pedestrian access, security, lighting, signing and publicity, management and maintenance are all important design considerations. Where rooftop parking is proposed, lighting should be designed sensitively to minimise the level of light pollution to the surroundings.



The Council in assessing car-parking requirements for developments in Solihull Town Centre, and in Shirley and Chelmsley Wood district centres, will have regard to the above PPS6 aims and the more specific guidance on parking in its supporting document. It will be the aim of the Council to manage parking to ensure that these centres are easy and convenient to access. Emphasis will be on provision of parking for the public rather than for commuters and will take into consideration:

- Demand for parking
- Existing provision for parking
- Capacity of the road network
- Potential for improvements to public transport



Within these 3 centres, or at edge of centre locations, the Council will consider allowing additional vehicle parking over the relevant maximum standard provided the parking will genuinely serve the centre as a whole and that agreement to this can be secured prior to grant of planning permission, that the additional parking is needed to support the vitality and viability of the centre (taking into consideration existing provision) and that it is managed to focus on the needs of shoppers. The Council will seek to ensure that the scale of parking is in keeping with the size of each centre and its character, and sits well within the local townscape.

Employment Land



Solihull is an important provider of employment within the Region. In addition to Solihull Town Centre, the NEC and Airport, there are also a number of major business parks and traditional industrial sites, including high quality sites capable of attracting or retaining important investment in the Region.

The business land is generally well situated in regard to the key locational requirements of business and most is close to the main population densities of working age population in the Borough. All significant developments are located within or very close to the main

urban area of the Borough. There is therefore the prospect of improving access by more sustainable modes of travel particularly where sites are large enough (or collectively large enough) to be attractive to public transport operators.



The nature of ownership of business sites will also influence the prospects for encouraging access by greener travel modes and consequently the levels of car parking needed. Large sites that are in single ownership hold out the prospect of easily implementing comprehensive and co-ordinated travel plans. Other older sites may be large but fragmented ownership provides a greater challenge for such a comprehensive approach.

Airport and National Exhibition Centre

Birmingham International Airport published its surface access strategy in July 2000. The document sets out the way in which the Airport proposes to increase public transport modal share to 20% by 2005. The strategy has been produced jointly with the National Exhibition Centre in recognition of the interaction between the sites in regard to transport issues. The Airport is required to provide car parking at a rate less than the rate of increase in passenger or employee numbers. This principle would apply to any further expansion of the Airport.



Within the strategy, the NEC has a commitment to increase the use, by visitors, of public transport and to the achievement of a public transport modal share of 20% amongst staff by 2005. In order to encourage progressive access to the NEC by sustainable travel modes and to protect local amenity, the Council considers that NEC parking needs should be met by provision within the NEC.

The Council will normally require all formal parking provision for both Birmingham International Airport and the National Exhibition centre to be contained within their operational site boundaries.

Parking outside the Airport boundary is an issue for the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Solihull's position is that any Park and Ride for Airport passengers should be integrated into public transport upgrades and any remote park and ride facilities must demonstrate positive benefits to the Highway network. A proliferation of off-site urban and rural parking sites accessed via M42 junction 6, adjacent junctions or from the local urban network should be avoided.



As with any development proposals, in considering proposals for additional car parking, the Council will have careful regard to impacts on environmentally sensitive areas, including those important for biodiversity.

Travel Plans



The Government aims to raise awareness of the impacts of travel decisions and to promote the widespread use of travel plans amongst businesses, schools, hospitals, and other organisations. Travel plans are therefore important in delivering sustainable transport objectives, including:

- Reducing car usage and promoting the use of public transport, walking and cycling.
- Reducing traffic speeds and improving road safety and personal security, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.
- Enabling environmentally friendly delivery and freight movements, including home delivery services.

Travel plans should accompany planning applications for developments that are likely to have significant transport implications. The types of development and thresholds that trigger the need for a Transport Plan are indicated in the parking standards table on pages 8 and 9.

However, there may be other circumstances where a Travel Plan is required as follows:

- Smaller developments comprising jobs, shopping, leisure and services that would generate significant amounts of travel in on or near to air quality management areas and in other locations where there are local initiatives or targets set out in the development plan or local transport plan for the reduction of road traffic or the promotion of public transport, walking and cycling.
- School facilities which should be accompanied by a school travel plan that promotes safe cycling and walking routes, restricts parking and car access at and around schools, and includes on-site changing and cycle storage facilities.
- Where a travel plan would help address a particular local traffic problem associated with a planning application that might otherwise be refused on local traffic grounds (a travel plan will not however, enable unacceptable development).



Parking for the Disabled



Guidance on the design and location of parking for the disabled can be found in Department of Transport Traffic Advisory Leaflet 5/95 (April 1995). The Council will require parking for disabled people to be included in new developments.

Disabled parking provision is required:

- Additional to the maximum vehicle parking standards and in accordance with the levels of provision set out in this SPD.
- To be designed in accordance with the given dimensions in this SPD (under design criteria).

Parking facilities should be provided as close to entrances as is practicable and in a well-lit area no more than 50 metres from the desired destination. Parking spaces should be clearly marked with an appropriate recognised British Standard disabled symbol. The design of developments will be expected to incorporate adequate consideration of the route from disabled parking areas to the entrance to facilities. Pedestrian routes to and from car parks with disabled parking should be free from steps, bollards and steep slopes.



Where steps are necessary they should have edges with a strong colour contrast and be well lit. Pedestrian ramps should also be provided and should be short with gradients preferably no steeper than 5% but not exceeding 8%. These gradients should also apply to any sloping pathways into car parks. Handrails should be provided on either side of steps and ramps.

Accessible Locations

Solihull Town Centre and Shirley and Chelmsley Wood District centres provide their catchment populations with the opportunity for access to a range of retail and other services, and to jobs, by a variety of transport modes including frequent public transport, cycling and walking from a broad range of customer origins.



In determining accessibility of other locations, including local centres, the Council, for the purposes of this SPD will take into consideration ease and convenience of access by a choice of transport modes.

This will include the following considerations:

- Frequency and quality of public transport services (frequency, for an accessible location, would generally be expected to be, for example, at least 4 buses per hour to, for example, Solihull centre) and the range of customer origins served.
- Convenience of access to a main centre. Convenient access will generally be taken as within 800 metres safe walking distance (approximately 10 minutes walk) of a main centre unless the development is aimed at serving the mobility impaired, or groups likely to be less mobile, such as the elderly.
- Ease of access from main arrival points to main facilities, including safe provision for pedestrians, cyclists and disabled people.
- The range of facilities safely and easily accessible, by a variety of transport modes, from the location. This should include health, education, employment, shopping, leisure and open space.
- The overall contribution made to sustainable development objectives.
- The availability and location of parking.



Parking Standards (Maximum parking provision must not exceed except for disabled parking spaces) :

A1 Shops

Food Retail 1 space per 14m² (*over 1000m²)

Non-Food Retail below 930m² 1 space per 18.6m²
 930m² – 1000m² 50 spaces maximum
 over 1000m² * 1 space per 20m²

A2 Financial and Professional Services

1 space per 25m²

A3/A4/A5 Restaurants & Cafés/Drinking Establishments/Hot Food Takeaway

Range from 1 space per 4 customers to zero in some town centre locations.

B1 Business

below 1900m² 1 space per 23m²
 1900m² – 2500m² 83 spaces maximum
 2500m² – 24000m² * 1 space per 30m²
 24000m² – 28000m² * 800 spaces maximum
 over 28000m² * 1 space per 35m²

B2-B8 General Industry/Warehousing

1 space per 40m² plus any office component as per B1 plus space for servicing.

C1 Hotels and Hostels (sui generis)

1 space per bedroom, plus separate evaluation of A3, conference and other facilities open to non-residents.

C2 Residential Institutions

Each case to be decided on its merits by agreement with LPA.

C3 Dwelling Houses

An average of 2 spaces per dwelling unit (excluding integral garages), unless at accessible locations where only one space per unit will be permitted.

Exceptionally, for sites in an accessible location but with a main road frontage, two spaces per unit may be required on road safety grounds.

D1 Non-Residential Institutions

Medical and Veterinary Services		5 spaces per consulting or treatment room.
Education	Pre-school Nurseries *	1 space per 4 pupils
	Primary Schools* (Including nursery units)	2 spaces per classroom, plus whatever additional provision may be deemed necessary to ensure the operation of the approved Travel Plan.
	Secondary Education *	1½ spaces per 2 staff or as determined by agreed Travel Plan.
	Higher and Further Education *	1 space per 2 staff plus 1 space per 15 students on roll.

D2 Assembly and Leisure. Theatres/Nightclubs (sui generis)

General	Below 450 m ²	1 space per 10m ²
	450m ² - 1000m ²	45 spaces
	Over 1000m ² *	1 space per 22m ²
Cinemas & Conference facilities	Below 1000m ²	1 space per 4 seats
	Over 1000m ² *	1 space per 5 seats
Stadia	Under 1000 seats	1 space per 10 seats
	1000 – 1500 seats	100 spaces plus coach parking
	Over 1500 seats *	1 space per 15 seats plus coach parking

In all cases disabled parking will be required in addition to the above provision as shown below:

Safeguarded Provision for disabled parking

Employees and visitors to business premises		
	Below 200 parking bays	3 bays or 6% of car park capacity, whichever is the greater
	Over 200 parking bays	4 bays plus 4% of capacity
Shopping, recreation and leisure		
	Below 200 parking bays	3 bays or 6% of car park capacity, whichever is the greater
	Over 200 parking bays	4 bays plus 4% of capacity

* In all cases of development falling within these criteria a Green Travel Plan will be required to be submitted with the planning application. In other cases the submission of a Green Travel Plan may also be required.

Floorspace figures referred to in the above table are gross (sq.m)

Design Criteria



- All car-parking spaces are to be accessible at all times. Areas for circulation and turning are to be kept clear at all times. Parking areas should not be prominent in views from the street or elsewhere in the public realm. There should be convenient and safe pedestrian routes between car parks and the main entrances to buildings.
- General car parking spaces are to be 2.5 metres wide by 4.5 – 5.0 metres long. Exceptionally where no turnover of employee spaces is likely to occur during the day, the width may be reduced to 2.3m. Reduced aisle width must provide for increased bay widths.
- For all parking spaces in residential curtilages an area 2.5m wide by 6.0m long should be provided in front of garage doors.
- For tandem parking an additional 4.8m length is required. 2.1m additional width is required to park alongside or 2.3m if contained by wall, fence, etc.
- Unconstrained spaces or shared facilities should have spaces 4.8m by 2.5m.
- Spaces for use by disabled people should be at least 4.8m long x 2.4m wide with additional access space of 1.2m to either side and 1.8m at the end of each bay.

Operational servicing areas must be adequate to allow delivery vehicles to turn on site.

Consultation Statement

Formal Consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal Scoping Report was carried out in October 2005. The following statutory consultees were invited to comment:

- English Heritage
- The Countryside Agency
- English Nature
- The Environment Agency

Other consultees at the scoping stage were:

- Government Office West Midlands
- Highways Agency
- Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council (SMBC) – Transport and Highways
- SMBC Economic Development.

The Environment Agency advised that assessment of the likely effects of the draft Supplementary Planning Document should include effects on reducing flood risk. The Agency also requested the inclusion of a possible indicator to help assess this aspect. This was the number of planning applications granted planning permission contrary to Environment Agency Advice on flood risk grounds. The advice of the Environment Agency has been complied with.

The Highways Agency supported the main objectives set out for the SPD in the Scoping Report and the use of these to ensure that the final SPD will promote sustainable development. The Agency stressed the importance of links between parking standards, transport assessments and green travel plans that should be taken into consideration in the draft SPD. The Council has reflected these principles in the draft SPD.

In compiling the draft SPD internal consultation included:

- Transport and Highways
- Planning Services (Development Control/Forward Planning)
- Economic Development
- Council Members

On page 13 is a list of bodies consulted on the draft SPD and its accompanying SA report. These include:

- Statutory Bodies consulted at the SA scoping report stage.
- Neighbouring Local Authorities
- Parish/Town Councils (Solihull)
- Neighbouring Parish/Town Councils
- Community and Residents Organisations
- Government Departments/Organisations/Statutory Undertakers
- Members of Parliament (Local)
- Private Companies
- Action, Community and Voluntary groups
- SMBC internal consultees

In addition the draft SPD documentation was publicised as follows (including the time period for consultation and where/how the documentation could viewed/obtained):

- Notices were placed in two local newspapers (Solihull Times and Birmingham Post) to advertise the availability of the draft SPD documentation, its content, where/when it can be inspected, the consultation period and the means of making a response.
- A similar notice to the above was sent to secondary schools, colleges and community groups for display on notice boards.
- Inclusion of the SPD documentation on the Council's web-site at www.solihull.gov.uk/LDF where there was also an on-line form for making responses.
- A copy of the draft documentation was available for inspection at the Borough's public libraries and also at the 3 housing offices in the north of the Borough.
- A copy of the draft documentation was available at Solihull Connect (the Council's main reception adjacent Solihull Town Centre library).
- A paper response form was included with the documentation to enable written responses.
- Paper copies of the draft documentation were available on request.

The consultation period ended on Friday 24th March 2006.

The findings of consultation were reported to the Council's Cabinet Member for Regeneration at the end of May together with recommended changes to the SPD resulting from the consultation process. A schedule was attached to the report summarising the representations received, setting out requested changes and providing the Council's response. The report together with changes to the SPD was agreed for adoption by the Cabinet Member. The report together with the responses to the consultation are set out in this appendix.

Arrangements for monitoring the effects of the SPD have been reviewed in the light of the consultation process and will remain as described in the final SA report.

The adopted SPD (together with this consultation statement and a statement of adoption) is available on the Council's web-site at www.solihull.gov.uk. The adopted SPD can be inspected at Solihull Connect (the Council's main reception adjacent Solihull Town Centre library). Paper copies are available on request. Respondents that asked to be notified of the adoption of the SPD were notified.

List of Consultees

Neighbouring Local Authorities

Birmingham City Council	Stratford on Avon District Council
Bromsgrove District Council	Warwick District Council
Coventry City Council	Warwickshire County Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council	Worcestershire County Council

Parish and Town Councils

Balsall Parish Council	Fordbridge Town Council
Barston Parish Council	Hampton-In-Arden Parish Council
Berkswell Parish Council	Hockley Heath Parish Council
Bickenhill Parish Council	Kingshurst Parish Council
Castle Bromwich Parish Council	Meriden Parish Council
Chelmsley Wood Town Council	Smiths Wood Parish Council

Neighbouring Parish and Town Councils

Allesley Parish Council	Kenilworth Town Council
Baddesley Clinton Parish Council	Lapworth Parish Council
Beausale, Haseley, Honiley & Wroxall Parish Council	Stoneleigh & Ashow Parish Council
Coleshill Town Council	Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council
Fillongley Parish Council	Water Orton Parish Council
Great and Little Packington Parish Council	Wythall Parish Council

Community and Residents Organisations

Balsall Common Village Residents Association	Hockley Heath Residents Association
Bentley Heath Residents Association	Lawnswood Residents Association
Billsmore Green Residents Association	Marston Green Residents Association
Catherine-de-Barnes Residents Association	Olton Residents Association
Cheswick Green Residents Association	Shirley Residents Association
Dickens Heath Community Association	Solihull Residents Association
Dorridge & District Residents Association	Tidbury Green Residents Association
Fordbridge Area Resident's Association	Triangle Residents Association
Fordbridge Residents Association	Wells Green & Lyndon Residents Association
Harwood Grove Residents Association	White House Residents Association
Hatchford Brook Residents Association	Woodlands Residents Action Group

Government Departments / Organisations/ Statutory Undertakers

Advantage West Midlands	English Nature
Birmingham International Airport Limited	Government Office for the West Midlands
Business Link Solihull	Highways Agency
Centro/WMPTA	Solihull Friends of the Earth
Chamber of Commerce & Industry	The Environment Agency
Countryside Agency	West Midlands Fire Service HQ
English Heritage	West Midlands Police

Members of Parliament

Lorely Burt MP	Caroline Spelman MP
----------------	---------------------

Private Companies

Arlington Securities	National Mutual
Automobile Association	Persimmon Homes (South Midlands) Ltd
BT Group plc	RAC Motoring Services
Cala Homes (Midlands) Ltd	Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd
Cala Properties	Taylor Woodrow Devs Ltd
Chase Midland Plc	The British Land Co
Commission for Architecture & The Built Environment	The Housebuilders Federation Midland Region
Land Rover Vehicles	West Midlands RSL Planning Consortium
Marcity Developments	West Midlands Travel Ltd
Marks & Spencer PLC	Wimpey Homes West Midlands Ltd
National Exhibition Centre	

Action, Community and Voluntary Groups

CPRE	North Solihull Regeneration Partnership - EC Harris
Disability West Midlands	Solihull Chamber of Trade
Disabled People's Network-Solihull	Solihull Society for the Physically Handicapped
Disabled Persons Network	Warwickshire Rural Community Council
Knowle Parish Church Youth in Action	

SMBC Internal Consultees

All Solihull Council Members	
Community Services, Town Centre Management	Strategic Services, Solicitors
Community Services, Transport and Highways Resources, Financial Strategy/Physical Resources	Strategic Services, Community and Economic Regeneration

Responses to Consultation Draft

List of Respondents

Advantage West Midlands	Highways Agency
Balsall Parish Council	Mr J Jones
Birmingham Airport (Airport Company)	Regional Planning Partnership
British Land	Solihull Fire Station
Castle Bromwich Parish Council	Solihull Friends of the Earth.
Centro	Sport England
The Countryside Agency	Mr I Strickley
Dorridge and District Residents Association	Taylor Woodrow
English Heritage	Warwickshire Rural Community Council
English Nature	

Responses to Questions 1 and 2 of the consultation form :

		Yes	No	No View
Question 1	The draft supplementary planning document says what it is trying to achieve on page 1, under 'Background'. Are these aims the right ones?	7	1	3
Question 2	Do you agree with the parking standards in the draft supplementary planning document?	2	4	5

Summary and change requested	Our response / action
<p>Concerned that new business development should be provided with adequate parking. Also concerned that too much parking for the disabled is enabled.</p>	<p>The SPD reflects PPG13 standards set to encourage access by more sustainable travel modes. Parking for disabled persons accords with government guidance on quantity and design. No change</p>
<p>No specific comments on the SPD.</p>	<p>No comments warranted. No change</p>
<p>Concerned that tighter parking standards will disadvantage rural communities that do not have adequate access to public transport. The non-residential institutions (D1) use class should have more generous provision to reflect this. The SPD should be more flexible in regard to standards in rural areas.</p> <p>Provide a more generous standard for non-residential institutions (health centres, day nurseries, libraries, churches etc).</p>	<p>PPG13 does not enable more relaxed standards in rural areas. More sustainable travel modes will not be encouraged by more generous parking provision. No change</p>
<p>Insufficient provision for disabled parking. Provide a more generous parking standard for the disabled.</p>	<p>Parking for the disabled is a minimum standard (all others are maximum standards) which accords with national guidance. No change</p>
<p>Airport parking is often outside the operational site boundary.</p>	<p>Off-site Airport parking is not fully in SMBC control because it has occurred in other local authority areas. Parking outside the Airport boundary is an issue for the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy. Solihull's position is that Park and Ride for Airport passengers should be integrated into public transport upgrades and any remote park and ride facilities must demonstrate positive benefits to the Highway network. A proliferation of off-site urban and rural parking sites accessed via M42 junction 6, adjacent junctions or from the local urban network should be avoided. SPD modified</p>

Summary and change requested	Our response / action
<p>Confining Birmingham Airport parking to within the operational site boundary could impact on biodiversity. The requirement should relate only to the current operational boundary.</p> <p>The SPD should seek to protect biodiversity in any expanded Birmingham Airport boundary.</p>	<p>Agree that environmentally sensitive areas need to be taken into consideration in the decision making process relating to car parking provision within the Airport (and NEC). SPD modified</p>
<p>No specific comments on the SPD.</p>	<p>No comments warranted. No change</p>
<p>Restricted parking standards in residential area developments will encourage illegal parking and could restrict access for the fire service unless supported by enforcement measures.</p>	<p>The more generous SPD standard should reduce on-street parking pressures. Maximum standards are still needed in order to satisfy PPG13 requirements and to encourage efficient use of land/good design.</p> <p>No change</p>
<p>Generally the SPD is comprehensible and appropriate but some changes are needed.</p> <p>Section on 'Background' should reflect on reasons why additional parking might be needed for example to reflect the costs and risks of too little parking.</p> <p>Developers are not required under the SPD to provide more spaces than they would wish. This should be changed to say that they would provide no more than the occupants of the development are likely to need. Reference to provision of more spaces 'exceptionally' to reflect local circumstances should delete 'exceptionally'.</p> <p>The SPD should state that gated developments are disapproved of because of likely issues of parking inefficiency and free movement of vehicles. Clear provision for visitor parking should be made within new developments. The SPD should reflect this.</p>	<p>PPG13 only enables additional parking where there is a road safety issue.</p> <p>PPG13 specifically leaves the issue of parking provision, within the defined maximum standards, to developers (except where road safety is a material consideration). First bullet point, under 'Implementation' heading, deleted.</p> <p>SPD modified</p> <p>Reference to gated communities deleted. SPD modified</p>

Summary and change requested	Our response / action
<p>The SPD should recognise that garages are often used for household storage and that building designs should reflect the need for sufficient storage space</p> <p>Reference should be made to ‘Better Places to Live by Design’ that encourages innovative solutions for parking in high-density developments.</p> <p>The SPD requirement that maximum parking provision ‘must’ not exceed those set out should be changed to ‘should’ not exceed those set out.</p> <p>The SPD enables 2 spaces per dwelling unit ‘(excluding integral garages)’. The reference in brackets is unnecessary. The SPD exceptionally allows 2 spaces per unit in highly accessible locations for highway safety reasons. The word ‘exceptionally’ should be deleted.</p>	<p>Exclusion of integral garages as parking space reflects that there are many domestic garages that are not used for parking a car. No change</p> <p>Agree that a cross-reference could be included. SPD modified</p> <p>This could weaken the stance of the SPD that, in accordance with PPG13, enables more relaxed standards only exceptionally. No change</p> <p>The reference to integral garages reflects that many garages are not used for parking a car. Sentence is amended to clarify requirement for parking provision to recognise road safety considerations. SPD modified</p>
<p>SPD should include standards for motorbikes and cycles.</p> <p>Threshold for requirement for a TA should be lower for leisure uses (1000-1500 seats).</p>	<p>Encouragement is given to provision for motorcycles and bicycles under ‘Implementation’ heading (7th bullet point as amended).</p> <p>Thresholds for leisure use are set in PPG13 as a maximum standard. Transport Assessments for leisure use may enable tighter provision. No change</p>
<p>Well thought out SPD. Use less jargon.</p>	<p>No specific references given. The SPD tries to be clear and concise. No change</p>
<p>SPD noted with interest (no specific comments).</p> <p>Welcomes the SPD in encouraging sustainable travel choices. Doesn’t agree that significantly lower levels of parking should be adopted in housing developments aimed at households that may need less parking than for family housing (e.g. students, the elderly) because higher levels of visitor parking might be needed and/or requirements may vary dependent on specific location.</p>	<p>No comments warranted. No change</p> <p>In accordance with PPG13 principles, tighter standards will be pursued where locational circumstance allow. No change</p>

Summary and change requested

Our response / action

To make standards effective, parking in undesignated areas needs to be restricted. Parking should be restricted in existing developments when expansion or change of use is proposed. Parking to the rear of properties adjacent private gardens should be prevented in accordance with 'New Housing in Context' SPD.

SPD should reflect these principles. It should state that planning powers are available to reduce parking to those in the standards. SPD should also seek restrictions on undesignated parking and reduce parking in existing developments when expansion or change of use is proposed.

Welcomes the SPD including its ethos and its commitment to sustainable development principles.

The 6th Bullet point, under heading 'Implementation', should be amended to clarify that developers will not normally be required to fund on street parking controls. Substitute with 'where necessary, introduce on-street parking controls in areas adjacent to major trip generating development to ensure that the limitation of off-street parking does not lead to on-street parking pressures. In some circumstances, it may be appropriate for the Council to require developments to fund these controls'.

Under the 'residential development' heading, 2nd paragraph, the sentence 'Proposals resulting in higher levels of off-street parking, especially in urban areas, should not be adopted' should be replaced by 'In some instances, proposals resulting in higher levels of off-street parking should not be adopted'.

The SPD standard for dwelling houses should be substituted with 'An average of 2 spaces per dwelling unit (excluding integral garages). At highly accessible locations such as town centres, one space per unit may be permitted. In some circumstances for sites with a main road frontage, two spaces may be required where there are significant road safety implications'.

SPD seeks to provide a set of parking standards and some general principles for implementing them rather than provide excessive detail of where and in what circumstances standards will apply. Standards will apply to changes of use. Where significant extensions of existing development are proposed, parking for the whole development may be reviewed if circumstances make this practicable. Cross-reference made to the Council's 'New Housing in Context' SPG. **SPD modified**

The SPD requirement includes 'where appropriate'. Requested change is unnecessary. **No change**

The change requested would not reflect that the SPD standards are set as a maximum and that where circumstances require tighter standards will be expected. **No change**

The suggested wording would not reflect that the standards are set as maximum and additional spaces will only be required exceptionally (on highway safety grounds). However, revised SPD provides greater clarity. **No change**

Summary and change requested	Our response / action
<p>The SPD seeks to confine Airport parking to within the Airport boundary but the Airport Company may not have control over off-site parking proposals for the Airport.</p> <p>SPD should acknowledge that provision for off site parking is not within the control of the Airport Company and that the draft airport master plan proposes that the Airport will work with local authorities to seek 'proper' conditions for off site parking for the Airport.</p>	<p>SPD should reflect that Airport parking is an issue for the review of the Regional Spatial Strategy. SPD modified</p>
<p>No specific comment on the SPD but would like to be involved in SA preparation processes.</p>	<p>Noted. No change</p>
<p>The standard of 1 space per 35 sqm for larger business sites will affect competitiveness and marketability. The standard does not reflect PPG13 requirements.</p> <p>The standard of 1 space per 35 sqm for large business sites is over-restrictive and could adversely affect the competitiveness of Blythe Valley Park RIS and its proposed extension.</p> <p>Adopt the PPG13 standard of 1 space per 30sqm.</p>	<p>The standard is reflective of the decision of the Secretary of State in approving outline planning permission for Blythe Valley Park. The Secretary of State acknowledged the need to encourage access by more sustainable travel modes and considered that the proposal could potentially encourage the provision of bus services. However, parking for large business sites needs to be set on a regional basis to ensure that sites compete on a 'level playing field ' basis. SPD will be subject to review in this regard. No change</p>
<p>The SPD is in general conformity with the RSS. Changes should be included to reflect the regional guidance review process in regard to parking standards.</p> <p>SPD should acknowledge that work is underway to consider parking standards as part of the RSS review. The SPD should acknowledge that it may therefore need to be reviewed in the light of revised regional guidance. The SPD should also be revised to clarify that additional provision for parking in main centres will only be made if needed to ensure continued vitality and viability, taking existing provision into account, and that short stay parking is favoured.</p>	<p>Agree that the SPD should reflect this view. SPD modified</p>