

# Consultation Statement

for the Isle of Wight Council's draft

Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments

Supplementary Planning Document

1. This statement sets out who the Isle of Wight Council consulted when preparing the draft Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), a summary of the issues raised and how those issues have been addressed in the final SPD. Preparation of this statement is a requirement of Regulation 12(a) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the council's Statement of Community Involvement.
2. Consultation commenced on the draft SPD on Friday 28 October and closed midday Monday 28 November. The consultation period for parish and town councils was extended to incorporate meeting cycles and closed on midday Monday 12 December.
3. Copies of the documents were available online (on both the homepage of [iwight.com](http://iwight.com) and on the planning policy pages), and at Seaclose Offices. A notice advertising the consultation and how to respond was placed in the local newspaper and a copy of the notice can be found in Appendix 1. The consultees who were specifically notified of the consultation are listed in Appendix 2.
4. There were 26 responses to the consultation. A summary of each representation, the council's response to them and any proposed changes are set out in Appendix 3 and 4.
5. A number of changes have been made to the document following discussions between officers, to reflect the content of the representations and to cover editorial changes (such as correcting typographical errors and factual updates). The changes are set out in Appendix 4.
6. Internal consultation had taken place prior to the public consultation and this shaped the content of the consultation draft SPD. An outline of this consultation work can be found in Appendix 5.

# Appendix 1

## Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments Draft Supplementary Planning Document Consultation

The Isle of Wight Council is consulting on the content of the above document with a view to adopting it as a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) within the Island Plan Local Development Framework.

The Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments Draft SPD sets out the council's proposed approach towards the type and level of parking provision provided in new development.

The document is supported by a draft Environmental Screening Statement and a Consultation Statement.

The above documentation is available to view and download at:

[www.iwight.com/spd](http://www.iwight.com/spd)

A copy of the draft SPD and supporting documents are also available for public inspection at:

Seaclose Offices Reception, Fairlee Road, Newport  
Monday-Thursday 8.30am to 5pm (except last Wednesday of the month - 10am to 5pm)  
Friday 8.30am to 4.30pm

**The period for representation will run from Friday 28 October until midday on Monday 28 November 2016.** Any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specific address of the adoption of the SPD.

Representations should be sent to: Planning Policy, Isle of Wight Council, Seaclose Offices, Fairlee Road, Newport, Isle of Wight, PO30 2QS or via email to:  
[policy.consultation@iow.gov.uk](mailto:policy.consultation@iow.gov.uk)



# Appendix 2

The following table sets out who was specifically notified of the SPD consultation.

<b>Who was notified of the consultation?</b>
All Parish/Town Councils
Architects and Agents
Relevant IWC Officers and associated contract delivery teams
Statutory consultees – Environment Agency, Historic England and Natural England

## Appendix 3

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
PG1	Bob White	<p>I congratulate the Council on its positive response to Government guidance on residential parking. I was one of several people who contributed towards the policy shift to which you refer in the SPD. However, the guidance could make a far greater contribution towards good layout design if it reflected the joint CIHT/IHE guidance <a href="#">Residential Parking Guidance Note</a>) and encourage use of the Space to Park <a href="http://www.spacetopark.org">www.spacetopark.org</a> toolkit for good, contextual design.</p> <p>The zonal approach is less robust, and more open to problems with on-street parking, than one which relates to the existence, or otherwise, of on-street parking controls. As such, residential car parking standards should be linked with local parking strategies.</p> <p>I find no mention of garages and tandem parking in the SPD. Both of these have been the cause of significant on-street parking problems in new developments. Indeed, some studies have shown that less than 50% of garages are used for parking cars. Visitor parking does not appear to be considered.</p> <p>Although good street design is mentioned, far more emphasis needs to be placed on the integration of casual parking (including for visitors) into the street scene. Good on-street parking can enhance streets; poor curtilage parking can compromise otherwise well designed streets. I have numerous photographs of successful and unsuccessful approaches, beyond those featured in</p>	<p>Noted, but no evidence given to back up the assertion. The draft SPD is linked to the wider Parking Strategy.</p> <p>The point is noted, but the council does not want to be unduly prescriptive.</p> <p>The council note the point and appreciate that parking can be done in a variety of ways that can contribute to the sense of place. However, we don't want to be unduly prescriptive and have</p>	<p>Add in reference to Space to Park.</p> <p>Invite him in to come and a CPD session?!</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>Space to Park.</p> <p>Has the Council conducted satisfaction surveys of recent residential developments, along the lines of those conducted in Kent between 2007 and 2013? The Kent surveys are referred to in Space to Park. Even rudimentary surveys would show how some approaches have failed (including rear court parking), and others have succeeded. "What works where", as referred to in both key documents, was an earlier raft of guidance based on design and numerical provision.</p> <p>Residential car parking affects the lives of many people, with serious social issues having arisen in poorly designed developments. Local residential design guidance, incorporating positive approaches to car parking, can help developers to create successful streets and communities.</p> <p>In order to avoid the SPD being less than it should be, and in the hope that the Council may produce a document that will inspire other authorities, I would be happy to discuss these issues further at no cost to the Council.</p>	<p>signposted to Manual for Streets. There is also the adopted policy DM2 Design Quality for New Development</p> <p>The local planning authority has not undertaken such surveys.</p> <p>The council note the point and appreciate that parking can be done in a variety of ways that can contribute to the sense of place. However, we don't want to be unduly prescriptive and have signposted to Manual for Streets. There is also the adopted policy DM2 Design Quality for New Development</p> <p>While the council appreciates this view, it is considered that the document is fit for purpose and can contribute to the existing policy structure.</p>	<p>Introduce an</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		As an aside, I do not believe that 20 dwellings create enough transport impact to warrant the need for a Transport Assessment.	This is noted and the council will introduce an amended approach that is more proportionate, that differentiates between a Transport Assessment and a Transport Statement, and the triggers for requiring these different documents.	amended approach
PG2	Southern Vectis	<p>Southern Vectis welcomes the opportunity to comment on the Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments – Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Document, and support its aim to ensure future developments provide sufficient and appropriate parking that will not result in an unacceptable impact on the surrounding road network.</p> <p>We would also suggest that the policy needs to be explicit in terms of new development and parking in particular, not being developed in such a way that holds up the flow of public transport across the Island. We are grateful to the acknowledgement of the contribution Southern Vectis makes to the comprehensive public transport offer on the Island.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> In essence our response makes two key points;-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Local Photographic Surveys needs to pay attention to, and include options to resolve any problems for buses passing through the network arising from development, and;</li> <li>• Appendix 1 (a section A1.6) should be amended to include details on carriageway widths to accommodate commercial vehicles visiting developments.</li> </ul>	This is noted; although the council would make the point that this is not a policy. It is an SPD that contains guidelines.	

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><b>Local Photographic Survey</b>  The requirement for a local photographic survey of parking near proposed development sites is noted. As part of this study, the location of, and parking across bus stops also needs to be noted in the guidance so the Planning Authority can also note the potential impact on bus networks and possible solutions. For example the creation of a bus stop clearway to enable buses to pass through networks more smoothly should be identified and funded through the development where appropriate.  We would also suggest that the any development that increases on-street parking along main corridors should be resisted as well as removing parking that proves difficult in terms of public transport operation will reduce network congestion and improve journey times.</p> <p><b>Appendix 1 – Parking Guidelines</b>  We would point to emerging guidance from CIHT which is currently being developed, and on which Southern Vectis have been involved. The aim of the guidance is make development more bus friendly and support the development of commercially viable routes once a development is fully built out. Development should also promote quality development and quality bus provision that is attributive to users with improved access to main corridors, less deviations off route and reduces potential delays with carriageway widths within new development a minimum of 6.75 metres.  We would request that this is included in section A1.to ensure that development is appropriate and accessible by commercial vehicles. Whilst the site may not initially be accessed by commercial vehicles it is easier to introduce services on</p>	<p>The council notes the point, and to allow for survey and assessment to incorporate a wide range of sustainable transport modes proposes a change to the text.</p> <p>Whilst the point is noted, the guidelines relate to parking. It is, however, acknowledged that well designed and high quality streets improve the quality of the area, the sense of place and can safely sustain a range of users.</p> <p>It is considered appropriate to include this issue within the Design section.</p>	<p>Amended text in the Design section.</p> <p>Amend text in the Design section.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>carriageways with 6.75m widths and we would urge this as standard.</p> <p>It may be appropriate to highlight where sites for different developments may trigger payments towards public transport contributions, especially for larger sites or how this might link to travel planning for sites that are developed across use classes. Whilst the true location for this may not lie within the car parking standards it may be useful to signpost within this document.</p>	This issue does not relate to the proposed SPD, but is addressed through existing policies and DM processes.	
PG3	Bembridge Parish Council	Bembridge Parish Council supports the Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Development.	Support noted.	None proposed in light of the representation.
PG4	Shanklin Town Council	Bicycle parking provision 1 bike rack per room for guest house, hotel etc. is absolute nonsense.	The proposed approach is not for 1 bike rack per room for guest house, hotel etc. See page 14 table 5.	None proposed in light of the representation.
PG5	Arreton Parish Council	Arreton Parish Council support the proposals for the recycling and refuse storage at new developments and also the proposals for parking provision.	Support noted.	None proposed in light of the representation.
PG6	Chale Parish Council	Chale PC met on Monday and noted both the SPDs currently open for consultation re. Recycling and Parking for new developments and have nothing to add.	Comment noted.	None proposed in light of the representation.
PG7	Angela Mcurty	<p>As a disabled driver I would certainly expect any new home I was to move into to have a car parking space.</p> <p>If people are to be encouraged to use buses etc then the cost of bus fares needs to be reduced and services need to be more frequent. Last time I wanted to visit Newchurch there was ONE bus going out there in the morning and ONE coming back in the evening. My friends no longer attend the Brighstone Xmas Fair because they have to wait HOURS for a bus back to Newport. Porchfield doesn't have a bus service at all and a friend of mine in</p>	<p>The residents of the Island have a range of needs, and the provision of a range of dwelling types and parking provision will help address these.</p> <p>The proposed approach doesn't preclude development proposals including parking.</p>	None proposed in light of the representation.

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		Ryde has to walk two miles to her bus stop.		
PG8	Michael Green	<p>Fewer Parking spaces are you serious , the IOW is a rural area and buses in some villages are virtually zero and if you are lucky enough to have a regular service the cost is extortionate. I cannot imagine a family catching the bus to a supermarket for a weekly shop.</p> <p>Do any of you catch a bus I doubt it as you would not be suggesting such an absurd plan.</p>	<p>The council is not proposing fewer parking spaces, as there are no current provision requirements.</p> <p>As set out in the draft SPD, the council will expect new development in rural locations to incorporate parking provision, to reflect the need of people to travel to the main towns (and then use the public / shop parking facilities) .</p> <p>A factor to consider is how the rise in internet shopping and home delivery services is changing shopping patterns.</p>	None proposed in light of the representation.
PG9	Deborah Pollock	Please could I just remind any spaces lost is a hindrance too community nursing staff. I work in Newport and surrounding areas with equipment too transport. We get no parking permits that allow us to park near our patients or discounted. Often we get tickets where we have had to stay with distressed patients. Please remember us when planning new developments. It's really hard out there for us community Nurses! Thank you for listening!	<p>The council recognises the specific needs and requirements faced by such users.</p> <p>The proposed approach relates to new development only, not the existing situation.</p> <p>The council's draft Parking Strategy covers the wider issues being raised, such as parking permits and pricing regimes.</p>	None proposed in light of the representation.

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
PG10	Planning Bureau, for McCarthy & Stone	<p>My Client commends the manner in which the proposed SPD differentiates between the parking standards for general needs housing and specialist accommodation for the elderly. We are however concerned that the parking standards detailed in the various tables within Appendix 1 are inconsistent when referring to older persons' accommodation. At present we feel Appendix 1 lacks clarity and may potentially contain some errors.</p> <p>We note that <i>Table 1: Residential Vehicle Guidelines</i> provides a standard for 'Sheltered Housing' of 0.25 car parking spaces per unit. This a car parking standard that we would generally support as it reflects our experience of lower car ownership in our developments.</p> <p><i>Table 4: Health Care Establishments</i> however provides standards for 'Older Persons Housing: Active Elderly with Warden Control' at one space per unit. This definition can also encompass the aforementioned term of 'sheltered housing' and both forms of accommodation are aimed at the active elderly. There is therefore likely to be confusion in the application of parking standards for older persons' accommodation as a result.</p> <p>We would consider that the requirement of 1 space per unit detailed in '<i>Table 4: Health Care Establishments</i>' would constitute overprovision of parking provision.</p> <p>McCarthy and Stone has unrivalled experience in developing retirement housing for the elderly, having implemented well 1000 category II sheltered housing developments throughout England, Scotland and Wales.</p> <p>Retirement Living (Category II sheltered housing) has been defined as "grouped flatlets to meet the needs of the less active elderly</p>	<p>The support is noted.</p> <p>The wording in the document will be aligned to reflect this point, and to introduce a level of consistency across the spectrum of development for supported living facilities. It is accepted that with all of these types of development there is likely to be a need for additional parking that may be used by visitors, family, health care professionals, support staff etc.</p>	<p>Changes made to Tables 1 and 4</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><i>people</i>". The key wording here is "less active elderly people", although residents are not normally so frail as to be wholly inactive. Based on survey work it was found that the average age of entry to these McCarthy and Stone developments of this description was over 76 years.</p> <p>It has been found that, of those residents who have given up car ownership, as the majority eventually will, a very significant proportion, of about 18%, do so at, or close to, the time that they enter this form of housing.</p> <p>This reduction in car ownership is exacerbated for residents of 'Extra Care accommodation' which is specialist older persons' accommodation that is aimed at the 'frail' elderly. The average age of a resident in a McCarthy and Stone Assisted Living (Extra Care) development is currently 83 years old. This accommodation can sit within both Use Class C3 or C2 of the Use Classes Order dependant on the extent of care and the facilities provided.</p> <p>As the highway authority may likely seek the residential car parking standards in Table 4, this would constitute a significant level of over provision in our view and would make it extremely difficult to deliver these types of development in the most sustainable locations (i.e. within 0.5 metres of a town or local centre) as such locations tend to be spatially constrained. We do however note that the SPD states that the parking standards will not be applied within town centre locations.</p> <p>To aid the Council we would respectfully point to the approved South Gloucestershire Council Residential Parking Standards SPD, as an example of what we consider to be a good example of parking standards for specialist accommodation for the elderly. In</p>		

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>this SPD the car parking standards for Extra Care accommodation are lower than those of Category 2 housing retirement housing – parking requirements of 1 space per every 2 dwellings and 1 space per 4 dwellings respectively.</p> <p>I would also query the Council's rationale behind the cycling standards for older persons' housing detailed in both Table 1 &amp; Table 4 – i.e. 1 space per unit. As referenced earlier, sheltered housing and in particular that Extra Care accommodation, is used by older people who tend to be frail and are likely have mobility difficulties. Were an older person in the physical condition to cycle on regular basis it would be unlikely they would require such accommodation.</p> <p>A recent survey of 242 McCarthy and Stone Retirement Living units showed only 7 bicycles owned by residents in these apartments. This is an ownership rate of 0.0289 cycles per apartment or 1 cycle per 35 apartments.</p> <p>Whilst we can understand the rationale behind encouraging cycling in the general population we consider that a requirement for one cycle space per apartment in sheltered housing is onerous and inappropriate. We respectfully request that the Council rethink their approach in this respect.</p> <p>In both their Retirement Living and Assisted Living developments, McCarthy and Stone provides an internal mobility scooter store for use by residents. This is a far more relevant requirement and in the handful of instances that resident has used a bicycle it can be stored in this area.</p>	<p>This is noted, however it is believed that is an appropriate level of provision to accommodate residents, staff and visitors, and does not preclude the flexible use of such facilities (such as combining with mobility scooter storage).</p> <p>This reflects the wider support and usage of cycling on the Island.</p>	
PG11	Victor Hook	I reject adoption of this strategy in it's entirety. The Supplementary Planning Document was required in order to	The draft document cannot in itself address any existing on-street	None proposed in light of the

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>examine the parking issue. However, the documents objectives are flawed inasmuch as the population will still accept houses without parking but still insist of having a motor vehicle by way of a car. Motorcycles are such a small proportion of powered vehicles their consideration is almost irrelevant, particularly in the Winter.</p> <p>On street parking is already a major problem and this intended strategy will do no more than exacerbate the problem.</p> <p>I can only hope the councillors' will take their constituents' feelings into account and reject adoption of this wholly unacceptable parking proposal.</p>	<p>parking issues – this is for the wider parking strategy to address.</p> <p>The focus of the document is on new development, and will contribute to a wider package of measures to address legitimate parking issues.</p>	<p>representation.</p>
PG12	Steve Jewell	<p>I would like to comment under Appendix 1 section A1.2 Provision for residential Parking.</p> <p>Anyone who frequently visits estates like the Barratt Development at Whippingham in an evening or at night will see that the lack of off-street parking has created unprecedented on-street parking to the extent there is almost no space left, causes dangerous obstructions and hinders emergency services access at time of need.</p> <p>The number of spaces should match closely the number of bedrooms per property.....maybe four spaces for a four bedroom property is excessive but at least three should be provided, otherwise as teenagers reach driving age, but can't afford to leave the parental home, become on-street parkers and all that entails.</p> <p>Please recommend that 2-3 and above properties have</p>	<p>The draft document cannot in itself address any existing on-street parking issues – this is for the wider parking strategy to address.</p> <p>The focus of the document is on new development, and will contribute to a wider package of measures to address legitimate parking issues.</p>	<p>None proposed in light of the representation.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		sufficient parking spaces built into the planning approval process.....		
PG13	Ken Fry, Mayer Brown Ltd	<p><b>Useful guidance</b> It is stated that the draft SPD has been informed by the experiences of other local authorities, although it is not stated specifically which ones. I recommend the following two documents as useful background guidance (copies attached):</p> <p><b>Wales Parking Standards 2008</b> takes a zonal approach and could form a suitable basis for a revised SPD. Some simplification would be needed as it includes a total of 6 zones, ranging from City Core to Deep Rural, but it is a thoroughly practical document and probably the best set of detailed guidelines I have seen.</p> <p>The <b>CIHT / IHE Technical Guidance Note on Residential Parking</b> does not include detailed standards, but does contain useful background information and general advice on various topics, including, but not limited to, the following: Car ownership levels (e.g., car ownership among the occupiers of flats is normally lower than that for houses); Design issues, e.g: - Garages are often used for storage rather than parking, especially when the internal dimensions do not relate to the size of modern cars. Where garages are to be provided, additional curtilage and/or on-street parking is likely to be required.</p> <p>- Modern working patterns often necessitate the parking of vans at home, hence there is a need to design with them in mind. Consideration should be given to modelling parking bay dimensions on vans rather than cars, especially where on-street spaces for such vehicles might be the best solution.</p>	<p>The council has reviewed the document and will amend the SPD to include reference to the guidance note referred to.</p> <p>See also council responses to PG1.</p> <p>This point is noted, and amendments will be made to the Design section of the SPD to reflect this.</p>	<p>Amended text in the Design section.</p> <p>Amended text in the Design section.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>- Developments that exhibit high cycle ownership and use tend to be those without parking problems and fears about safety. As such, getting the parking right appears to contribute towards the personal health agenda.</p> <p><b>2 General (1.8 / 3.8 / Process Flowchart)</b></p> <p>2.1 Whilst the abolition of the previous maximum standards is welcome, it is not clear whether the new guidelines are a reversion to minimum standards as traditionally used, or are fixed levels that will require a detailed Parking Provision Assessment for any variation whether downwards or upwards. If the latter, this would involve a lot of extra work and significantly increase the cost of applications for small developments, because PPAs carried out in accordance with the Council's requirements involve a great deal of survey time and are therefore not cheap (typically £2k - £3k, but see below).</p> <p>2.2 The box in the flowchart saying, "Not agree over level of provision" is ambiguous: I am hoping this simply means, "No agreement regarding level of provision", but it appears to have been interpreted in some quarters as, "Not agree over-provision." This needs rewording to avoid confusion.</p> <p><b>3 Zones – general considerations (3.2 / 3.5)</b></p> <p>3.1 I drew up the original parking zone boundaries and definitions used in the UDP. In doing so, I had regard to existing street</p>	<p>The council considers that the provisions set out in paragraphs 1.8, 3.2 and 3.8 are clear, although will make some text bold to highlight it.</p> <p>The guidelines are what the council expects to see in the first instance, although the approach has built in flexibility to allow for variation, should the applicant wish, where it is justified. The level of information expected would be commensurate to the proposal.</p> <p>The council acknowledges this point and will change the flow chart to improve clarity.</p> <p>This point is noted, although it is considered that the approach of simplifying the zones and aligning</p>	<p>Make specific text in bold in paragraph 3.8.</p> <p>Will change the flow chart.</p> <p>New paragraph following paragraph 3.9.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>character ('sense of place') and local traffic routes, not merely the established or proposed land uses, hence my list of typical characteristics for Zone 1 was slightly different to the new list and I'm not convinced that the new list is an improvement.</p> <p>3.2 It is sensible to combine old Zones 3 &amp; 4, with a single, minimum level of provision throughout suburban and rural areas across the Island, as in practice the transport needs of both are virtually identical. (The maximum 75% standard for Zone 3 in the old UDP was less than the 100% I had originally proposed, and was reduced for ideological rather than technical reasons).</p> <p>3.3 However, the abolition of the old Zone 2 covering edge of town centre and inner fringe areas is a simplification too far. Such areas are distinctly different in character from both inner town centres on one side and suburban areas on the other, and eliminating them produces some obvious anomalies (see below). The parking requirement in 'edge of centre' areas is more variable, being greatly affected by factors such as walking distances to town centre facilities, existing local land uses, proximity of public car parks and on-street parking restrictions. As such, these are the areas where a PPA is more likely to be appropriate and some of them should, in my opinion, be retained as a separate Zone 2.</p> <p>3.4 It may be reasonable to accept by default, without a PPA, a reduced level of off-street parking provision for residential development in a retained Zone 2 (e.g., minimum 50% of full</p>	<p>them to the town centre boundaries is appropriate within the current context. However, the wider point is acknowledged and additions will be made to the document to reflect this.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>See previous comments and proposed changes.</p> <p>The council's approach has been updated from the previously adopted approach, and prepared in line with national policy and</p>	

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>standard, rather than the UDP maximum of 50%), but this should be based on car ownership levels within those areas, based on 2011 Census data.</p> <p>3.5 In Zone 1, does the text in the box (3.2) saying that development within Town Centre Boundaries "...will not be expected to provide parking..." actually mean that development within TCBs "...will be expected <b>not to</b> provide parking..."? Clarification is needed. If the latter, whilst it may be reasonable to expect some justification for providing parking, to require a full PPA in every case seems excessive.</p> <p>3.6 Whilst it may be simpler to redefine Parking Zone 1 using the TCBs, some of them are not logical in terms of vehicular access and parking implications and are too tightly drawn. If one zone is to be removed, I believe the boundaries should be shown further out, closer to the old Zone 2 boundaries, for the reasons stated above.</p> <p><b>4 Zones – detailed matters (3.3)</b>  <b>Cowes</b>  4.1 Why should the Zone 1 boundary lie halfway along Birmingham Road? There is no obvious change in environment or traffic conditions from one end of the street to the other, yet if that boundary is enforced, under the current proposals one property could be expected to provide no parking at all, whereas the neighbouring property could be obliged to provide to full standards.</p>	<p>guidance.</p> <p>Point is noted, and a number of amendments to the supporting text throughout the document will be introduced.</p> <p>Noted, but the proposed policy approach has moved away from the previous approach.</p> <p>The town centre boundaries have been taken as an existing proxy. There is flexibility within the document (both existing and proposed) to deal with sites on a case-by-case basis, when such 'issues' are identified either by the applicant, the local planning authority or the local highway authority.</p>	<p>Amendments throughout document</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>4.2 Sun Hill, Market Hill and the southern end of Castle Road, Cowes are very densely developed and it is likely that the introduction of off-street parking would significantly change their character. Why not include them in Zone 1? (Also Bars Hill, which can only be accessed by driving through Zone 1 or along The Grove), where it would be better not to encourage additional traffic.</p> <p><b>East Cowes</b></p> <p>4.3 Whilst it might make little difference in practice, there doesn't seem to be any logical reason to include such a short stretch of Clarence Road and its junction with York Avenue within Zone 1 and exclude all the rest; this zone is arguably drawn too tightly.</p> <p><b>Freshwater</b></p> <p>4.4 Although there was previously no Zone 1 in Freshwater, I do not believe any major problems would arise from defining one there using the TCB; given the relative lack of bus services in the West Wight, I would not suggest extending the zone in this case.</p> <p><b>Newport</b></p> <p>4.5 Although the old Zone 2 extended further out, the TCB seems a reasonable compromise here.</p> <p><b>Ryde</b></p> <p>4.6 Ryde is arguably better served by public transport than anywhere else on the Island, with extensive areas outside the TCB where it is not difficult to live without owning a car (and containing a large number of flats). Subject to checking on actual car ownership levels, my impression is that Zone 2 could be retained to include a significant proportion of the old UDP Zone 2, particularly between West Street and the railway line.</p>		

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p><b>Sandown and Shanklin</b> 4.7 I believe there is very little, if any, scope to enlarge the inner zone in either town, particularly given the seasonal pressures on on-street parking and public car parks and the somewhat uncertain future of the railway. I would not suggest extending the inner zone in either case. In particular, it can be very difficult at times to find a parking space within reasonable walking distance of central Shanklin, especially when there is a popular event at Shanklin Theatre.</p> <p><b>Ventnor</b> 4.8 Would it not be logical to extend the inner zone to include everything within the High Street – Victoria Street – Albert Street circuit, as those properties mostly back onto a public car park?</p> <p><b>5 Cycle parking (4.1 / 4.2)</b> 5.1 To make better sense, delete the words, "...the provision of..." (4.1, line 3).</p> <p><b>6 Parking Provision Assessment (5.1 – 5.5)</b> 6.1 To say that a PPA "...will be required..." (5.1) seems onerous. It would be better to say "...may be required..."</p>	<p>Comment noted and change accepted.</p> <p>The council considers the requirement for a PPA is a reasonable one, particularly as there is then flexibility and proportionality in how the assessment is delivered.</p> <p>The council disagrees that the suggested content is contradictory, however for clarity a change will be</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.1 as suggested.</p> <p>The LPA would expect this to include (but not necessarily be</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>6.2 Despite initially saying, quite reasonably, that there is no set format for a PPA (5.2), the draft SPD then contradicts itself by requiring a very detailed format (5.2 – 5.5). Parking surveys are inherently time-consuming and not easy to programme into normal work schedules, making them expensive to undertake. The stated minimum requirement of three times a day (7 a.m., midday and 7 p.m.) over a five day period is excessive for small developments of, say, one or two dwellings and not appropriate for most commercial uses. Sunday surveys may be appropriate for some retail applications, for example, but most B1 uses will not create a parking demand outside the hours of 8 a.m. – 6 p.m. on Monday – Friday or 8 a.m. – 1 p.m. on Saturday. In many cases, one or at most three days of surveys tailored to suit the proposed development will yield results as useful as the five or seven days' data specified in the draft SPD (5.4). Appropriate survey times, durations and walk distances are all likely to vary, depending on the site.</p>	made.	<p>limited to) relevant and proportionate information, potentially including:</p> <p>The council suggests that if the applicant considers that an alternative approach would be appropriate, this issue should be discussed at the pre-application stage with the local planning authority and local highway authority.</p>
PG14	St Helens Parish Council	<p>The Council expressed concerns about the lack of parking provision required within Town centre Boundaries, especially within residential developments. Public transport on the Island falls short of that provided in many other towns and cities across the country therefore Islanders tend to rely on the car for transport and parking needs to be provided. Town Centre are congested at present and insufficient provision will only add to the problem.</p> <p>Residential parking guidelines in our opinion should provide more parking. New developments often have narrow roads therefore people tend to park on pavements forcing pedestrians into the highway, especially those with wheelchairs or pushchairs, it also</p>	<p>The draft document cannot in itself address any existing on-street parking issues – this is for the wider parking strategy to address.</p> <p>The focus of the document is on new development, and will contribute to a wider package of measures to address legitimate parking issues.</p> <p>The guidelines, and the zonal approach, have been proposed to</p>	<p>Changes are proposed to the Design section, that will incorporate some of the issues raised in this representation.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>looks unsightly. St Helens already has a parking problem due to old narrow lanes and lack of parking, this consultation should be an opportunity to improve local parking not add to it by insufficient provision within new developments. The Parish Council believe each area should be assessed individually to gauge the nature of parking issues within that locality, a one policy fits all approach is not appropriate in this instance. They would like to see the number of allocated residential spaces increased from a minimum of 1 to 1.5 for 1 and 2 bedroom properties and sheltered accommodation provision we believe should be increased to 1 space per dwelling, as spaces need to be provided for the residents own vehicles, those of carers and visitors and we believe 0.25 to be insufficient.</p>	<p>allow for flexibility and locally-appropriate approaches to be applied.</p> <p>Changes are proposed to the document in light of this, and other, representations relating to the provision for assisted accommodation.</p>	<p>Changes to Tables 1 &amp; 4 to ensure consistency and appropriate level of provision.</p>
PG15	Wootton Bridge Parish Council	<p>The Parish Council has considered the proposed planning document and are less than impressed with it. Unfortunately the document seems to utilise a national framework which probably works well in London, Southampton, Portsmouth and any major city with a good public transport infrastructure; however the island is very rural even in the town centres and most people who live here have a car. Due to this the proposals, especially no parking allocation in towns seems rather odd. We believe this needs to be looked at again taking into account the uniqueness of the island.</p>	<p>The approach proposed is based on previously adopted local standards, and takes into account approaches in comparable areas (such as the New Forest).</p> <p>As set out in the draft SPD, the council will expect new development in rural locations to incorporate parking provision, to reflect the need of people to travel to the main towns (and then use the public / shop parking facilities).</p> <p>If people live in towns, in walking proximity of shops and services,</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
			<p>they are less likely to want or need to use their car to make trips.</p> <p>A factor to consider is how the rise in internet shopping and home delivery services is changing shopping patterns.</p>	
PG16	Hepburns Planning Consultancy Ltd	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the new proposed Parking Provisions as Part of the New Development SPD. We understand that this will still remain as only guidance and can be discussed for each application, tailoring the provision required to the specific scheme. Much of the document is therefore fine, however a few points such as the parking guidelines in Appendix 1 are quite concerning and I shall run through the reasons why.</p> <p>I see in paragraph 2.4 that supposedly "<i>The market is best placed to decide if additional parking spaces should be provided</i>". I am not sure if this is the Government's or the Council's view, but it is an interesting point that developers do normally make an informed judgement on new housing sites as to whether their potential buyers want to be able to park off-street, which can provide a little more value to the site.</p> <p>However, it is also the case that this is not always possible due to restricted smaller sites within the settlement boundary, where larger family living accommodation is more marketable and cars are not so much of a necessity. In some Island towns, due to the cost of car ownership, many families do not own a car, or only own 1 car per household. Each location is different, sometimes dependent upon how affluent it is or how accessible to public buses and shops/services/facilities.</p>		

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>This is to some extent accepted within these paragraphs:  <i>“Development outside areas identified as Town Centre Boundaries on the Island Plan Proposals Map will be expected to provide parking provision in accordance with the guidelines set out in Appendix 1. If parking provision is proposed that is different to that set out in Appendix 1 the council will require evidence, in the form of a Parking Provision Assessment, to justify the level proposed...</i></p> <p><i>3.6 Providing the fullest level of parking provision in town centre locations may, for example, reduce significantly the amount of residential development that could be built on a site. Such development is more likely to be 1 or 2 bedroom properties that, by their nature, will be more affordable to a range of Isle of Wight residents.”</i></p> <p>It is this variety in locations and demographics which is causing some concerns for us as Planning Consultants if we are dealing with a one-size fits all parking guidelines SPD. We understand that this is negotiable, but if we end up negotiating say 50% of cases, is the policy appropriate?</p> <p>We also have concerns over the need for a PPA for any site which</p>	<p>The comment is noted, although the council would suggest that it is not a ‘one size fits all’ approach, and furthermore an appropriate level of flexibility and proportionality has been built in to the document. It is therefore considered a reasonable response to the issues associated with the provision of parking in new development and within the context of the wider Parking Strategy.</p>	<p>Comment noted and point addressed through minor changes</p> <p>See changes proposed elsewhere.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>does not meet with the requirements. Your SPD states that:</p> <p><i>“5.1 A Parking Provision Assessment (PPA) will be required in the circumstances set out in section 3 of this document, and the council expects a PPA to be proportionate to scheme it is supporting. A PPA can be used to support either no parking provision, or a different level than those set out in Appendix 1.”</i></p> <p>It then requires as a minimum a long list of evidence regarding the sustainability of the location as well as a photographic survey to be carried out:</p> <p><i>“5.4 A local photographic survey should assess on-street parking availability within a 300 metre radius of the application site. As a minimum the survey is expected to be carried out three times a day (at 7am, midday and 7pm) over a consecutive five day period, which must include a weekend. Depending on the nature and scale of the proposal a longer period of at least seven consecutive days may be appropriate.”</i></p> <p>We have successfully argued against survey requests such as this for small scale development within sustainable locations. These surveys are time-consuming and costly if you need to pay a consultant to spend hours visiting sites around the Island at different times of the day for a week. The Planning Officers and Island Roads Officers know the Island roads and have a clear idea where there are on-street parking issues, I do not see why the applicant should bear the burden of providing this evidence, especially if for example the site is within a Settlement Boundary and near to a regular bus service and shops etc. I would ask that this wording be changed to be more flexible i.e. <i>‘a photographic survey may be required for less sustainable locations’</i> and then an Officer can make a judgement at pre-app stage or early within the application process.</p>	<p>highlighted above.</p>	

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><b>Town Centre Boundaries</b></p> <p>The SPD requires that “<i>Development outside areas identified as Town Centre Boundaries on the Island Plan Proposals Map will be expected to provide parking provision in accordance with the guidelines set out in Appendix 1</i>”. Appendix 1 outlines that 1 – 2 bed properties need 1 space per unit, 3 – 4 beds need 2 spaces and 5+ beds need 3 spaces. In principle, this provision seems at a correct level, however, using Town Centre Boundaries as the trigger point is not appropriate.</p> <p>For example, looking at The Bay area on the Island Plan Core Strategy Proposals Map, you can see how small the town centre boundaries are (black dotted lines) in Sandown and Shanklin. To say that you would need 2 parking spaces for every 2/3 bedroom flat/house outside of this would be impossible.</p> <p>Perhaps a better starting point is to accept that the sites within the <b>Settlement Boundary</b> are within sustainable locations and therefore they do not have to offer the same level of parking as sites outside of the boundary. However, the Council can still ask for a PPA if they have serious concerns as is currently the case. As it stands, the SPD would require a PPA for almost all sites which is simply not practical.</p> <p>Of course there must be a definition of what parking is needed where, yet we disagree with the way this is being proposed. As far as cycle parking is concerned, we fully support encouraging the use of alternative forms of transport, yet again, I am not sure if the town centre boundary should be used to trigger this. Surely if you live in a town centre you would be more likely to use a bike to</p>	<p>The town centre boundaries have been taken as an existing proxy. There is flexibility within the document (both existing and proposed) to deal with sites on a case-by-case basis, when such ‘issues’ are identified either by the applicant, the local planning authority or the local highway authority.</p>	

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>get around and secure cycle storage would be more important than if you live in a rural area?</p> <p>I have only briefly read the non-residential parking guidance and this appears to follow the normal parking provisions guidelines. Again, I am not sure how this would work with the town centre boundary trigger, yet at least this is more relevant to retail/commercial uses located within these areas.</p> <p>Overall, we understand the pressures on the road network for on-street parking in certain locations, however, we do not agree with using the Town Centre Boundary as a trigger point. We also agree with the cycle parking provision guidelines, yet again feel that overall there needs to remain some level of judgement to be used for each individual site.</p> <p>Requiring a PPA for almost every site, with a photographic survey is unreasonable and will delay and possibly reduce sites coming forward with the ever increasing upfront costs involved in planning applications.</p>	<p>The comment is noted, although the council would suggest that it is not a 'one size fits all' approach, and furthermore an appropriate level of flexibility and proportionality has been built in to the document. It is therefore considered a reasonable response to the issues associated with the provision of parking in new development and within the context of the wider Parking Strategy.</p> <p>The council considers the requirement for a PPA is a reasonable one, particularly as there is then flexibility and proportionality in how the assessment is delivered.</p>	
PG17	Bourne Leisure	Section 1: Why a Supplementary Planning Document is required	The guidelines, whilst not forming minimum or maximum	No change required.

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>The "Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments Consultation Draft SPD" does not currently provide clarity on how the parking guidelines will be applied in relation to new development. It states at paragraph 1.6: <i>"The council recognises that the amount of parking provided through new development can have implications on surrounding areas and existing residents, particularly in more urban environments. In light of this, the document sets out the expected parking provision for motor vehicles and the minimum number of cycle parking spaces required for all use-classes as part of new development. It also sets out the council's requirements in terms of the general design and dimensions of parking provision as part of new development, as well as the infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles."</i></p> <p>This statement is unclear as to whether the guidelines will be applied only to "net additional" development or whether they would take account of current parking levels related to any existing development at, or connected with, the site in question.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the parking guidelines SPD should make it clear that the requirements only apply to "net additional" development. Otherwise, there is a risk that some new developments may become unviable and/or unachievable if they have to make up for any existing deficit in parking provision at the site when compared to the guidelines. It is recognised that in some circumstances it may be necessary for additional parking to be provided but this can be assessed by the Council on a case-by-case basis as part of the planning balance exercise undertaken during application determination.</p> <p>The Company also considers that the SPD should state that the</p>	<p>requirements, clearly set out what level of provision the council expects. As such if an applicant is proposing an alternative level of provision they are able to do so with appropriate supporting evidence.</p> <p>This approach would be applicable to any new development, and applied on a proportionate and flexible basis.</p>	
		<p>The council has deliberately not</p>		

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>Council's parking guidelines should represent the "minimum" provision, in order to provide prospective applicants with the opportunity to propose more parking spaces where appropriate, without as a matter of course having to submit a Parking Provision Assessment (PPA). This approach would help to ensure consistency with the national Planning Practice Guidance's (PPG) caution against maximum parking standards, which is also recognised within the draft SPD at paragraph 2.2. The PPG states:</p> <p><i>"Maximum parking standards can lead to poor quality development and congested streets, local planning authorities should seek to ensure parking provision is appropriate to the needs of the development and not reduced below a level that could be considered reasonable."</i> (Paragraph 008, Reference ID 42-008-2-140306).</p> <p>Bourne Leisure therefore requests that paragraph 1.2 of the draft SPD is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>"The council recognises that the amount of parking provided through new development can have implications on surrounding areas and existing residents, particularly in more urban environments. In light of this, the document sets out the expected <u>minimum</u> parking provision for motor vehicles and the minimum number of cycle parking spaces required for all use-classes as part of <u>net</u> new development. It also sets out the council's requirements in terms of the general design and dimensions of parking provision as part of new development, as well as the infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles."</i> (proposed changes underlined)</p> <p>Section 3: When will Parking Provision be Required?</p> <p>There is an inconsistency within the draft SDP regarding when a</p>	<p>sought to introduce minimum standards, instead providing applicant with guidelines and flexibility. The approach identified would contradict the aims of the SPD.</p> <p>The point is noted and changes to</p>	<p>Various changes to</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>Parking Provision Assessment (PPA) will be required for development that takes place outside the "Town Centre Boundaries" identified on the Island Plan Proposals Map. The consultation document states within the text box following paragraph 3.8: <i>"If parking provision is proposed that is different to that set out in Appendix 1 the council will require evidence, in the form of a Parking Provision Assessment, to justify the level proposed."</i></p> <p>However, the flow chart on page 11 states that a PPA will only be required if the Council disagrees with the proposed level of parking provision, even if this differs from the guidelines within the SPD.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the approach specified in the flow chart is more appropriate, since it provides flexibility for the Council to agree a different level of parking provision based on the specifics of the development proposal, without requiring the submission of a PPA. This approach is based on the PPG statement that local authorities should <i>"take a proportionate approach to the information request in support of planning applications"</i> (Paragraph: 038 Reference ID: 14-038-20140306).</p> <p>The Company therefore requests that the second sentence within the text box following paragraph 3.8 is amended as follows:</p> <p><i>"If parking provision is proposed that is different to that set out in Appendix 1 <u>and the Council disagrees with this level of provision</u>, the council will require evidence, in the form of a Parking Provision Assessment, to justify the level proposed."</i> (<u>proposed changes underlined</u>)</p>	<p>the document following this and other representations will be made.</p>	<p>the document as already outlined, including to the flowchart.</p>



Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>need for a TA should be assessed on a case-by-case basis, depending on the nature of the tourist accommodation, the likelihood that it would generate significant levels of movement, existing road capacity and public transport availability. These factors can lead to considerable variation in the levels of movement likely to be generated, indicating that it is not appropriate to apply a single threshold to all tourist-related development (including accommodation).</p> <p>If, despite this issue, the Council does at any point in the future, post-approval of the SPD, decide to propose a floorspace threshold for tourist accommodation for a requirement to provide a TA, Bourne Leisure would stress that any newly proposed threshold must be subject to consultation.</p> <p>Appendix 1: Parking Guidelines</p> <p><i>Tourist Accommodation: Car parking</i></p> <p>Table 5, Appendix 1 of the draft SPD specifies that tourist accommodation developments are expected to provide 1 car parking space per bedroom. However, it is unclear whether this provision relates only to visitor parking or whether it includes staff parking.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the SPD should recognise that staff car parking provision may also need to be considered in relation to tourist accommodation developments. The number of employees at each development will depend on the location, the type of operations and the range of facilities at the premises. It would therefore be unhelpful to specify a set requirement for staff parking.</p>	<p>The council accepts this point and</p>	<p>Amend Table 5 and</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>The Company there requests that the following sentence is added after Table 5, Appendix 1: <i>“Provision may also be made separately for staff car parking at a level to be agreed with the Council on a case-by-case basis”</i>.</p> <p><i>Tourist Accommodation: Cycle parking</i></p> <p>Table 5, Appendix 1 of the draft SPD includes the following column heading for cycle parking provision: <i>“Cycle parking provision guideline”</i>. The draft SPD states that the following cycle parking spaces/stands should be provided for tourist accommodation development (Table 5, Appendix 1):</p> <p>1 Long stay: 1 space per 6 staff or 1 space per 40sqm; and,  2 Short stay: 1 stand per 5 bedrooms.</p> <p>By comparison, the guidelines for commercial development (Table 3, Appendix 1) require:</p> <p>B1(a) Office</p> <p>1 Long stay: 1 stand per 150sqm; and,  2 Short stay: 1 stand per 500sqm.</p> <p>B1(b&amp;c) High Tech / Ligh Industry</p> <p>1 Long stay: 1 stand per 250sqm; and,  2 Short stay: 1 stand per 500sqm.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure considers that the proposed guidelines for cycle parking provision at tourist accommodation developments are not proportionate compared with other uses, e.g. for commercial</p>	<p>has proposed changes to reflect this.</p> <p>The council considers an appropriate level of provision is set out in the guidelines, reflecting its commitment to cycling and the increasing importance of cycling to the island’s visitor economy.</p>	<p>add further text.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>development. It is also unclear whether the long stay cycle stands are intended for staff and the short stay stands for visitors.</p> <p>The Company considers that the guidelines for cycle parking should depend upon specific factors for each proposed development, including its location, the availability and quality of existing cycle infrastructure and the availability of public transport facilities. These factors can have a significant impact on the need for cycle stands, indicating overall that it is not appropriate to apply a set requirement to all tourist accommodate development.</p> <p>If despite this issue, the Council does decide to include set guidelines for cycle parking provision, Bourne Leisure considers that these should be clearly labelled as guidance rather than minimum levels of provision. This would at least allow a certain level of flexibility in response to local circumstances.</p> <p>If the Council decides to take this approach, Bourne Leisure considers that the column heading for cycle parking provision in Table 5, Appendix 1 should be amended as follows: "<i>Cycle parking provision (guideline only)</i>" (proposed amendments underlined).</p> <p>However, Bourne Leisure considers that, in order to ensure that the Council's guidelines for cycle provision are proportionate to the needs of the particular development, the SPD should not include set cycle parking numbers.</p> <p>The Company therefore requests that the Council amends Table 5, Appendix 1 delete the set guidelines for cycle parking and adds the following sentence below the table: "<i>Cycle parking will be provided at a level to be agreed with the Council on a case-by-case basis, depending on the location of the development, the availability and quality of existing cycle infrastructure and the</i></p>	<p>The SPD is clearly guidance, and as such it is not considered necessary to make the suggested changes.</p>	

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<i>availability of public transport facilities".</i>		
PG18	Nettlestone & Seaview Parish Council	Both [Guidelines for Parking Provision as Part of New Developments and Guidelines for Recycling and Refuse Storage in New Developments consultation draft SPDs] were discussed by members at the recent Parish Council meeting and it was resolved to inform you that the PC notes the contents of the consultations but has no comments to make.	Noted.	No change proposed.
PG19	Newport Parish Council	Our Planning and Licensing Committee have looked at this draft SPD on two occasions and do not have any particularly strong views about what you are suggesting...so effectively that's 'no comment'!	Noted.	No change proposed.
PG20	Niton & Whitwell Parish Council	<p>At a meeting on Monday 28th November, in response to the following paragraph of the draft SPD:</p> <p><i>"To reflect their sustainable locations, development within areas identified as Town Centre Boundaries on the Island Plan Proposals Map will not be expected to provide parking provision as a matter of course, although the council recognises that in some instances applicants will wish to provide parking.</i></p> <p><i>If parking is proposed in these locations the council will require evidence, in the form of a Parking Provision Assessment, to justify the level proposed."</i></p> <p>Niton and Whitwell Parish Council resolved to submit the comment below:</p> <p>"The Parish Council objects to the proposal that new housing developments within town centres will not be expected to provide parking provision as a matter of course. The Parish Council</p>	<p>The council notes the issues raised, but would contend that the focus of the document is on new development, and will contribute to a wider package of measures to address legitimate parking issues.</p>	The design section has been bolstered, including specific

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		believes that the most likely effects of such a policy would be the obstruction of carriageways, pavements and grass verges, leading to a greatly compromised street scene and possible dangerous obstruction of emergency vehicles - with no effective enforcement regime in place to counter such problems."	The issues relating to design, road width and safety are noted, and whilst they were covered in the consultation draft, further text will be added.	reference to road width.
PG21	Ryde Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The title of the document should not include the word 'guidance' as it does not send the correct message to developers</li> <li>Page 4 – remove the words 'reliance on Newport for retail and employment opportunities' as this sends out the wrong message about sustainable transport patterns</li> <li>The use of Town Centre Boundaries as the deciding factor on whether a development is in a sustainable location is considered flawed. The Town Centre boundary of Ryde is linear and something at the top end of Melville Street is just as accessible to the town centre as the butchers at the top of the town. Therefore, a buffer of 300 metres around the Town Centre Boundary is considered to be more reflective.</li> <li>The local photographic evidence needs to be undertaken in term time and also where possible in summer time (2 periods)</li> </ul>	<p>Guidelines are considered to be the approach that strikes the most appropriate balance, in terms of the competing considerations for determining a planning application.</p> <p>The role that Newport plays, as the Island's centrally-located county town, is a relevant factor when considering the wider parking issues and strategy.</p> <p>The town centre boundaries have been taken as an existing proxy. There is flexibility within the document (both existing and proposed) to deal with sites on a case-by-case basis, when such 'issues' are identified either by the applicant, the local planning authority or the local highway authority.</p> <p>The approach proposed accords with industry standards and is</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>Text to be amended, to highlight the flexibility and reflect the different nature of the Island's town centres.</p> <p>No change proposed</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p>to reflect the difference the tourists make to parking on the island.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The IWC reference 'junctions already modelled to be approaching or exceeding capacity'. These are not readily identifiable and could be provided in the form of a website link.</li> <li>• There do not seem to be transport assessment requirements set out for the following uses, c2, c3 with a holiday restriction, hotels</li> <li>• What evidence are the LPA backing up their assessment of number of parking spaces required on – have they compared these to recent developments approved or applications currently awaiting to be determined to consider if they have got the balance right?</li> <li>• It should not be for the developer to determine the level of shared parking on site. A guide needs to be provided and then if the developer is moving away from that guide evidence needs to be provided.</li> </ul>	<p>considered to be sufficiently robust and appropriate.</p> <p>The council's most recent modelling information is available online. There may be other sources of modelling not belonging to the council that may legitimately be used to inform an approach.</p> <p>Not all uses will be identified, and the thresholds for transport assessments relate to criteria that are independent of, or restricted to, use class.</p> <p>The council has reviewed its previous standards in light of latest policy, guidance best practice and local schemes. It has also reviewed the provisions of other local authorities in the Solent area.</p> <p>The council considers the proposed approach as outlined is suitable, and in the absence of evidence to the contrary is content to proceed with the approach as consulted upon.</p>	<p>Wording and hyperlink added</p> <p>Changes to the transport assessment and transport statements criteria and thresholds.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The tables need cross referencing against recently approved developments in all sectors as there seems to be some element of copying and pasting (For example – Older persons housing (active elderly with warden control) – there seems to be no provision set aside for warden parking.</li> <li>• There seems to be no requirement for staff parking on tourism sites</li> <li>• Has the education facilities requirements been checked against recently approved schemes?</li> <li>• The document states that ‘it is important that proper consideration is given to providing spaces for disabled people’. Whilst this is welcomed there will be no enforceability of this if the requirements can be provided ‘on plot’ at the discretion of the developer with the result being that no disabled visitor spaces are provided. Therefore, a clear standard for disabled spaces should be included in the SPD.</li> <li>• The document refers to the council ‘encourages’ developers to assist with catering for future electric vehicles. However, in the document there is no fiscal incentive and there also is no absolute requirement rather a ‘encourage’. Without a direct requirement or a justification being provided why developers</li> </ul>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>The council has reviewed its previous standards in light of latest policy, guidance best practice and local schemes. It has also reviewed the provisions of other local authorities in the Solent area.</p> <p>The whole document is predicated on the principle of being guidelines. Even if there was a clear standard, it could not be required through planning legislation and as identified it would be at the discretion of the developer to provide.</p> <p>Noted, but an SPD cannot introduce new policy requirements, and therefore it sets out the council’s preferred approach that it would encourage, from a planning perspective.</p>	<p>Table 4 has been updated to address this issue.</p> <p>Table 4 has been updated to address this issue.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		cannot provide this will not be delivered and therefore is meaningless		
PG22	Gurnard Parish Council	<p><b>Any new developments</b></p> <p><b>For residential housing must include:</b></p> <p>One parking space for any bedsit, one or two bedroomed property</p> <p>Two parking spaces for any three or four bedroomed property</p> <p>Three parking spaces for any five plus bedroomed property</p> <p><b>For Tourist accommodation must provide</b></p> <p>One parking space per bedroom</p> <p><b>School/playgroup/child care or nursery provision must provide</b></p> <p>1.5 parking spaces for all full time equivalent members of staff</p> <p>There is also provision for both short stay and long stay parking in town centres</p> <p>Cycle parking is also a consideration – with long term parking having to be under cover</p> <p>Councillors felt that these recommendations would have a good</p>	<p>The guidelines in the document are there to guide discussion and are not minimums or maximums. The proposed provisions are considered reasonable, and the policy approach has sufficient flexibility.</p> <p>This is the provision that is set out in the guidelines document, and as such is what will be expected.</p> <p>See comment above.</p>	<p>No change proposed.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		effect on Gurnard.		
PG23	Northwood Parish Council	Northwood Parish Council, being aware that cars nowadays were being made larger, suggested that an examination of the actual size of car parking space required to ensure easy ingress and egress from the vehicles should be investigated to ensure that the parking provision as part of any new developments be fit for purpose, including those spaces specifically designed for use by the disabled.	The council notes this point and, in specific relation to disabled bays, paragraph A1.10 provides commentary relating to the dimensions. The design section also signposts to a number of other documents, such as Manual for Streets, which include information on parking bay dimensions.	No change required
PG24	Cowes Town Council	<p><b>PARKING PROVISIONS Draft Development Screening Statement</b></p> <p>1. The principles set out are adequate; however, an overburdening factor, not mentioned at any stage, is vehicle parking affordability. Here one refers to car parking charges at council owned/managed public car parks/spaces. Such is an important governing factor in the provision of any parking facility. Albeit it may not be considered as pertinent to an Environmental Screening Statement, it is an important factor when the traveller has a choice of parking facility. Furthermore, the choice of transport is oft dictated by the cost of travel and, if using their own conveyance, the cost of parking can be a determining factor; thus having an effect as regards to the parking provisions.</p> <p><b>PARKING PROVISION Supplementary Planning Document.</b></p> <p><b>1. Item 1.7</b> - To select only Newport for reliance for retail and employment opportunities is not equitable. This should not be singularly selective and, if any reference is made at all, then it should refer to "major towns".</p>	The role that Newport plays, as the Island's centrally-located county town, is a relevant factor when considering the wider parking issues and strategy.	No change required.

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><b>2. Item 2.5</b> - This is wholly supported and one would expect this to be a primary criteria.</p> <p><b>3. Item 3.2 and 3.7</b> - Justification as to why parking is proposed should not be a governing factor. Parking provision within TCBS should lie with the applicant; however, such parking could be subject to public use when not being utilised, or under utilised, by the land owner.</p> <p><b>4. Item 4.2</b> - Cycle parking should not be mandatory where new out of town residential development sites are concerned. Cyclists residing on such developments will ensure their own 'safe-keep' parking arrangements at their property, whereas bicycling visitors will be provided with such by whom they visit. <b>Item 6</b> of this section should be governed by usage, viz a vis, the requirement needs to be determined by the level of cycling employees. In this regard a criteria needs to be set.</p> <p><b>5. Item 4.5 and 4.6</b> - Not considered necessary to provide but subject to identifying needs on a site specific basis as set out in <b>5.3</b>. The provision of under cover/enclosed parking is not deemed necessary on residential developments.</p> <p><b>6. Item 5.4 and 5.5</b> - This is subjective and evidential photography would be at the discretion of the applicant thus leading to possible opportunistic timing of photographic events.</p>	<p>The proposed approach is to work with the applicant, using the guidelines as the starting place for any discussion. It will be for the applicant to decide how to use their land.</p> <p>The council considers an appropriate level of provision is set out in the guidelines, reflecting its commitment to cycling and the increasing importance of cycling to the island's visitor economy.</p> <p>The onus is on the applicant to provide sufficiently robust evidence to support their proposal. The proposed approach is intended to strike a balance between being reasonable and ensuring an accurate</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><b>7. Item 6</b> - Transport Assessment: "Residential" needs to be less, possibly 15 units. Any assessment of parking needs has to be site specific, therefore at the Pre-App stage there needs to be a pre-determination as to site specific requirements. It's essential for the applicant to have such an early requirement in order to best determine his submission.</p> <p><b>8. Item A1. 1 &amp; 2</b> - Parking spaces need to be allocated on a householder basis where there is a designated parking area. Any shared communal parking requirements needs to be determined at a Pre-App stage.</p> <p><b>9. Appendix 1</b> - We suggest, <b>Table 1</b> - 2 bed units = 2 car spaces, 4 bed units = 3 car spaces and Sheltered = 0.35. This is based on the increasing number of car owners which is not determined wholly on social and economic principles. In Table 3 B1 - Office space needs to be 1 space per 40m<sup>2</sup> and 1 cycle stand per 100m<sup>2</sup>. However, such needs to be determined on a site specific basis.</p> <p><b>Table 4</b> - needs to be 6 spaces per outpatient.</p>	<p>assessment is undertaken.</p> <p>In light of the consultation responses the council has amended its approach and introduced a further transport survey requirement with different triggers.</p> <p>The council will engage with the applicant over parking provision, based on the guidelines in the SPD but it is not the role of the LPA to instruct how provision should be made.</p> <p>The link between sheltered accommodation provision in this table and table has been made clearer, with a consistent approach. The guidelines in the document are there to guide discussion and are not minimums or maximums. See previous comments regarding cycle parking provision.</p> <p>In the absence of information to support this, it is difficult to support this proposed change. However, a number of changes have been made to table 4 in light of other</p>	<p>Changes to section 6 proposed.</p> <p>No change required.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p> <p>A number of changes have been made to table 4.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's response to the comments	Changes to the SPD
		<p><b>10. A1.9 - Table 8:</b> Must be determined by location.</p> <p><b>Further comment</b> 1. Parking bay sizes must reflect the increased size of cars. In this regard there needs to be a set criteria.</p>	<p>representations received.</p> <p>It is unclear from the representation why location should be considered.</p> <p>The design section signposts to a number of other documents, such as Manual for Streets, which include information on parking bay dimensions.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>No change required.</p>
PG25	Environment Agency	<p>Having reviewed the document we are happy with the content and have no specific comments to make with regards to the policies. However, we would like to take this opportunity to provide you with some general comments for you to consider for new car parks being located within areas subject to flooding. AS you will be aware, vehicles can become serious hazards during times of significant flooding We would suggest that this advice could be reflected within the supporting text within the Design chapter.</p> <p>Car parking may be appropriate in areas subject to flooding, provided flood warning is available and signs are in place. Car parks should ideally not be subject to flood depths in excess of 300mm depth since vehicles can be moved by water of this depth. Car parks located in areas that flood to greater depths should be designed to prevent vehicles floating out of the car park (at Boscastle in August 2004, vehicles floated out of the car park and contributed to the obstruction of bridge openings).</p> <p>When considering car parking within flood risk areas, the ability of</p>	<p>It is noted that no specific comments are made.</p> <p>The advice is noted, and a paragraph will be added to the Design section to reflect this.</p>	<p>No change required.</p> <p>Additional paragraph in the Design section to reflect this.</p>

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		<p>people to move their cars within the flood warning time should be considered. Long-term and residential car parking is unlikely to be acceptable in areas which regularly flood to a significant depth, due to the risk of car owners being away from the area and being unable to move their cars when a flood occurs. Like other forms of development, flood risk should be avoided if possible. If this is not feasible, the FRA should detail how the design makes the car park safe.</p>		
PG26	Historic England	<p>Having considered the draft SPDs and the Council's screening opinions, we concur with the Council that neither SPD is likely to have significant (historic) environmental effects and we therefore consider that neither SPD need be subject to strategic environmental assessment.</p>		No change required.
PG27	Natural England	<p>Whilst we welcome this opportunity to give our views, the topic of the Supplementary Planning Document does not appear to relate to our interests to any significant extent. We therefore do not wish to comment.</p> <p>Should the plan be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment, then, please consult Natural England again.</p> <p>Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment</p> <p>A SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment only in exceptional circumstances as set out in the Planning Practice Guidance here. While SPDs are unlikely to give rise to likely significant effects on European Sites, they should be considered as a plan under the Habitats Regulations in the same way as any other plan or project. If your SPD requires a Strategic Environmental Assessment or Habitats Regulation Assessment, you are required to consult us at certain stages as set out in the</p>		No change required.

Ref	Respondent	Comments which were made during the consultation	The Isle of Wight Council's Changes to the SPD response to the comments	
		Planning Practice Guidance.		

## Appendix 4

Deletions are shown with a ~~strikethrough~~ and additions are underlined.

Doc. Ref.	Change	Reason
Front Cover	<del>Consultation Draft</del>	Consequential update
Front Cover	<del>November 2016</del> <u>Adopted January 2017</u>	Consequential update
All pages header	<del>November 2016</del> <u>Adopted January 2017</u>	Consequential update
Para numbers	Renumber, where necessary	Consequential update
Page 2	Delete page content	Consequential update – it provided information on the consultation
Para 1.6	It also <u>signposts other sources of information</u> <del>sets out the council's requirements in relation to terms of the</del> general design and dimensions of parking provision as part of new development, as well as the infrastructure requirements for electric vehicles.	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
New para 3.2	<u>The council accepts that, as encouraged by national Government guidance and best practice, a reasonable and proportionate response is required. As such, this document has been written in a way to allow a reasonable degree of flexibility and proportionality for proposals on a case by case basis, rather than adopting a 'one size fits all' approach.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Page 6 text box	<b><u>ZONE 1 – WITHIN IDENTIFIED TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES</u></b>  <i>Some existing text has been underlined to emphasise.</i>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 8	Further information regarding what information is expected to be included in a Parking Provision Assessment is set out in section 5 of this document. <u>The council will take a proportionate view on a case-by-case basis, and may consider alternatives forms of evidence and justification to allow an informed assessment to be made.</u>	
Page 7 text box	<b><u>ZONE 2 – OUTSIDE OF IDENTIFIED TOWN CENTRE BOUNDARIES</u></b>  <i>Some existing text has been underlined to emphasise.</i>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation

Para 3.9	...is generally those out_of_town locations where access to public transport and travel on foot, <u>or bicycle may not be an option and in. In such situations</u> reducing the number...	For clarity
New para following 3.9	<u>There may instances when the local planning authority, or the local highways authority, consider that factors such as the 'planning balance' of the proposal, the weight attached to other policies and local context (such as street layouts and existing parking provision) mean that an alternative level of provision should be utilised, and/or evidence is required. Such a position will be established on a case-by-case basis.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 4.1	...well located safe and <del>the provision of</del> secure cycle...	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 5.1	<u>The council requires evidence and justification to support any departure from the guidelines set out in this document, with a A Parking Provision Assessment (PPA) being the preferred evidence. As such a PPA will be required in the circumstances set out in section 3 of this document, and</u> <del>the</del> council expects...	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
New para 5.2	<u>The onus will be on the applicant to provide sufficient and appropriate evidence to allow for an informed assessment to undertaken. The council will take a proportionate approach towards the level of evidence required, and would expect it to be commensurate to the proposal. Establishing the type and level of information required will be undertaken on a case-by-case basis. The council encourages the use of pre-application advice should discussion regarding this matter be required.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
New para 5.7	<u>A local photographic survey may be used to highlight the location and quality of existing sustainable transport links, or access to facilities and services. It may also be used to identify any barriers to accessibility and opportunities for improvement.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Heading, page 10	<b>6. Transport Assessments <u>and Statements</u></b>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation

<p>Para 6.1</p>	<p>As set out in the NPPF “<i>all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment (TA)</i>”. Further guidance is available in the PPG regarding <a href="#">TAs and decision-taking</a>, and it also highlights links between parking provision and TAs. The <a href="#">guidance</a> includes information on when a TAs is required, how should the need for and scope of a TA be established, what information should be included in TAs.</p> <p>Paragraph 32 of the NPPF states that all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment. Plans and decisions should take account of whether:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <u>the opportunities for sustainable transport modes have been taken up depending on the nature and location of the site, to reduce the need for major transport infrastructure;</u></li> <li>• <u>safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all people; and</u></li> <li>• <u>improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively limit the significant impacts of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe.</u></li> </ul>	<p>For clarity, following points raised in the consultation</p>
<p>Para 6.2</p>	<p><del>To assist the development process and to give greater clarity on when the council will expect a TA to be submitted, the council has identified when a TA will be required thresholds which if exceeded will generally trigger the need for a TA to be submitted.</del></p> <p>There is further comprehensive information available in <a href="#">paragraphs 42-013-20140306 to 42-015-20140306</a> of the planning practice guidance, relating to when assessments and statements are required, establishing their need and scope and what information should be included. The council strongly advises applicants to read this information, as this is the basis for the council’s decision making.</p>	<p>For clarity, following points raised in the consultation</p>
<p>Para 6.3</p>	<p><u>The council accepts that a transport assessment can be a disproportionate and costly requirement, depending on the nature and scale of development proposed. As such the council will utilise an approach that allows for either a transport assessment or statement as a ‘lighter touch’. The indicative thresholds for these are set out below.</u></p>	<p>For clarity, following points raised in the consultation</p>

Para 6.4	<p><u>The submission of a fit for purpose transport assessment or statement will aid the local planning and highway authorities understand and assess the likely impacts arising from the proposed development. They should enable the local planning authority to establish whether the residual transport impacts of a proposed development are likely to be “severe”, which may be a reason for refusal, in accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 6.5	<p><u>The Transport Assessment or Transport Statement may propose mitigation measures where these are necessary to avoid unacceptable or “severe” impacts.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 6.6	<p><u>The council’s most recent highways modelling, the <a href="#">Isle of Wight - 2027 Local Plan Transport Impacts</a>, is available online. This was undertaken by Solent Transport using the sub-regional transport model.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Text box page 11	<p><b><u>Transport Assessments</u></b></p> <p><b>The council will expect a Transport Assessment to be submitted when development is likely to:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• generate a significant (<u>which is likely to be a 5%+</u>) increase in movements; or</li> <li>• impact significantly upon junctions already modelled to be approaching, at or exceeding capacity; or</li> <li>• be located near junctions where there are geometric deficiencies or recorded traffic incidents;<del>or.</del></li> </ul> <p><u>There may be instances when proposals do not meet the criteria above, but the local planning authority or highway authority may consider a Transport Assessment will be necessary to determine a planning application.</u></p> <p><u>If this is the case the applicant will be advised at the earliest possible point in the application process (and ideally at the pre-application advice stage) and be given clear reasons why the assessment is considered necessary.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation

Text box page 11	<p><b><u>Transport Statements</u></b></p> <p><b><u>The council will expect a Transport Statement to be submitted when development exceeds the thresholds set out below:</u></b></p> <table data-bbox="593 384 1176 523"> <tr> <td><b>Residential (C3)</b></td> <td><b>20 units</b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Commercial (B1 &amp; B2)</b></td> <td><b>2,500m<sup>2</sup></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Commercial (B8)</b></td> <td><b>5,000m<sup>2</sup></b></td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Miscellaneous commercial</b></td> <td><b>500m<sup>2</sup></b></td> </tr> </table>	<b>Residential (C3)</b>	<b>20 units</b>	<b>Commercial (B1 &amp; B2)</b>	<b>2,500m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Commercial (B8)</b>	<b>5,000m<sup>2</sup></b>	<b>Miscellaneous commercial</b>	<b>500m<sup>2</sup></b>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
<b>Residential (C3)</b>	<b>20 units</b>									
<b>Commercial (B1 &amp; B2)</b>	<b>2,500m<sup>2</sup></b>									
<b>Commercial (B8)</b>	<b>5,000m<sup>2</sup></b>									
<b>Miscellaneous commercial</b>	<b>500m<sup>2</sup></b>									
Para 7.2 (new)	<p><u>The council recognises that whilst the provision of parking may be a functional, or market-led requirement, the amount, location, arrangement and design of such spaces can have both positive and negative implications with regard to the accessibility and quality of spaces/places that are created. Consideration should be given to factors such as site constraints, the established character or context of an area, and the desire to achieve high quality places where people wish to live, work, or enjoy.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation								
Para 7.3 (new)	<p><u>The council accepts that there are numerous design considerations with regard to new development of all scales, and does not wish to diminish the role of skilled designers or applicants to tailor their schemes and as such does want to be prescriptive in relation to the design of new schemes. In this regard the council would expect that issues relating to parking provision should dovetail with the requirements of policy DM2 (Design Quality for New Development) of the Island Plan <a href="#">Core Strategy</a>. However, it does <del>The council will</del> expect all parking provision to be provided in conformity with the standards set out in the <a href="#">Manual for Streets</a> and <a href="#">Manual for Streets 2</a>, unless an alternative approach can be justified and is acceptable.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation								
Para 7.4 (new)	<p><u>Applicants are also advised to refer to the <a href="#">Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation guidance note on residential parking</a> and the <a href="#">Space to Park tool kit</a>, along with any other up-to-date guidance and best practice.</u></p>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation								

Para 7.5 (new)	<u>Where development proposals are for major development the council will expect applicants to ensure streets are designed in a forward looking way, considering the opportunity for the provision of parking solutions and to allow for buses and larger vehicles to move without impediment. Consideration should also be given to changing living, working and travel behaviours and patterns, and the dimensions of vehicles.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 7.6 (new)	Car parks located in areas that flood to depths greater than 300mm should be designed to prevent vehicles floating out of the car park. When considering car parking within flood risk areas, the ability of people to move their cars within the flood warning time should be considered. Long-term and residential car parking is unlikely to be acceptable in areas which regularly flood to a significant depth, due to the risk of car owners being away from the area and being unable to move their cars when a flood occurs. Like other forms of development, flood risk should be avoided if possible. If this is not feasible, the FRA should detail how the design makes the car park safe.	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Para 7.7 (new)	<u>In considering the design elements of proposals, the council will make a judgement balancing the policy and guidance context, best practice and the location, scale and nature of the proposal.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Flowchart	<i>Flowchart amended</i>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
A1.3 (new)	<u>When the total number spaces identified through the guidelines do not total a whole number, it should be rounded up to the next whole number.</u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Following Table 1	<u><i>For further requirements relating to sheltered accommodation please see Table 4.</i></u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Table 4	Family Centres ± <u>0.5 spaces</u> per 2 FTE, ± <u>0.5 spaces</u> per 2 clients	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Table 4	<i>Older people's housing: Active elderly with warden control</i> ± <u>0.25 spaces</u> per unit and <u>0.25 visitor/staff spaces</u> per 2 clients	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Table 4	<i>Older people's housing: Nursing and rest homes</i> ± <u>0.25 spaces</u> per 4 residents and 1 space per FTE	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Table 5	1 space per <u>visitor</u> bedroom	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation

Table 5	1 space per 6 <del>staff</del> <u>bedrooms</u> or 1 space per 40m <sup>2</sup>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation
Following Table 5	<u><i>The council will consider the provision for staff car parking and cycle parking associated with tourist accommodation on a case-by-case basis. Applicants should engage with the council at the earliest opportunity in the application process.</i></u>	For clarity, following points raised in the consultation

# Appendix 5

The following table sets out the consultation undertaken by the council that informed the preparation of the draft SPD.

Who was consulted?	Summary of issue(s) raised	How addressed in the draft SPD
<p>Elected Members, Contract Management Team, Commercial Services, Parking Operations, Recreation and Public Spaces, and Island Roads</p>	<p>Earlier versions of the document were circulated internally to elected members and officers for comment.</p> <p>Comments received covered:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-the merits or otherwise of standards versus guidelines.</li> <li>-Principle of not requiring parking provision within town centre boundaries as a matter of course for all development.</li> <li>-The role and content of planning provision assessments.</li> <li>-The provision of facilities to support and encourage cycling (and other activities such as running).</li> <li>-The role and content of transport assessments.</li> </ul> <p>-parking arrangements on unclassified roads</p>	<p>A number of changes were made, where appropriate, to the draft SPD, to reflect the comments made.</p>