



Woking Local Development Framework
Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document
Statement of issues raised during consultation
July 2006

1.0 Introduction

In February and March 2006 the Council consulted stakeholders and the community on its Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document. This consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulation 17 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

The Draft Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document was sent to 209 consultation bodies. Responses were received through written representations.

2.0 Consultation results

Nine representations were received from the following; statutory consultees (4), representatives from the development industry (2) and residents associations (3). The comments received and the Council response can be found in Appendix 1 to this report.

3.0 Main issues raised

Due to the low number of representations received, there were no common issues identified. The following issues were raised;

- Not good practice to permanently fix the level of car parking based on staff travel plans and car clubs when their continued existence cannot be guaranteed.
- The SPD should provide for greater flexibility in the imposition of the standards to encourage appropriate development to come forward. The provision of parking should be appropriate to the development proposed and compatible with the local area and highway network.
- Transport sustainability is not mentioned in either of the Sustainability Appraisals.
- 1.5 car spaces per bedroom for hotels and motels is considered too high.
- Aren't former 'Special Industrial Use Classes' B3 - B7 all now encompassed in the B2 use class?
- Update A3 to accord with 2005 Use Classes Order, i.e. should be A4 pubs/wine bars and A5 fast food take away.
- High Accessibility Zone - agree 50% reduction in principle, but concern that zone is too generalised and no explanation has been included in justifying the 1250m radius/catchment zone from Woking Station.
- C3 Dwelling houses - 1.5 per dwelling average will need to be reviewed to take account of draft PPS3
- A5 Hot/fast food takeaway - no Surrey County Council standard

4.0 How the issues have been addressed

Some of the comments received were in support of the standards, and others were objections but not agreed with and therefore no amendments were made as a result of these comments. Some of the comments received resulted in minor amendments to the standards, but the only significant change to the standards was regarding the definition of the High Accessibility Area. This has been altered from 1250m 'as the crow flies' from Woking Station, to 1250m walking distance along footpaths and pedestrian walkways. The comments received and the Council response can be found in Appendix 1 to this report.

Schedule of Representations – Appendix 1

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
Mayford Village Society	Support	We have read the report and feel that Woking Borough Council is taking all necessary steps to improve transport and parking facilities within the Borough. We find the report acceptable, and thank you for consulting with us.	No response required.
Byfleet, West Byfleet and Pyrford Residents Assoc	Object	On the subject of para 2.2 page 4. We consider the last sentence beginning 'Staff Travel Plans' should be deleted. In our opinion, to permanently fix the level of parking, based on a Staff Travel Plan or car club, the continuing existence of which cannot be guaranteed, is not a good policy.	Travel Plans are a well established method of demand management and an approach recommended by national, regional and county Government. It would therefore be inappropriate to delete reference to this in the SPD.
GOSE	Support	We note that the document is consistent with national and regional planning policies and is clearly cross-reference to the saved Policy MV9 in Local Plan, which it would supplement.	No response required.
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership - London	Object	Object para 1.9 Para 1.9 states that the council in assessing development proposals as a whole will expect the standards to be followed. The SPD should provide for greater	Draft PPS3 allows local planning authorities greater flexibility in setting parking standards appropriate to the local area. Woking's standards are based on extensive research of the local area, as described in Annex 4. It is felt that the proposed standards do allow for flexibility by virtue of the fact

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
		<p>flexibility in the imposition of the standards to encourage appropriate development to come forward. The provision of parking should be appropriate to the development proposed and compatible with the local area and highway network. Recognition should be given to the guidance in PPS3 that advises Councils to introduce flexibility in the application of standards.</p> <p>The document should be amended to reflect the above.</p>	<p>that they are maximums and developers may therefore seek to apply lower standards and that for residential applications below 20 units, the SPD states that the standards are advisory.</p>
Highways Agency	Support	<p>The HA considers that parking provision can be one of the key 'tools' by which trip demand can be managed, A package of integrated measures, including parking, could form part of an overall travel management strategy for the Borough to reduce demand and the need to travel in accordance with PPG13.</p> <p>The HA is pleased to see a commitment from the Borough Council to restricting parking for new developments and the level of parking on and off street to provide reassurance that the Council are committed to developing a sustainable growth area in Woking Town Centre.</p> <p>The HA is strongly supportive of policies</p>	No response required.

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
		that will require developers to mitigate against any impact that may be caused as a result of developments. After every effort has been made to reduce demand through sustainable initiatives. As part of this process, the HA would recommend that the impacts on the trunk road network are given specific consideration.	
	Object	The HA notes that transport sustainability is not mentioned in either of the Sustainability Appraisals. We would expect that transport issues would form a key consideration in the assessment of options as they emerge for consideration.	It is noted in Table 2 of the SAR that the SPD seeks to support transport sustainability, but that there is no direct correlation between restricting parking and meeting the criteria in SA Objective 20 which seeks to increase access to public transport and deliver jobs, services and homes where they can be accessed easily by public transport. Nevertheless, frequent references are made in the SAR to transport sustainability issues where they are considered relevant. The Non Technical Summary section of the SAR, for example, notes the transport sustainability benefits of the SPD at page 5. Further explanation of this is provided in Annex 3.
Bisley Parish Council	Support	The parish council agrees with this document. We don't think that it is very relevant to us other than the bus frequencies to Woking and car parking in Woking which has been noted in this	Park and Ride schemes are being considered through the Core Strategy DPD.

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
		preferred option. Bus frequencies are adequate but could be improved. Park and Ride is something that should certainly be considered.	
SEERA	Support	We support the production of the SPDs to provide detailed guidance on this issue, and consider that the document is in general conformity with the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS).	No response required.
Surrey County Council	Support	This complies with the general principles of Structure Plan Policy DN3 (parking provision) and the parking strategy for Surrey.	No response required.
		P6: A5 Hot/fast food takeaway - no SCC standard	The Council will apply the same standard to A4 and A5 uses as to A3.
		P7: B2 General industrial - SCC standard 1:30. on grounds PP not need for c/u to B1, also 1:30, unless conditioned to B2 only when 1:50 OK	The proposed standards are maximums and so this comment is not applicable.
		P8: C3 Dwelling houses - 1.5 per dwelling average will need to be reviewed to take account of draft PPS3.	Draft PPS3 allows local planning authorities greater flexibility in setting parking standards appropriate to the local area. Woking's standards are based on extensive research of the local area, as described in Annex 4.
		P10: High Accessibility Zone - agree 50% reduction in principle, but concern that zone is too generalised and no explanation has been included in justifying the 1250m radius/catchment	The HAZ was defined based on 1250m being considered a reasonable walking distance to and from a major station. This was described in the reports that went through the Council's decision

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
		zone from Woking Station. Pockets of land not having good access by public transport, cycling or walking should be identified, Accessibility mapping available from SCC would aid in identifying such areas.	making process, but omitted from the SPD. This has now been rectified.
		P12 Cycle parking standards - accord with Parking Strategy for Surrey, but aren't former 'Special Industrial Use Classes' B3 - B7 all now encompassed in the B2 use class? Update A3 to accord with 2005 Use Classes Order, i.e. should be A4 pubs/wine bars and A5 fast food take away.	Noted. These points have been clarified in the relevant tables in the SPD.
Woking Chamber	Object	<p>age 12 Educational (D1) Primary Schools</p> <p>We cannot see the logic of 1 space per 10 staff and 1 space per 20 students. Having a daughter that teaches in a local primary school she leaves early and gets home late and has much work to transport between home and school. This would make car share impossible. The same applies to secondary schools.</p> <p>Page 8 Day Nurseries/Creches</p> <p>Seems to have a better allocation than the schools with 0.75 per member of staff and 0.2 spaces per child</p>	This is a misinterpretation of the schedule. This comment refers to cycle standards not car parking standards.

Consultee	Type of Comment	Representation	Council Response
		Page 7 Hotels and Motels Suggests 1.5 car spaces per bedroom, which is probably too high.	The explanation for this higher standard can be found in the schedule on p. 7.