

Stevenage Borough Council

Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (2020)

Consultation Statement

18 February 2020 – 22 March 2020



1. Introduction

This document has been prepared to show how the requirements of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 were adhered to during the production and adoption of the Stevenage Borough Council Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (2020).

The SPD will be a material consideration in planning decisions and the purpose of the SPD is to give further guidance and clarity regarding policies SP6, IT5 and IT6 of the adopted Stevenage Local Plan.

2. Town and Country Planning Regulations

The SPD has been produced in accordance with Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The most relevant regulations relating to the process are as follows:

- Regulation 12: Regulation 12(a) requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before adoption of the SPD, this must set out who was consulted, a summary of the issues raised, and how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD.
- Regulation 12(b) requires the Council to publish the documents for a minimum 4 week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received and identify the address to which responses should be sent.
- Regulation 35: Regulation 12 states that when seeking representations on an SPD, documents must be available in accordance with Regulation 35. This requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps;
 - Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
 - Publish the document on the Council's website

3. Details of consultation

Following approval at a meeting of the SBC Executive, consultation was undertaken on the Draft Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD for a period of over four weeks, from 18 February 2020 to 22 March 2020. Consultation was undertaken in line with the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. Consultees who have previously signed up to the planning consultation list were contacted by email, or by post where no email address had been provided.

The consultation was also advertised on the Council's website home page, Planning Policy pages, and on social media. A hard copy of the consultation document was available at the Council offices, in the Customer Service Centre and in the town's two libraries.

Representations were submitted on the Council's planning consultation portal, Objective (<https://stevenage-consult.objective.co.uk/portal/>), or were sent via email to Planning.Policy@Stevenage.gov.uk.

4. Who was consulted?

A list of consultees is provided in Appendix 1.

5. What were the main issues raised during the consultation?

The main topics raised during the consultation were:

- Amend the edges of Accessibility Zones as carriageways aren't always the most appropriate distinction between levels of accessibility
- Supportive of promoting cycling and Electric Vehicles
- The level of Electric Vehicle charging points should be increased
- Parking requirements should be different for houses and for flats
- Overspill parking will continue to be an issue
- Parking enforcement is an issue
- If the Council wants to force people not to drive, we should remove/reduce parking spaces
- Banning white van drivers from parking in residential areas would ease parking stresses
- Visitor parking requirements should be reduced
- How should EV charging points be split in developments with allocated and unallocated parking?
- Take account of new Use Class legislation

6. How has the Council responded to these issues and what changes has the Council made to the SPD document as a result?

The main concepts and principles of the Draft SPD have been maintained and brought forward into the adopted version of the SPD. However, a number of minor amendments have been made to take account of respondents' comments.

A complete schedule of consultation responses, the Council's response to the comments and any changes made to the SPD as a result are provided overleaf:

| Name/Organisation | Comment ID | Paragraph | Comments: | SBC Response | SPD Amendment |
|--|------------|-----------|--|---|--|
| JA England | PPST1 | 2.8 | As garages are converted into living areas owners are required to ensure that parking spaces are available elsewhere, and as a result they are paving over front gardens. This is also being done where parking is not available close enough to properties. But paving over gardens that are designed to absorb rain water are leading to more local flooding on roads and around properties. How are you going to address this - will you place restrictions on existing green area being paved over, will you provide additional rain water drainage solutions or is there some other way the risk will be mitigated? | This is outside of the scope of the SPD. Loss of garages will only be permitted where re-provision of the lost parking spaces is provided within the curtilages of the house. This would be part permitted by planning application, and as part of a planning application, drainage would have to be assessed and have to be considered acceptable by the Lead Local Flood Authority. | No changes necessary |
| Xavier Preston, Growth and Infrastructure Unit, Hertfordshire County Council | PPST2 | 1.24 | Electric vehicles are still part of the congestion issues careful consideration should be given to any parking provision which encourages electric vehicle car use to ensure its does not facilitate like for like swap from fuel vehicles therefore offering no incentive to change to other modes. | Comment noted. The promotion of Electric Vehicles is for the environmental benefit (namely reduced CO2 emissions and improved air quality) as a replacement for traditional motor vehicles. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST3 | 1.30 | Paragraph 106 of the NPPF states that "Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network...". The draft SBC guidance quotes this, but in section 1.30 states "The parking standards expressed in this document are maximum levels", why has this approach has been taken, in the light of NPPF advice? | The approach to set maximum levels has been taken due to the importance placed on promoting a modal shift in transportation-use, identified in the Local Plan and supporting evidence-base. The Council believes there is sufficient need to set maximum levels as one of a number of methods to promote the use of other forms of viable transportation to ensure that growth can occur within Stevenage without causing unacceptable impacts on the Stevenage Highways network. | Additional explanation in paragraph 1.30 |

| | | | | | |
|--|-------|---------|--|--|--|
| | PPST4 | 2.1 | Actual car ownership levels are on the basis of Census 2011 statistics – which are now very out of date. Is there more up to date car ownership statistics that can be used – perhaps consider using HCC’s County Travel Survey (2018) to support this? Is there scope for dynamic change to development levels when new evidence of actual ownership statistics is forthcoming? | The Council believes the Census statistics are the most complete and robust dataset with regards to car ownership levels and using them provides a consistent approach to historic parking provision requirements. Rather than use less robust data, it is intended that when the next Census data is published, the data will be reviewed and if a review of this SPD is considered important based on findings of the new Census data, it will be reviewed. SPD review processes do not take as much time as DPD reviews so a review of the SPD could be undertaken relatively promptly. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST5 | 2.4 | This paragraph states there is an obvious difference in car ownership between dwelling type - is this the case at super output areas? | We have not looked at super output areas in this analysis of available Census data. We have provided a consistent approach by focussing on bedrooms and dwelling types with a geographic context provided by defining Accessibility Zones. Super Output Areas could be assessed following the publication of the next Census data and incorporated into a review then, if considered necessary. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST6 | Table 3 | Why have standards which go above the actual Census 2011 statistics – with the adoption of LTP4, lower parking levels should be sought. What are the actual parking levels within the zoned areas e.g. has there been more detailed ‘super-output’ Census assessments, or are the Census assessments just generally for the whole of Stevenage? | The Census assessments cover the whole of Stevenage. Whilst the standards go over the levels of the Census 2011 statistics, anecdotally, car ownership is thought and has been seen to have increased | No changes necessary |
| | PPST7 | 2.24 | “As an alternative...[developers will be encouraged to provide car-share schemes]”. This could be in addition to the measures stated in the preceding paragraph in some circumstances, rather than an either/or scenario? | Agreed. | Minor rewording to ensure this could be an additional approach, not an either/or scenario. |
| | PPST8 | 2.37 | How has this statement been decided? | This was originally carried forward from the existing SPD but due to consultee feedback, has been reduced in the final SPD. | Minor rewording to reduce the level of visitor parking. |
| | PPST9 | Table 5 | How have these figures been derived? | These percentage reductions have been carried forward from the existing SPD. | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------------------|---|--|----------------------|
| | PPST10 | 3.10-3.11 | As noted in 3.11 travel patterns are established from the outset therefore would not support phased removal. Travel options and how to ensure good travel patterns can be developed from the outset and should be discussed during the planning phase and implemented from occupation of the site. More emphasis should be placed on the alternatives through the Travel Plan and provisions of the S106 agreements. | Noted. Travels Plans and Travel Assessments and the thresholds for their requirement are discussed later in the SPD | No changes necessary |
| | PPST11 | 3.15 | HCC would request the Enhanced Partnership is party to any further discussions around development. Depending upon the location of the chosen site cycle parking/interchange should also be considered. | Noted. Any plans for a Park and Ride facility would need to be fully considered by all stakeholders and the input of the Enhanced Partnership would be welcomed. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST12 | 4.6, 4.9, 4.11&4.12 | Car free developments are to be considered (2.21) but this section discusses funding by developers of new car parking structures (4.10). Is it foreseen that town centre developments will require increased parking levels. This is the location where low car ownership should be promoted with increased accessibility to facilities/services and promotion of alternatives modes be a requirement of any development proposals within the area. | It is unlikely that town centre developments will necessitate new parking premises however the SPD needs to clarify the process of requesting financial contributions in case a development proposal does come forward where the existing parking levels are not sufficient to meet the needs of that development. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST13 | 4.18 | Car sharing is supported as a mode, but careful consideration needs to be given around the management of any scheme. At the 'normal' cost levels, car sharing would be a reduced rate for those participating, what is the reasoning behind further reduced cost? | Reduced costs would be promoted to make the use of car-share scheme more preferable to the ownership and use of private cars by residents in the town centre. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST14 | 5.1 | Point 3 – SBC should be considering and seeking more ambitious targets than 20%. | In the long run, the Council will seek more than 20% but 20% is currently considered an appropriate amount that doesn't will promote a higher use/ownership of Evs than at present without taking up too high a proportion of parking spaces and causing overspill parking issues. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST15 | 7.9 | HCC are supportive of increased cycle parking facilities. Developments located on the current cycle network (and any planned extension to the network) should be encouraged to have higher levels of parking and facilities to enable use. | Noted | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------|---------|---|---|--|
| | PPST16 | 8.18 | The provision of public transport services and considerations to facilitate and encourage use should have greater consideration in certain locations to enable the reduction/no increase in the provision of vehicle parking. | Agreed | Minor rewording to ensure site context is used to determine appropriate measures for a Travel Plan to promote. |
| | PPST17 | General | As per Hertfordshire County Council's Enhancement Partnership statutory document (section 11.4) parking controls play an important role in making public transport options more attractive to be consistent with LTP4 and Intalink Bus Strategy policies, in particular through pricing mechanisms, supply/standards in new developments and by managing parking in such a way to provide bus priority through congested areas. Role of district and borough councils Some elements of the Enhanced Partnership can only be delivered with the support of the district and borough councils, including with respect to powers for duties for planning, parking, some highways schemes and air quality management. These powers are likely to be important in delivering effective bus priority through the feasibility studies. | Noted | No changes necessary |
| | PPST18 | General | Hertfordshire County Council would welcome the opportunity to continue working alongside SBC as one of the main stakeholders involved with all parking issues across the Borough. | Noted. HCC's involvement will be welcomed in the future. | No changes necessary |
| Public Health Hertfordshire | PPST19 | 2.21 | Anti-social parking often discourages walking, cycling and informal play. How will the planning authority enforce to avoid overspill from these developments to surrounding areas? | The design of road layouts, parking areas will seek to prevent the informal use of space for overspill parking. In addition, following assessments during and/or after the planning application stage, if it is identified that a certain development will cause or has caused parking stresses elsewhere, developers will be expected to provide a financial contribution towards parking management mitigation. | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|------------|--|--|--|
| | PPST20 | 2.25-2.29 | Public Health supports the liveable streets approach (set out in 2.25 – 2.29), and suggests the SPD could be strengthened by setting out the key role this will play in creating greater opportunity for informal outdoor play as a small part of tackling childhood obesity, and promoting greater levels of active travel for all ages. The approach may also improve social connectivity. We are more than happy to contribute further wording on this. | Agreed. Liveable Streets have many benefits. | Minor rewording to promote the many benefits of Liveable Streets. |
| | PPST21 | General | The emphasis throughout the SPD on mode shift is focussed on cycling. Whilst Public health fully supports this, it is worth considering that this is not entirely inclusive and we'd encourage the SPD to further raise the profile for walking. | Walking is promoted alongside cycling in the Local Plan and Mobility Strategy and doesn't have the infrastructural requirements related to parking as cycling does. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST22 | General | There is no mention of waymarking for active travel in the SPD | A separate study has already been undertaken which identifies improvements required for waymarking to promote cycling and walking (active travel) across the borough | No changes necessary |
| | PPST23 | 3.12 & 7.9 | There is no connection drawn between the Park & Ride proposals (3.12 – 3.17) and Cycle Hubs (7.9 – 7.10). This is considered a missed opportunity. | Agreed. Cycle Hubs should promote sustainable transport to and from their terminals. | Minor rewording to ensure potential Park & Ride terminals are designed to promote sustainable transport to the terminal by people who would use the service. |
| | PPST24 | 8.5 | Transport Assessments (8.5) should be specifying air quality, not just environmental impact. Air quality has specific health impacts, particularly in relation to health inequalities; environmental impact assessments will usually not identify these. | Agreed. Air quality is an important consideration of transport. | Minor rewording to incorporate air quality issues in the scope of Travel Assessments. |
| | PPST25 | General | The planning authority may wish to consider strengthening the SPD to include specifics on the positive health benefits and opportunities for improved community wellbeing to ensure development in Stevenage is positively planned. | The benefits of sustainable transport are explicitly specified in other SBC policy documents, namely the Local Plan, Mobility Strategy and Transport Strategy. | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|---|--------|---------|--|---|--|
| Richard Carr, Transport for London | PPST26 | General | I can confirm that we have no comments to make on the draft parking provision and sustainable transport SPD | Noted | No changes necessary |
| Andrew Marsh, Historic England | PPST27 | General | I can confirm that we have reviewed the document, and whilst we do not have any specific comments at this stage we thank you for making us aware of this document, and can advise that we will be interested in receiving subsequent consultations on the SPD. | Noted | No changes necessary |
| Mr M Right | PPST28 | General | Verbally supported the SPD, particularly the EV Charging requirements. | Noted | No changes necessary |
| SBC Overview and Scrutiny Committee | PPST29 | 2.10 | Can we ensure developers provide garages which are fit for purpose (ie, large enough)? | A minimum size requirement is included in the SPD, below which garages will not count towards parking provision | No changes necessary |
| | PPST30 | 2..17 | Parking enforcement is key. | Noted. Parking enforcement falls outside of the scope of the SPD but where necessary, the SPD seeks financial contributions from developers to help with parking management of their sites. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST31 | General | Forster Country will receive lots of Lister Hospital overflow. | Parking at Lister Hospital has already been established. This SPD seeks to ensure that new developments have an appropriate level of parking. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST32 | 5.1 | Disabled parking. Need to be married up with EV provision | Agreed. | Minor rewording to ensure that EV parking provision is provided across a range of parking spaces, including disabled parking spaces. |
| | PPST33 | 5.1 | Is there ability to introduce mobility scooter charging points in the town centre? | This is outside of the scope of this SPD. It would be possible to include mobility scooter charging points in the town centre, however, this is most likely to occur on a shop-by-shop basis (ie within cafes where a customer stays for a prolonged time) or as part of the shop mobility stores which already exist or are planned as part of the Bus Station relocation. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST34 | 5.1 | Is there ability to introduce mobility scooter charging points in the town centre? | Comment duplicated accidentally | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|--|---|----------------------|
| | PPST35 | General | Can we introduce higher charges for vehicles that don't fit in a standard space? | This is outside of the scope of this SPD. This would be for the Parking Strategy and on-going parking management to decide and formalise through existing Council procedures. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST36 | General | Cynical that the modal shift will ever happen as people use their cars | Noted. The Local Plan is predicated on a modal shift occurring so it is a Council-priority to promote the modal shift to ensure that planned growth does not have an unacceptable impact on the Highways network. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST37 | 7.1 | What are we doing to promote female cycling? | This is outside the scope of the SPD. The SPD, the Local Plan, the Transport Strategy and the Mobility Strategy seek to promote a modal shift across the population of Stevenage more generally than promoting individual groups. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST38 | General | Can we use income from charges to promote the modal shift? | This is outside the scope of the SPD. The decision of what to spend parking charge income on is agreed through existing Council procedures. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST39 | General | Very happy with the content of the document but we have to marry this with serious promotion of bus and cycling (and we should pay for them) | Noted. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST40 | General | Very happy with the content of the document but we have to marry this with serious promotion of bus and cycling (and we should pay for them) | Comment duplicated accidentally | No changes necessary |
| | PPST41 | 2.7 | If you want to stop people from driving, get rid of the parking spaces | The promotion of alternative forms of transport is a long term project. The widespread removal of parking facilities would have major impacts on the residents of Stevenage who rely on driving. It would be possible to remove parking spaces in localised areas, but that is outside the scope of this SPD. This SPD identifies where reduced levels of parking is appropriate for new developments as a way of promoting alternative forms of transport. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST42 | 2.7 | Unless we start taking parking seriously, we should stop pretending we're doing anything to help Climate Change | Noted. The transportation sector contributes significantly to carbon emissions. Methods to create the modal shift away from the dominance of private-owned motor vehicles are listed in Future Town, Future Transport, and the reduction of parking provision in new developments is one of those schemes. | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------|--------|------------|---|---|---|
| | PPST43 | 3.12 | Why don't we have a park and ride, like in Royston? | Stevenage is served by an existing bus service that is one of the most extensive in the county. Opportunities for a Park and Ride would require a private operator to promote a scheme cooperatively with the Council, the surrounding district Councils and Hertfordshire County Council as local highways authority. This has not occurred yet. A potential scheme would have to look at reducing overall levels of driving rather than focus on a narrow location to reduce congestion in a specific area. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST44 | General | Banning white vans from residential areas would solve all the problems. Can we not ban them and make them park in one designated area on the periphery of town? | This is outside the scope of the SPD. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST45 | 2.23 | Can we put in parking enforcement BEFORE a development is inhabited? | The transfer of land from a developer to the Highways Authority (if highways land), SBC or to a management company is formalised through a Section 106 agreement at the planning determination stage. Planning enforcement becomes part of ongoing management practices once the land transfer has occurred. | No changes necessary |
| SBC Executive | PPST46 | General | Lobby government for funding for EV charge points | Noted | No changes necessary |
| | PPST47 | General | There will be an issue in the future regarding enforcement of parking on the land of new developments which isn't owned by SBC or HCC. | Noted | No changes necessary |
| | PPST48 | 2.33 / 3.9 | We need a clear direction on whether we are to ask for any disabled spaces to be enforceable or merely allocated. Who would enforce them? | The enforcement of disabled parking spaces would depend on whether or not the space was on public land or within a private development. Developments would be obligated to provide disabled spaces in line with approved plans permitted through a specific planning permission. The management of that private car park would then be up to the enforcement of the management company. | No changes necessary |
| Phil Howard, SBC Engineering | PPST49 | 2.7 | The basic residential car parking standard seems to be unchanged, is that correct? Should they all be turned down by 0.5? | Yes. Whilst the basic car parking standard remains unchanged, the Accessibility Zones have been increased and reductions also increased from the previous SPD. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST50 | 2.33 | Worth inserting "a minimum of" before "5%"? | Agreed | Minor rewording to ensure it is clear that 5% is a minimum level of provision |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|---|--|---|
| | PPST51 | 7.1 | Can I suggest that for residential premises the standard should be a simple “1 per bedroom” as without being an HMO you are likely to find more people living in a house than it has bedrooms and the proposed standard risks excluding a noticeable proportion of residents. I’d also question why this is caveated “(without garage)” as the garage will be counted toward the house’s car parking, and with a car in it is unlikely to be particularly practical for getting cycles in and out? Particularly in the number you might have in a 4 bed house? Or can we discount garages from car parking counts, and require they have 1 cycle stand per bedroom concreted in, positioned to ensure you don’t put a car in them? | <p>The cycle levels were set in the Stevenage Cycling Strategy and based on research into potential cycling levels of different households. However, agreed that larger dwellings should provide more cycle parking.</p> <p>Garages are included in cycle parking provision as it is still most likely that that is where bikes will and can be kept with access just as easy, if not easier, than it is for a parked car.</p> | Minor rewording to increase cycling parking provision of larger properties. |
| | PPST52 | 7.7 | Reads as to me as preferring shared cycle parking (though particularly for flats) for all residential developments. Why is this the case? For developments made up of housing I would not see shared cycle parking as an attractive offer, except perhaps for some visitors: residents would want to keep their bicycle at home. | Agreed. Whilst appropriate for flatted development, shared cycle parking is not an optimal solution for traditional housing. | Minor rewording to ensure cycle parking is provide in each unit for non-flatted developments. |
| | PPST53 | 7.1 | Something should definitely be said about “Double decker” cycle parking as proposed in all the recent town centre planning apps for flats. This type of parking is inaccessible to those who are unable to ride a safety bike and need to use adapted or unusual cycles such as hand bikes (and it is therefore not EA compliant to only provide this type), or wish to ride a recumbent (which could also be for medical/ability reasons), or wish to use a bakfiets or longtail cargo bike to avoid needing a car to move bulkier/heavier items (including children). As with disabled parking in car parks, for flatted developments proposing to use double decker parking there should be a minimum percentage of accessible cycle parking suitable for these users. | Agreed, some forms of cycle parking are not appropriate for all cyclists and/or cyclists of all forms of bike. | Minor rewording to ensure consideration of the type of cycle parking being provided is suitable to all potential users. |
| | PPST54 | 7.8 | The SG1 application boasts of going over spec as this says, then depending on the site doesn’t or does so minimally (i.e. Sheffield stands naturally house 2 bikes so if the requirement is 19 it is difficult not to provide 20). How about setting a required % uplift for cycle parking in accessible areas, corresponding to the drop in car requirement? | Noted. Whilst it could be beneficial to request higher amounts of cycle parking in more accessible locations, it is considered these requirements already provide a high level of parking to ensure cycling is a viable option for transport for those living, working or visiting the Accessibility Zones. | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|--------------------------------------|--------|---------|---|---|----------------------|
| | PPST55 | 9.9 | Unless backed up by real prevention of informal parking, parking standards are largely meaningless. That means either physical measures that really will prevent parking where the designers don't intend, which is very likely to "compromise other residential design principles", or an RPZ approach where there is an entry sign at the entrance to the street, and repeater plates, and no parking is permitted except in marked bays (which can be sympathetically done using paving styles etc) – for which DCs would be needed to cover the costs of implementing the control and the early years of enforcement. | Noted. The SPD already contains an explanation that developer contributions may be needed to help manage overspill and inconsiderate parking brought about by new developments. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST56 | General | Informal parking on the verge/footway is detrimental to pedestrians and the street scene, and developers should expect to pay a Developer contribution for this to be prevented in any new street that is to be adopted as public highway. | Agreed. Requirements to pay developer contributions to prevent subsequent parking issues outside of the development but caused by the development are stipulated in the SPD. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST63 | Table 7 | Again, seems to generally mirror past standards, however does the change in cycle parking for several business use classes to m2 only rather than 1 l/t per 10 staff risk lowering the requirement? | The cycle levels were set in the Stevenage Cycling Strategy and based on research and are considered to be higher than was included in the existing Parking Provision SPD | No changes necessary |
| North Hertfordshire District Council | PPST57 | 1.8 | Policy Context: Under the policies and guidance that have been considered, specifically local, consideration should be given to also including North Hertfordshire's Transport Strategy (2017). There is alignment on many aspects between the two local authorities' aspirations for encouraging the growth in sustainable transport modes, especially between Stevenage and neighbouring towns in North Hertfordshire, where there is already much travel between destinations. In addition, the Transport Strategy is consistent with both HCC's (Hertfordshire County Council) Local Transport Plan 4 (2018) and, draft North and Central Hertfordshire Growth and Transport Strategy (2019). | Noted | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----------|---|--|--|
| | PPST58 | 2.30 | Strategic Sites: Where reasonably possible, NHDC would welcome the opportunity to ensure alignment of parking standards, especially with regards to planned strategic sites, including HO3 North of Stevenage, that adjoin the planned new strategic sites in North Hertfordshire, to ensure a consistent design and approach, that benefits future residents, ongoing relevant SBC and NHDC policies and strategies, as well as HCC as the Highways Authority. As such, NHDC would welcome the opportunity to discuss these aspects in more detail going forward to ensure a consistent approach is adopted where possible by both local authorities. | Agreed. It would be beneficial for adjacent strategic sites across our local authority boundary having consistent and/or complementary parking requirements. | Minor rewording to promote a joined up approach to parking levels where strategic sites lie adjacent to one-another but on opposite sides of a authority boundary. |
| | PPST59 | 3.12-3.17 | Park and Ride: Whilst supporting SBC's commitment to support usage and patronage growth of local bus services, we would express reservations about the effectiveness of the introduction of a new Park and Ride service for Stevenage. There is much evidence to suggest that Park and Ride schemes can be counterproductive, encouraging the growth in private vehicle usage, as well as abstracting passengers from existing bus services. Instead, a more effective approach could be to use existing local bus services, with enhancements where appropriate, with smaller car parking facilities located near bus stops or hubs along the route, where it is possible for the driver/passengers to transfer to the bus to continue their journey into the town/city. | Noted. The SPD already contains considerations that must be adhered to for a Park and Ride scheme to be implemented in Stevenage and/or the wider region. | Minor rewording to add alternatives to a new Park and Ride scheme which have been shown as more effective for promoting bus use than a brand new service. |
| | PPST60 | 3.12-3.17 | In a similar approach the Cambridge Busway, whereby using local bus services that operate at a high frequency and with guaranteed journey times services along the Busway have seen big growth in patronage, including modal shift from the car as passengers have confidence in the reliability of the service. In a similar approach, by enhancing existing bus services, the aims of a Park and Ride service can be achieved, without the need to procure a bespoke service for this purpose. | Noted | No changes necessary |

| | | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|---------|--|--|---|
| | PPST61 | 5.1-5.2 | Electric Charging: Whilst SBC's commitment to the roll out of residential EV charging is both laudable and to be welcomed, we feel it is worth highlighting that it appears consideration is given solely to domestic EV's. However, given that the document is also considering sustainable transport, should consideration also be given to future proofing EV charging for buses and other passenger transport vehicles as well? With Government commitment to the phase out of petrol and diesel vehicles, combined with the roll-out of EV charging nationally, given the SPD's longer term aims and vision for Stevenage, should consideration, or reference in some way be made to SBC's support for the introduction of EV charging facilities for bus services as well. | Noted. The recently approved proposal for a new bus station in the town centre incorporates the technology to charge EV buses as and when bus services in Stevenage start to use EV technology. | Minor rewording to emphasise that EV transport is not just related to privately-owned cars. |
| | PPST62 | 2.30 | Working with neighbouring local authorities: Whilst not specifically mentioned, NHDC considers that there would be merit in referring in the SPD statement about working with neighbouring local authorities to monitor vehicle displacement, and any subsequent collaborative working as part of the Duty to Co-operate between local authorities. | Agreed. Vehicle displacement could be an issue as both authorities have sites close to the Stevenage border and issues could become cross-boundary. | Minor rewording to promote cooperative working against vehicle displacement. |
| Will Wilkojc, SBC Housing Development | PPST64 | Table 3 | Can you amend parking restrictions for a specific development based on the SPD once it is adopted, if the parking requirement differs compared to what it was at the time of permission being granted? | Yes, if an application is submitted for an amendment of some form at an existing development permitted prior to the adoption of this SPD, amendments should take into account the parking requirements in this SPD. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST65 | 2.17 | There seems to be a steep drop-off in locations from 25-50% to 100% provision on the other side of the road, (top of the Old Town in particular). Could there be more of a transition? | The reason for that steep drop off is that the area just to the north of the north end of the Old Town does not meet any of the criteria to be included in an Accessibility Zone, and due to it's distance from the train and bus stations, the accessibility gets worse very quickly as you move away from the High Street. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST66 | 2.17 | Boundaries for Accessibility Zones seems to be down the middle of roads so one side of a cul-de-sac would be in a different zone to the other side despite having the same length journeys. Boundaries could be run down the back of garden curtilages. | Agreed. Garden curtilages form a more sensible edge of Accessibility Zones in some instances. Large carriageways act as a block in many cases, so remain an appropriate edge to the Accessibility Zones, but this is not the case in all circumstances. | Accessibility Zone boundaries have been reviewed and in some places amended depending on whether the carriageway or |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|---------|---|--|--|
| | | | | | garden curtilage was considered more appropriate for determining accessibility. |
| | PPST67 | 2.37 | Visitor parking of 0.5 spaces per unit seems high. | Agreed. | The visitor parking requirement has been reduced to 0.25 to prevent overprovision of poorly-used parking spaces. |
| | PPST68 | 3.10 | How would phased restraint be conditioned? Would there be a trigger met and signed off by the Council or would it be time-based? This could be important if modal shift occurs and parking could be initially provided with a view for removal. | Phased restraint is likely to only be used in large, multi-phase applications and would not need to be conditioned as follow-up applications could amend previous parking levels. However, we agree that there will be some cases where | Minor rewording to explain how a small development could utilise phased restraint. |
| | PPST69 | 5.1 | What would the preferred distribution be for 20% electric parking spaces in a scenario with allocated parking or private driveways? | Ideally, EV charging points would be installed in unallocated shared spaces with Passive charging point standards being met for private driveways or allocated spaces. However, the Council accepts that not all proposed developments will have shared parking or unallocated spaces so this is likely to be a case-by-case discussion for each development with the aim of promoting the alternative forms of transport to the traditional privately-owned vehicle | Minor rewording to explain the Council's overriding aim for EV provision. |
| | PPST70 | 5.1 | What if demand for electric parking isn't there to install 20% on Day 1 of a development? | The 20% requirement is included to promote EV use in the future not to meet current, low demand. The provision of EV spaces will hopefully promote demand for EV cars. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST71 | Table 3 | Car ownership levels for 3- and 4- bed units differ significantly between housing and flatted development so there should be a different target specified. | Agreed, the parking requirement for larger flats was unnecessarily high. | Parking requirements have been split for flatted developments and housing developments to reduce the |

| | | | | | |
|--|--------|-----|--|---|---|
| | | | | | parking requirements of 3-bed or 4-bed flats/apartments. |
| | PPST72 | 5.1 | County Council are conditioning 10% electric charging as part of the County Transport Plan, so will this be taken as a floor to the provision amount that we don't fall below? | All applications will be asked to provide 20% EV charging points. | No changes necessary |
| | PPST73 | 7.1 | Should charging points be considered in cycle stores as electric bicycles and scooters become more widely adopted? | Agreed that cycle parking may also require charging points. | Minor rewording to ensure the promotion of EV is not limited to cars but to all forms of vehicle, however requirements beyond including charging points at Cycle Hubs have not been added to the SPD at this point. |

Appendix 1 - Consultees

Specific Consultee Bodies and Duty to Cooperate Bodies consulted

- The Coal Authority,
- The Environment Agency,
- Historic England,
- The Marine Management Organisation,
- Natural England,
- Network Rail,
- Highways England,
- East And North Herts NHS Trust
- East and North Herts Clinical Commissioning Group
- Communications operators/organisations (including; Mobile Operators Association, BT Cellnet
- Limited, Telefónica, O2 UK Limited, Telereal Trillium, T-Mobile, Virgin Media, Virgin Mobile,
- Vodafone Ltd.,)
- The Homes and Communities Agency
- North Hertfordshire District Council
- East Hertfordshire District Council
- Other Hertfordshire authorities (including; Borough of Broxbourne, Dacorum Borough Council, Hertsmere Borough Council, St Albans City And District Council, Three Rivers District Council, Watford Borough Council, Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council)
- Hertfordshire County Council (including Growth & Infrastructure Unit, Public Health, Passenger Transport)
- Hertfordshire Highways
- Hertfordshire LEP
- Parish councils (including; Aston Parish Council, Codicote Parish Council, Datchworth Parish Council, Graveley Parish Council, Knebworth Parish Council, St Ippolyts Parish Council, Walkern Parish Council, Weston Parish Council, Woolmer Green Parish Council, Wymondley Parish Council)
- Hertfordshire Constabulary
- Anglian Water
- Thames Water
- Veolia Water Central (VWC)
- National Grid

General consultation bodies/organisations

| | |
|---|---|
| 5th Stevenage Air Scout Group | Broadwater Community Association |
| Aberdeen Asset Management | Broom Barns JMI |
| Active4Less | Brown And Lee |
| Adlington Planning Team | Brown And Lee Chartered Surveyors |
| Age Concern Stevenage | Buddhist Centre |
| Ahmadiyya Muslim Association | Building Research Establishment |
| Aldi Stores | Bus Users Group Stevenage |
| Aldwyck Housing Association | C.D.Bayles |
| Almond Hill Junior Mixed School | Campaign for Real Ale |
| Alzheimer's Society | Campaign For Real Ale Ltd |
| Anglian Water | Camps Hill Community Primary School |
| Aragon Land And Planning | Canyon Play Association |
| Archangel Michael And St Anthony Coptic Orthodox Church | Carers in Hertfordshire |
| Arriva | Catesby Property Group |
| Arriva The Shires And Essex Buses | CBRE Ltd. |
| Ashtree Primary School | Central Bedfordshire UA |
| Asian Women Group | Centrebus |
| Association of North Thames Amenity Societies | Chair North Herts Ramblers Group |
| Aston Parish Council | Chambers Coaches Stevenage Ltd |
| Aston Village Society | Chells Community Association |
| Aviva Investors | Chells Manor Community Association |
| BAA Safeguarding Team | Chells Scout Group |
| Barclay School | Chelton Radomes |
| Barker Parry Town Planning | Christadelphian Community |
| Barnwell School | Churches Together |
| BEAMS Ltd | Churches Together in Stevenage |
| Bedwell Community Association | Circle Anglia |
| Bedwell Primary And Nursery School | Citizens Advice Bureau |
| Bell Cornwell LLP | Clague Ashford |
| Bellway (Northern Home Counties) | Codicote Parish Council |
| Bellway Homes | Colinade Associates Ltd |
| Bellway Homes Miller Homes | Colliers International |
| Bellway Homes, Miller Homes & Wheatley Plc | Commercial Estates Group |
| Bidwells | Connexions Stevenage |
| Bloor Homes | Cortex |
| Bloor Homes South Midlands | Costco Wholesale UK Ltd |
| Borough of Broxbourne | Countryside Management Service |
| Bragbury End Residents Group | Countryside Properties plc, Stevenage Rugby Club and the Homes and Communities Agency (Cambridge) |
| Bridge Builders Christian Trust | CPRE Hertfordshire |
| British Horse Society | Crossroads Care (Hertfordshire North) |

| | |
|--|---|
| Croudace Strategic Ltd | Finishing Publications Ltd |
| CTC The National Cycling Charity | First Plan |
| Cycling UK Stevenage | Fitness First Plc |
| Dacorum Borough Council | Friends of Forster Country |
| Datchworth Parish Council | Friends of the Earth (Luton) |
| Davies And Co | Friends Religious Society |
| Defence Infrastructure Organisation | Friends, Families and Travellers and Traveller Law Reform Project Community Base |
| Deloitte | Fusion |
| Department For Business, Innovation and Skills | Gabriel Securities Ltd |
| Department For Culture Media And Sport | Genesis Housing Group |
| Department For Environment Food And Rural Affairs | GHM Consultancy Group Ltd (Logic Homes) |
| Department For Transport Rail Group | Giles Junior School |
| Design Council | Giles School |
| Dixons Dispatch Ltd | Glanville |
| Douglas Drive Senior Citizens Association | Glasgow City Council |
| DPDS Consulting Group | GlaxoSmithKline |
| EADS Astrium | Government Equalities Office |
| East and North Herts Clinical Commissioning Group | Graveley Against SNAP Proposals (GASP) |
| East and North Herts NHS Trust | Graveley Parish Council |
| East Coast | Graveley School |
| East Hertfordshire District Council | Great Ashby Community Council |
| East Herts District Council | Great Ashby Community Group |
| East Herts Footpath Society | Great Ashby Community Resource Centre |
| East of England Ambulance Service | Greene King Plc |
| East Of England Local Government Association (formerly EERA) | Greenside School |
| Eastlake Stevenage Limited | Gregory Gray Associates |
| Ecovril Ltd | Gujarati Hindu Association |
| Endurance estates | Hanover Housing Association |
| Environment Agency | HAPAS |
| Epping Forest District Council | Heaton Planning Ltd |
| Essex County Council | Hermes Real Estate Investment Ltd |
| Executive | Hertford Road Community Association |
| F&C REIT Asset Management | Hertfordshire Action on Disability |
| Fairlands Primary School And Nursery | Hertfordshire Association for the Care and Resettlement of Offenders |
| Fairlands Valley Sailing Centre | Hertfordshire Association Of Parish And Town Councils |
| Fairview Road Residents Association | Hertfordshire Association of Parish and Town Councils / Welwyn Hatfield Association of Local Councils |
| Featherstone Wood Primary School | Hertfordshire Association Of Young People |
| Fields in Trust | Hertfordshire Biological Records Centre |

| | |
|--|--|
| Hertfordshire Care Trust | Iceni Projects Ltd |
| Hertfordshire Chamber Of Commerce And Industry | Independent Custody Visitors Scheme |
| Hertfordshire Constabulary | Intercounty Properties |
| Hertfordshire County Council | J Young Investments Ltd. |
| Hertfordshire County Council (Archaeology) | JB Planning Associates |
| Hertfordshire County Council (Estates) | Jehovah's Witnesses |
| Hertfordshire County Council (Highways) | John Henry Newman RC School |
| Hertfordshire County Council Public Health | Jones Day |
| Hertfordshire Fire And Rescue Service | Jones Lang LaSalle |
| Hertfordshire Gardens Trust | Kirkwells |
| Hertfordshire Hearing Advisory Service | Knebworth Estates |
| Hertfordshire Highways | Knebworth House Education and Preservation Trust |
| Hertfordshire LEP | Knebworth Parish Council |
| Hertfordshire Police | Lambert Smith Hampton |
| Hertfordshire Police Authority | Land Registry Head Office |
| Hertfordshire Police Eastern Area | Lanes New Homes |
| Hertfordshire Property (HCC) | Langley Parish Meeting |
| Hertfordshire Society for the Blind | Larwood School |
| Hertfordshire Stop Smoking Service | Lepus Consulting |
| Hertfordshire University | Letchmore Infants And Nursery School |
| Hertfordshire Visual Arts Forum | Letchworth Garden City Heritage Foundation |
| Herts & Middlesex Wildlife Trust | Leys Primary And Nursery School |
| Herts Against the Badger Cull | Lincolns Tyre Service Ltd. |
| Herts and Middlesex Wildlife Trust | Living Streets |
| Herts Gay Community | Lodge Farm Primary School |
| Hertsmere Borough Council | London and Cambridge Properties Ltd |
| Hightown Praetorian Churches Housing Association | London Borough of Barnet |
| Highways England | London Borough of Enfield |
| Hill Residential Limited | London Borough of Harrow |
| HilliersHRW Solicitors LLP | London Gypsies and Travellers Unit |
| Historic England | Longmeadow Primary School |
| Hitchin Town Action Group | Lonsdale School |
| Holiday Inn Express | Luton Borough Council |
| Holy Trinity Church | Mantle |
| Home Builders Federation | Marine Management Organisation |
| Home Group | Marriotts Gymnastics Club |
| Homes And Communities Agency | Marriotts School |
| Howard Cottage Housing Association | Martin Ingram Opticians |
| Howard Property Group | Martins Wood Primary School |
| HSBC Trust Company (UK) Limited | Mayor of London |
| Hubert C Leach Ltd | MBDA UK Ltd |
| Hythe Ltd | Miller Strategic Land |

| | |
|--|--|
| Mind in Herts | Pin Green Community Centre |
| MKG Motor Group | Pin Green Residents Association |
| Moss Bury Primary School | Pin Green Residents Group |
| Moult Walker Chartered Surveyors | Planning Issues Ltd |
| MS Society Mid Hertfordshire | Planning Potential Ltd |
| NaCSBA | Planware Ltd |
| National Express | Planware Ltd. |
| National Housing Federation | POhWER |
| Natural England | Princes Trust |
| Network Rail | Putterills Of Hertfordshire |
| NFGLG | Rapleys LLP |
| NHS East and North Hertfordshire CCG | REACT |
| North Hertfordshire and Stevenage Green Party | Redrow Homes (Eastern) Ltd |
| North Hertfordshire College | Redrow Homes Eastern Division |
| North Hertfordshire District Council | Regional Land Holdings Ltd. |
| North Hertfordshire Friends Of The Earth | Relate North Hertfordshire And Stevenage |
| North Hertfordshire People First | Renshaw UK Limited |
| North Herts & Stevenage Green Party | rg+p Ltd |
| North Herts and Stevenage Community Learning Disability Team | Richborough Estates |
| North Herts Homes | Ridgemonk Park Training Centre |
| North Herts People First | River Beane Restoration Association |
| North Stevenage Consortium | Road Haulage Association |
| Odyssey Group Holdings | Roebuck and Marymead Residents Association |
| Office for Rail Regulation | Roebuck Nursery And Primary School |
| Old Stevenage Community Association | Round Diamond Primary School |
| On Behalf Of St. Peter's Church | RPF Developments |
| Origin Housing Group | RPS Planning and Development Ltd |
| Oval Community Centre | RSPB |
| PACE | Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd |
| Paradigm Housing Group | Savils |
| Passenger Transport Unit, Hertfordshire County Council | Saving North Herts Green Belt |
| Patient Liaison Group | Secretary of State for Communities |
| Peacock And Smith | Seebohm Executors |
| Peartree Spring Junior School | Shephalbury Sports Academy |
| Pennyroyal Ltd. | Shephall Community Association |
| Pentangle Design | Shephall Residents Association |
| Persimmon Homes | Showmen's Guild Of Great Britain |
| PHD Associates | Simmons And Sons |
| Physically Handicapped And Able Bodied Club | South East Midlands Local Enterprise Partnership |
| Picture Ltd | Sport England |
| Pigeon Investment Management Ltd | Sport Stevenage |
| Pigeon Land Ltd | Springfield House Community Association |

| | |
|---|--|
| St Albans City And District Council | Thames Water Property |
| St Ippolyts Parish Council | The Baha'I Community of Stevenage |
| St Margaret Clitherow RC Primary School | The Campaign for Real Ale |
| St Nicholas Community Centre | The Coal Authority |
| St Nicholas School | The Greens & Great Wymondley Residents Association |
| St Vincent De Paul RC Primary School | The Guinness Trust |
| St. Nicholas and Martins Wood Residents Association | The Guinness Partnership |
| Stanhope Plc | The Gypsy Council |
| STARCOURT CONSTRUCTION LTD | The Hitchin Forum |
| Stevenage And North Hertfordshire Indian Cultural Society | The Living Room |
| Stevenage and North Herts Women's Resource Centre | The National Trust |
| Stevenage Borough Council | The Nobel School |
| Stevenage Borough Council Transportation Development | The Salvation Army |
| Stevenage Business Initiative | The Theatres Trust |
| Stevenage Caribbean and African Association | The Woodland Trust |
| Stevenage Caribbean And African Association (SCARAFA) | Theatres Trust |
| Stevenage Cricket Club | Thomas Alleyne School |
| Stevenage CVS | T-Mobile |
| Stevenage Depression Alliance | TRACKS (Autism) |
| Stevenage Haven | Transport for London |
| Stevenage Irish Network | Trotts Hill Primary And Nursery School |
| Stevenage League Of Hospital Friends | Troy Planning |
| Stevenage Mosque | Turley |
| Stevenage Polish Association | Universities Superannuation Scheme Ltd |
| Stevenage Quakers | USF Nominees Ltd. |
| Stevenage Regeneration Ltd. | Veale Associates |
| Stevenage Sikh Cultural Association | Veolia Water Central (VWC) |
| Stevenage Town Rugby Club | VEOLIA WATER CENTRAL LIMITED |
| Stevenage Women's Refuge | Vincent And Gorbing Planning Associates |
| Stevenage World Forum For Ethnic Minorities | Virgin Media |
| Stevenage Youth Council | Visit East Anglia |
| Stewart Ross Associates | Vodafone Ltd |
| Strutt and Parker LLP | Waitrose Ltd |
| Symonds Green Community Association | Walkern Parish Council |
| Taylor Wimpey | Watford Borough Council |
| Taylor Wimpey / Persimmon | Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council |
| Telefonica O2 UK Limited | Welwyn Hatfield Council |
| Telereal Trillium | West Stevenage Consortium |
| Terence O'Rourke Ltd | Weston Parish Council |
| Thames Water | Wheatley Homes |

| | |
|--------------------------------------|------------------------------|
| Wheatley Homes Ltd | Woolmer Green Parish Council |
| Willmott Dixon Housing | WPNPF |
| Wm Morrisons Supermarket Plc | Wymondley Parish Council |
| Women's Link | Wyvale Garden Centres Ltd |
| Woodland Trust | Young Pride in Herts |
| Woolenwich Infant And Nursery School | Youth Council |

Approximately 950 individuals on the Council consultation register were also consulted.