

Parking SPD 2024

Table of changes with justification

§	Existing	§	Proposed	Justification
<h3>About this document</h3>				
<p>1.5 to 1.6</p>	<p>The Council's previous parking requirements were contained within the SBC Parking Provision SPD (adopted 2012). National and local guidance on parking provision has changed significantly since 2012 and a greater emphasis has been placed on sustainable transport. In particular, county-wide transport policy was updated with the adoption of the Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 in 2018 and, more locally, the Stevenage Local Plan was underpinned by a Mobility Strategy explaining the need and potential for a modal shift in transportation-use. As such, much of the policy basis for the previous SPD had changed and the document had become outdated.</p> <p>A draft version of this SBC Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD was published for public consultation in February 2020. Respondents' comments were considered and</p>	<p>1.1 to 1.3</p>	<p>This document replaces the Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD 2020 and provides guidance on the policies in the adopted local plan. It is a supplementary planning document (SPD) and is therefore a material consideration in planning decisions.</p> <p>This document was adopted as an SPD on [DATE], following a meeting of the Executive Committee of Stevenage Borough Council on [DATE].</p> <p>A draft version of this document was subject to two public consultations between [DATE] and [DATE] and a second from [DATE] to [DATE]. The</p>	<p>To reflect the publication of the new SPD.</p>

	incorporated into this final version. The Council formally adopted this Supplementary Planning Document and revoked the previous Parking Provision SPD on 12 October 2020 after a decision made by the Council's Executive.		consultations were carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, as well as the council's Statement of Community Involvement. A summary of the representations received and the council's response to these is set out in the statement of consultation which accompanies this document.	
-	-	1.4	Although this SPD is a material consideration in planning decisions, it does not form part of the development plan and consequently does not introduce new policies. Instead, it builds upon already existing policies and provides advice on how they might be complied with. As such, the application of the guidance in this SPD should be seen as the starting point for the assessment of planning applications, rather than a set of inflexible rules.	For clarity.
1.7 to	The Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD has been created to provide	1.5 to	National planning policy is set out in the National Planning	

<p>1.18</p>	<p>additional guidance to policies within the 2019 Local Plan. It supplements policies SP6, IT5, and IT8 by providing parking standards for all types of development.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The following policies and guidance have been taken into account: • National National Planning Policy Framework (2019) • County Hertfordshire's Local Transport Plan 4, 2018-2031 (2018) Roads in Hertfordshire: Highway Design Guide, 3rd Edition (2011) • LocalFuture Town, Future Transport - A Transport Strategy for Stevenage (2019) • Stevenage Local Plan (2019) • Stevenage Mobility Strategy (2016) • Stevenage Design Guide (2009) • Stevenage Parking Strategy (2004) <p>It also takes into account best practice guidance such as the Department for Transport's Manual for Streets (2007).</p> <p>National policy is to locate new development preferably where it is highly accessible by passenger transport, walking and cycling. New development should offer a realistic choice of</p>	<p>1.14</p>	<p>Policy Framework, the most recent version of which was published in December 2023. It does not form part of the development plan but is nonetheless a material consideration, both in the preparation of this SPD and in the assessment of planning applications.</p> <p>Paragraph 111 of the NPPF requires the following to be taken into account when setting local parking standards:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the accessibility of the development; b) the type, mix and use of development; c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport; d) local car ownership levels; and e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. <p>Paragraph 112 goes on to say that maximum parking standards should only be set where there is</p>	
-------------	--	-------------	--	--

	<p>means of access in order to minimise car-use.</p> <p>NPPF Para 105 - If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) the accessibility of the development; b) the type, mix and use of development; c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport; d) local car ownership levels; and e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. <p>NPPF Para 106 - 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, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.</p>		<p>clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network or for optimising the density of development. In town centres, the quality of parking should be improved so that it is convenient and safe, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Paragraphs 114 to 116 require development proposals to promote sustainable transport, giving priority first to pedestrians and cyclists and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport. Proposals should also address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility, minimise the potential for conflict between different road users, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and enable electric vehicle charging. Development should only be prevented or refused on highways grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>The Department for Transport's Manual for Streets explains how to design, construct, adopt and maintain new and existing residential streets, including offering guidance on how parking both on and off-street should be incorporated into new developments.</p> <p>The Hertfordshire Local Transport Plan 4 seeks to achieve a travel demand reduction and a modal shift in transportation-use. In line with the Manual for Streets, LTP4 Policy 1 introduced a Transport User Hierarchy for the county.</p> <p>LTP4 Policy 1: Transport User Hierarchy - To support the creation of built environments that encourage greater and safer use of sustainable transport modes, the county council will in the design of any scheme and development of any transport strategy consider in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to reduce travel demand and the need to travel • road user needs (such as pedestrians and cyclists) • transport user needs • two wheeler (mopeds and motorbikes) user needs • Other motor vehicle user needs 		<p>The development plan for Stevenage is comprised of the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011-2031 • The Hertfordshire Waste Core Strategy & Development Management Policies Development Plan Document 2011-2026 • The Hertfordshire Waste Site Allocations Development Plan Document 2011-2026 • The Hertfordshire Minerals Local Plan Review 2002-2016 <p>Of these documents, the Stevenage Borough Local Plan 2011-2031 (the local plan), which was adopted in 2019, is the only one relevant to parking. At the time of writing, the local plan is under review but the policies relevant to parking are not expected to be materially altered.</p> <p>Policy SP6 of the local plan sets out the strategic transport objectives for the borough, insofar as they relate to</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>LTP4 considers that greater traffic demand measures are essential in urban areas to achieve the modal shift in line with the Hierarchy to improve sustainable travel provision. This includes instigating parking restrictions as well as charges applied to on-street, off-street and potentially at workplace parking. The document goes on to say that development proposals should align or be part of local parking policies so that decisions on parking standards and provision complement efforts to reduce demand for car use.</p> <p>Not everyone subject to demand management policies will have viable alternatives to the car but they would benefit from reduced congestion and more reliable journeys.</p> <p>HCC delegates the function of Parking Authority to the ten Borough and District Councils. Standards of parking to be provided in new development, or when changes of use of land are proposed, shall be in accordance with the requirements of the Local Planning Authority. HCC previously produced Roads In Hertfordshire: a Design Guide which predominantly offers guidance on on-street parking. The Design Guide recommends that the most appropriate solution will be to design</p>		<p>development. The overriding objective is to promote means of travel other than private cars in the interests of both driving down the greenhouse gas emissions associated with transport and improving the health and wellbeing of the borough's residents. However, the policy also recognises the important role played by private cars in modern life and that certain parts of the town suffer because of a lack of sufficient car parking spaces. It therefore seeks to strike a balanced approach to parking, which is not too restrictive or unrealistic.</p> <p>Policy IT5 sets out specific requirements for development proposals with this strategic objective in mind. First and foremost, it states that planning permission will be granted where new parking is provided in accordance with the standards in this SPD. It also requires the protection of existing private off-street parking spaces and formally defined on-street spaces where they are needed.</p> <p>Policy IT8 sets out additional requirements for proposals</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>for a level of on-street parking that takes account of the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • overall level of car ownership in the immediate area; • amount of off-street parking provided; • amount of allocated parking provided; • speed and volume of traffic using the street; and • width and geometry of the street and its junctions 		<p>involving public off-street parking spaces, such as surface and multi-storey car parks. As with Policy IT5, the general principle is that new parking provision will be supported and existing spaces will be protected where there is a demonstrable need for them.</p> <p>This SPD also takes into account various other national and regional guidance documents. A list of these documents is provided at appendix 4.</p>	
	<p>In responding to Government and county-wide guidance, Stevenage has adopted an approach to reduce car-use through the promotion of sustainable transport methods and by setting limits to parking provision within new development.</p> <p>It is widely accepted that merely building additional capacity into the road network is not a suitable approach to mitigate future transport issues so the Local Plan (2019) is supported by a Mobility Strategy which seeks to promote a modal shift in Stevenage's transport network in line with Hertfordshire's LTP4.</p>	<p>1.15 to 1.21</p>	<p>Transport planning for the local plan began in 2014 with modelling of the potential transport impacts arising from the housing and employment growth proposed in what was then the preferred option local plan. This identified issues across the local highway network should the plan be delivered without mitigation.</p> <p>It is widely accepted that merely building additional capacity into the road network is not a suitable approach to mitigate future transport issues. Accordingly, the</p>	<p>For brevity.</p>

	<p>As well as needing to mitigate future congestion issues, the Council declared a Climate Emergency Motion in 2019 and committed to aim to achieve zero carbon status in the town by 2030. Transport contributes greatly to overall carbon emissions, providing another important reason to try to reduce the use of privately-owned vehicles in favour of sustainable modes of transport.</p> <p>Stevenage has an excellent network of public and active transport links and it is considered that a significant modal shift in transportation-use is possible in the town. The Council therefore prepared a Transport Strategy, “Future Town, Future Transport” (FTFT), to set out greater detail regarding the Council’s ambitious approach to delivering sustainable transport, providing a strategy for coordinated action by the wide range of agencies and institutions involved in transport provision. FTFT commits the Council to reviewing the Parking Provision SPD (2012) to include aspirational levels of cycle parking, stricter levels of vehicle parking and an increased provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure in new developments.</p> <p>Modal shift will require multiple methods of incentivisation and discouragement. Setting</p>		<p>Stevenage Mobility Strategy 2016 set out the council’s intention to improve transport choices, with a high priority placed on active travel. The strategy includes significant enhancements to pedestrian and cycle infrastructure, improved accessibility to public transport, and controls on car parking to discourage car use.</p> <p>Future Town, Future Transport 2019 – the council’s transport strategy – duly committed the council to updating the Parking Standards SPD by 2020. This culminated in the publication of the Parking Provision and Sustainable Transport SPD in October of that year, which is now replaced by this SPD.</p> <p>The overall approach to parking standards remains unchanged from the previous version of this document. Maximum parking standards are set for both residential and non-residential development, according to the type, mix, and use of development, with regard to Census 2011 data on local car ownership levels. Allowances are</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

<p>levels of parking spaces is a key way of discouraging driving, however it must be done at an appropriate level that does not lead to further issues such as overcrowding on residential streets or overspill onto nearby streets.</p> <p>As such, the Council considers that there is a clear and compelling justification, in line with NPPF paragraph 106, to set maximum parking levels and this is supported by the contents of the SBC Mobility Strategy and other Local Plan supporting studies.</p> <p>A differentiation must be made between the parking provision required for developments where cars are kept/owned ('trip origin' - i.e. Residential developments) and developments which cars are used to get to ('trip destination' - i.e. Non-residential). It is important to acknowledge that car ownership is not the same as car usage and owning a car does not necessarily create congestion, only the using of the car does. It is important to note that the car is the most suitable form of transport for certain trips and will continue to be. Where this is the case, there is the opportunity to encourage car pooling/ sharing, and electric vehicles to reduce congestion and environmental impacts.</p>	<p>then made for reductions in parking provision in areas that are well served by public transport and highly accessible for pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Standards are also set for disabled persons' parking and powered two-wheeler parking. Standards for electric vehicle charging points are not set, as these are now set by the Building Regulations.</p> <p>Parking on residential streets in Stevenage is of considerable local concern, with some roads not designed to accommodate on-street parking on both sides of the road. In some places, this has a significant impact on the function and feel of local areas. This SPD only controls parking provision within new development and by setting maximum parking standards, seeks to reduce the overall number of private cars in Stevenage rather than displace parking onto surrounding roads. The standards are set with this in mind.</p> <p>This SPD also sets standards for cycle parking. Stevenage has one of the UK's best cycle</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>There will need to be an appropriate quantum of town centre parking to ensure its ongoing viability in the medium term. This should still be set at a level, and therefore a price, which incentivises visitors to ride, walk, or take a bus into town. Over the long term, the total quantum of town centre parking may decrease to meet sustainability objectives. This will be set by the replacement Parking Strategy when adopted by the Council.</p> <p>Parking on residential streets in Stevenage is of considerable local concern, with some roads not designed to accommodate on-street parking on both sides of the road. In some places this has a significant local impact on the function and feel of local areas. This SPD only controls parking provision within new development, and by setting maximum parking standards, seeks to reduce the overall number of private cars in Stevenage. It will be crucial that the impact of restricting parking on new sites is not the overspill of vehicles parking on nearby streets and this was taken into consideration when setting the parking standards.</p> <p>Car pooling and car sharing, including car clubs, offer a significant opportunity to reduce parking requirements, particularly in residential</p>		<p>networks and is therefore well placed to facilitate an increase in cycling. Providing secure and convenient cycle parking, together with other supporting facilities (e.g. lockers and changing facilities) will be key to achieving this.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

	<p>developments. The advent of the electric car is also facilitated in this document, with all new off-street car parking spaces expected to be compatible with providing charging points to electric vehicles in the future.</p> <p>Cycling is a fast, efficient, and healthy mode of transport, and Stevenage has one of the UK's best cycle networks. The Council is keen to encourage all residents to cycle or walk as their primary mode of transport. Consequently, this SPD sets out separate standards car and cycle for residential and non-residential development. For both development types, areas have been identified within the town where a reduction in the parking levels are thought to be appropriate. These 'Accessibility Zones' provide a local context when determining an appropriate quantum of parking for any individual development. The criteria are explained in Appendix 1.</p>			
<h2>The standards</h2>				
X	The parking standards	-	There have been no meaningful changes to the standards for residential, non-residential, visitor, lorry, PTW, disabled	No meaningful change.

			persons' or cycle parking.	
X	Accessibility zones	-	<p>The accessibility zones have been amended to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Reflect the designation criteria (which remain unchanged); and b) Broadly ensure that properties on the opposite side of the same road fall within the same zone. <p>Please see the maps for further details.</p>	To accord with designation criteria and for fairness.
Applying the standards				
2.1 2.7 & 3.1 to 3.2	<p>Findings from the Census (2011) can be used to see the levels of car ownership of households in the borough. Table 1 shows the levels of car ownership per dwellings, split by number of bedrooms.</p> <p>[Table 1 Average No. of Cars/Vans owned per household]</p>	3.1	<p>The starting point for any proposal is to calculate the baseline maximum level of parking by applying the standards in Table 1 (for residential development) and Table 3 (for non-residential development), as appropriate.</p>	

	<p>Table 1 shows a clear relationship between the number of cars and the number of bedrooms in a household indicating that the approach of the Parking Provision SPD (2012) was appropriate.</p> <p>Table 1 also shows that the limits set in the Parking Provision SPD (2012) exceeded the number of vehicles owned at the time the SPD was adopted. This gave leeway for the SPD to remain appropriate if car-ownership levels were to rise, and also meant that it was appropriate for 'Accessibility Zones' to be identified at particular locations where parking requirements could be lower.</p> <p>Looking at the data in more detail, there is an obvious difference in car ownership between dwelling type. Table 2 illustrates the difference between ownership levels for houses/bungalows and those for flats/maisonettes/apartments. It is worth noting that even for houses/bungalows, car ownership is below the SPD (2012) limits other than for 1-bed houses discounting houses with 0 cars. [Table 2 Average No. of Cars/Vans owned per household split by dwelling type]</p> <p>It is acknowledged that car ownership levels have increased since the adoption of the 2012 SPD and that an up-to-date Census could</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>show that levels of car ownership are much closer to the Parking Provision SPD (2012) limits than the 2011 Census findings were, or potentially higher. However, the Council is promoting a modal-shift in transportation use so it would be inappropriate to increase the parking limits in this document.</p> <p>To strike a balance between the increase in car ownership and the sought decrease in car-use, it is appropriate to carry forward the car park limits from the 2012 SPD into the emerging Parking and Sustainable Transport SPD. However, these figures will be reduced in line with the aforementioned new Accessibility Zones, as explained later in this chapter. The publication of the next Census findings could necessitate a review of this document to reduce parking requirements if car ownership has fallen.</p> <p>Table 3 sets out the Council's proposed car parking standards for new residential development. Where the level of provision calculated for a quantity of a particular size/type of dwelling results in a fraction of a space, the level of provision should be rounded up to the nearest whole number. If there is more than one size/type of dwelling being proposed as part of a development, the</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>rounded up numbers of required spaces for each size/type of dwelling should be added together to give the overall required parking provision.</p> <p>[Table 3 Residential parking standards]</p>			
-	-	<p>3.2 to 3.5</p>	<p>Where a proposed use is not listed in the standards, whether that use is sui generis or falls within a defined use class, the appropriate maximum level of parking will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Initially, a “best-fit” approach should be used i.e. the proposal should be assessed against the standard for the most similar use which is listed. However, the resultant level of parking may not always be appropriate. Therefore, in all cases where a use is not listed in the standards, the proposed maximum level of parking provision should be justified with reference to some form of transport assessment or technical note.</p> <p>Unless stated otherwise, where the standards refer to areas (e.g. 100m²), they refer to gross</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>

		<p>internal area (GIA). The definition of GIA for the purposes of this SPD is given in appendix 3.</p> <p>Where the standards refer to numbers of staff, employees, pupils or students, this refers to the full-time equivalent (FTE) number. What constitutes full-time hours will vary between sectors and 1 FTE should not necessarily be taken to mean 40 hours per week of work or study.</p> <p>Sometimes more than one standard may be applicable to a proposal. In these circumstances, each of the proposed uses should be assessed against the relevant standards separately (having regard to the GIA, staffing levels, etc. in each use), before being added together. Where individual land use components are unknown or the proposal is for flexible uses, the maximum level of parking provision will be considered on a case-by-case basis, in the manner described in paragraph 3.2 above.</p>	
--	--	--	--

2.8	<p>These limits apply to proposals for new residential development and to proposals at existing housing sites. For example, if a proposal was for development at a single existing household, such as an extension for an additional bedroom or a change the use of land to create additional parking space, the limits in Table 3 should be applied to the size of proposed development. For example, if a single house was being extended from a 3-bed to a 4-bed property, the finished house should have 3 parking spaces (2.5 rounded up to 3).</p>	3.6	<p>For proposals which involve additions or alterations to existing developments, maximum parking should be assessed for the site as a whole rather than just for those elements which are new or altered. Applicants should ensure that sufficient information is included within applications to facilitate this process (e.g. the GIA of existing buildings, overall site staffing levels, etc.).</p>	<p>For clarity. Previously this was only stated in the residential section, whereas it is now clear that it applies to both residential and non-residential schemes.</p>
-	-	3.7 to 3.8	<p>For residential developments involving houses or flats, including householder developments, maximum parking is calculated on the basis of the number of bedrooms. For the purposes of this calculation, a room should be counted as a bedroom if:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) it is not a kitchen, dining room, living room, utility room, or bathroom; and b) it has a floor area of 7.5m² or more. <p>This means that home offices will normally be counted as bedrooms where they are of a</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>

			sufficient size (owing to the fact that they can be readily converted to bedrooms).	
2.38 to 2.39	<p>Visitor spaces must be provided at a standard of 0.25 spaces per dwelling. If parking is to be allocated, these will be in addition to the above standards. Where a significant proportion of parking is unallocated, additional visitor spaces would preferably not be provided.</p> <p>The number of visitor spaces required may be reduced in line with Table 4. This will be assessed on a case by case basis depending on which Accessibility Zone a development is within.</p>	3.9	For residential developments, except for householder developments, parking for visitors should also be considered. Where appropriate, the number of visitor parking spaces should be added to the number of resident parking spaces calculated through the application of the standards in Table 1. In these circumstances, applicants should also include details of how resident parking will be allocated as part of the application.	No meaningful change.
2.16 to 2.20 & 3.4 to 3.9	National policy seeks to manage car use but not car ownership. Car use responds to non-car accessibility levels but car ownership need not. Thus residential parking standards are not considered to be directly amenable to the same zonal approach that applies to non-residential development. Car ownership responds to other factors that can relate to locational characteristics, which may reduce car	3.10 to 3.15	Having determined the maximum level of parking, accessibility reductions should then be applied according to Table 2 (for residential development) and Table 4 (for non-residential development), as appropriate. These adjustments are expressed as proportions of the baseline maximum figure.	For brevity.

<p>ownership levels, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • housing with high accessibility to shops, jobs and services • housing with high accessibility to a wide range of public transport services. <p>In light of this, there are areas within the town where it is considered that lower levels of parking provision are likely to be appropriate. Accessibility Zones are shown on Map 1 and are based on the locational criteria mentioned above to set out areas where lower levels of car ownership are likely (explained in more detail within Appendix1).</p> <p>[Map 1 Map of Residential Accessibility Zones]</p> <p>Reduced standards have been allocated to each of the zones by way of a percentage, representing the percentage allowance of the standards put forward in Table 3.</p> <p>[Table 4 Accessibility Zone Reductions]</p> <p>Within each range, the higher percentage represents the maximum level of parking provision. The level of provision will normally be expected to fall within the range shown. The process of applying the parking standard in</p>	<p>For residential development, large parts of the borough fall outside of any accessibility zone, such that no reduction will be applicable. In these cases, parking should normally be provided precisely at the baseline maximum level.</p> <p>For non-residential development, the entirety of the borough is subject to some form of accessibility reduction.</p> <p>The application of accessibility reductions will result in a range of figures for parking provision. The higher figure represents the adjusted maximum number of parking spaces that should be provided, whereas the lower figure represents the minimum.</p> <p>The level of proposed parking should normally fall somewhere between the minimum and the adjusted maximum figures. Where this is not the case, the level of proposed parking should be justified with reference to a transport assessment or technical note.</p> <p>Proposals for higher or lower provision should, first and foremost, be based on site</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>Table 3 should be completed prior to the discounting recommended in Table 4. The reduced standards will provide the basis for negotiations in these areas, as specific sites will have individual characteristics which need to be considered.</p> <p>The introduction of residential uses into Central Stevenage will create several mixed-use development sites in the coming years. Where practical the Council will encourage the shared use of public parking facilities between different uses to maximise housing density and minimise land occupied by parking. Where residential use is proposed as part of a mixed-use development, e.g. housing over shops, car parking provision for the methodology in Section 4 of this document should be followed.</p> <p>In some areas of the town, the ease of access by passenger transport and access to daytime public parking allows for lower levels of parking to be provided for private non-residential uses. Adoption of the standards above without further reduction would over-provide in locations where non-car accessibility is good or, just as importantly, can be improved.</p> <p>Accessibility zones are shown in Map 2 and are based on the proximity of passenger transport.</p>		<p>context (particularly the accessibility of sustainable modes of transport) and the specific characteristics of the proposed development. The fact that a site lies close to the boundary of an accessibility zone (or an accessibility zone of a different level) will not, in itself, be accepted as justification for deviation from the range of acceptable provision.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>[Map 2 Non-residential Accessibility Zones]</p> <p>The zonal mapping process allows for progressive reductions in parking provision to be made accordingly. The resulting reductions are set out in Table 5.</p> <p>[Table 6 Zonal reductions]</p> <p>These ranges (expressed as percentages of the standards set out in Table 3) identify the degree of restraint to be applied to new development within each zone type. Within each range, the higher percentage represents the maximum level of parking provision. The level of provision will normally be expected to fall within the range shown.</p> <p>The general presumption is to use the lower provision that applies within each range. The range allows fine-tuning according to considerations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">the nature of the developmentlocal traffic conditionsthe relevance of rail servicesthe existing public parking supply. <p>A provision higher than the maximum standard (including zonal reduction) will only be</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	permitted in exceptional circumstances, and where it can be demonstrated in a TA that this is justified.			
-	-	3.16	Exceptionally, a site may straddle the boundary of one or more accessibility zones. In these circumstances, an attempt should be made to strike a balance between the requirements of each area the site falls within, having regard to the proportion of the site that falls within each area.	For clarity.
6.1 to 6.3	<p>Developers will be expected to allow for around 5% of the total stock of publicly accessible vehicle parking spaces to be for motorcycle use.</p> <p>This standard accords with advice on motorcycle use and parking provision produced by the Institute of Highway Engineers.</p> <p>The use of mopeds, scooters or small motorcycles can be beneficial in replacing car journeys; thus reducing congestion and emission levels. Secure parking for powered two-wheelers should be considered on its</p>	3.17 to 3.19	<p>The parking standard for PTWs is expressed as a proportion of the overall number of parking spaces. This means that the combined total of car and PTW spaces provided should fall between the minimum and adjusted maximum parking figures calculated in the previous step.</p> <p>For residential development, PTW spaces do not need to be provided where the majority of parking is allocated. This includes development where</p>	For clarity. Where car parking spaces are allocated to a dwelling, those spaces can be used for PTW parking. Therefore, there is no need to provide additional PTW spaces.

	<p>merits in every instance, taking into account the needs associated with the type of development proposed, particularly as its demands on development land are limited compared to those associated with car parking (i.e one car parking space can accommodate 5 or 6 motorcycles). Under or over-provision will be assessed on a site by site basis.</p>		<p>parking is provided on private driveways or in garages.</p> <p>For non-residential development, it is assumed that the vast majority of parking will be unallocated. Therefore, PTW spaces should always be provided.</p>	
6.4 to 6.7	<p>6.4 The following figures should be used as a guidance for what is likely to be considered acceptable in terms of service vehicle parking requirements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • B2 general industrial: 1 lorry space per 200 m² to 1 lorry space per 1,000 m² gross floor area • B8 warehousing/storage and distribution: 1 lorry space per 200 m² gross floor area (minimum 1 space) to 1 lorry space minimum plus 1 lorry space per 500 m² gross floor area. <p>The ranges reflect the variation in such standards and are not intended to reflect location. Provision for proposed developments will be assessed on a case by case basis.</p> <p>In terms of other land uses (e.g shops and</p>	3.20	<p>Few developments will require any lorry parking and where it is required, it will be assessed on a case-by-case basis, having regard to the specific nature or the proposed use or uses. Therefore, the standards presented should be seen only as a general recommendation and the proposed level of lorry parking should always be justified with reference to a transport assessment or technical note.</p>	No meaningful change.

	<p>offices) any service vehicle/lorry parking requirements are likely to be very specific to the operation in question. Therefore, the onus will be on the developer to make a convincing case. Requirements are likely to differ from those of B2/B8 uses where parking may well be required to accommodate lorries overnight.</p> <p>The benchmark standards above were identified by Hertfordshire County Council, following a review of lorry parking standards adopted/proposed by authorities outside of Hertfordshire.</p>			
2.34 to 2.37 & 3.10	<p>Where communal parking is proposed, a minimum 5% of the total number of spaces should be designated for use by disabled people. This is in line with guidance set out in Manual for Streets. A higher percentage is likely to be necessary for elderly persons accommodation.</p> <p>The number of disabled parking bays to be provided should be included in the total parking provision required, rather than in addition to it. However, it should always be provided at the full standard and should not be reduced according to Accessibility Zones.</p>	3.21 to 3.26	<p>Disabled persons' parking should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in Table 5. These standards apply to both residential and non-residential development.</p> <p>Parking for disabled persons is not subject to any accessibility reductions. This means that where the standards are expressed as a percentage, they refer to a percentage of the baseline maximum rather than adjusted maximum parking figure.</p>	<p>For clarity.</p> <p>Disabled persons' parking must be provided in addition to any other requirements otherwise in cases where there are accessibility reductions of approximately 90% or more, no disabled parking would be provided.</p>

	<p>Ideally parking spaces for disabled drivers should be provided in unallocated areas, including on-street, as it is not normally possible to identify which properties will be occupied by or visited by disabled people. These should be located as close as possible to building entrances.</p> <p>Consideration should also be given to the provision of storage for mobility scooters, especially when dealing with schemes for elderly persons accommodation. The need for this will be assessed on a site by site basis.</p> <p>The minimum parking standards for disabled motorists, in accordance with Building Standards 8300-1:2018: Design of an Accessible and Inclusive Built Environment are set out below:</p> <p>[Table 7 Parking provision for disabled motorists]</p>		<p>It also means that disabled persons' parking should be provided in addition to any parking provided as a result of previous steps.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.2 and 3.5 above also apply to disabled persons' parking.</p> <p>For residential development, disabled persons' parking need only be provided where parking is unallocated. Where a residential proposal includes a mix of allocated and unallocated parking, the number of disabled persons' parking spaces may be reduced accordingly.</p> <p>In all other cases, including all non-residential development, reduced levels of provision will only be acceptable where it is demonstrated that a development is adequately served by existing disabled persons' spaces. This may include developments which are adjacent to a sufficient number of on-street spaces.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

<p>7.1 to 7.8</p>	<p>The minimum cycle parking standards for all new development within the borough set below. Levels were originally set in the SBC Cycling Strategy (2018).</p> <p>[Table 8 Cycling Parking Standards]</p> <p>The minimum cycle standards differentiate between long and short stay provision, as the type of provision which needs to be made for each is different. The standards are based on “full-time equivalent” staff numbers where relevant. Provision on this basis can relate directly to mode choice targets. The standards are based on a mode choice target of 10%. This ambitious target is considered suitable for Stevenage, due to the town's exceptional infrastructure for cyclists. Cycle parking should be provided as close as possible to the entrance of the facility it serves, so that it offers a real advantage over using a private vehicle.</p> <p>Cycle parking provision at a specific development should be increased to allow for higher levels of cycling where local characteristics and employee travel plans indicate that this would be appropriate.</p> <p>Variation of Parking Type by Land Use</p> <p>The type of cycle parking provision required will</p>	<p>3.27 to 3.32</p>	<p>Cycle parking should be provided in accordance with the standards set out in Table 6. These standards apply to both residential and non-residential development.</p> <p>The cycle parking standards are minimum rather than maximum standards. Provision of spaces above the standard is strongly encouraged.</p> <p>The cycle parking standards differentiate between short-term spaces, which are principally for visitors, and long-term spaces, which are principally for residents and employees. Applications should make clear which spaces are for short-term use and which are for long-term use.</p> <p>As with disabled persons’ parking, cycle parking is not subject to any accessibility reductions. Again, this means that they must be provided in addition to any parking provided as a result of previous steps.</p> <p>Paragraphs 3.2 to 3.5 above also apply to cycle parking.</p>	<p>For brevity.</p>
-------------------	--	---------------------	---	---------------------

<p>vary depending on its use and up to date best practice guidance should be used at the point of application for any proposal.</p> <p>In public areas, cycle parking should be well overlooked to allow for maximum security. For short stay use such as this, Sheffield stands are generally appropriate, as these provide a simple and effective facility.</p> <p>For longer stay use, such as for employment premises, covered parking areas should be provided either within the building itself or located in close proximity to the building entrance. This will allow for weather and security protection. This can be accommodated through the use of cycle lockers or secure cycle sheds. For employment premises, shower facilities should also be provided in conjunction with these facilities.</p> <p>In terms of residential development, particularly flatted developments, there is a preference for shared cycle parking facilities to be provided, as opposed to providing spaces within each dwelling, as this is normally more efficient. Shared cycle parking facilities should be secure and convenient to use, ideally provided by a cycle shed. Cycle parking must be covered. Short stay cycle parking should also be</p>	<p>For residential development, units which have access to a private garage do not need to have any separate cycle parking. Where a proposal includes a mix of units which have garages and units which do not, the number of cycle parking spaces may be reduced accordingly.</p>	
---	--	--

	<p>provided for visitors. For non-flatted developments, long term cycle parking should be provided for each dwellings with short term parking provided communally.</p> <p>Some forms of cycle parking are inappropriate for all cyclists or all forms of cycles that cyclists use. For example, "double decker" parks are inaccessible for those that ride adapted bikes or less traditional bike such as a recumbent. The type of parking installed should be designed to be used by anybody and should not prohibit certain users or bikes from use.</p>			
2.7	<p>Table 3 sets out the Council's proposed car parking standards for new residential development. Where the level of provision calculated for a quantity of a particular size/type of dwelling results in a fraction of a space, the level of provision should be rounded up to the nearest whole number. If there is more than one size/type of dwelling being proposed as part of a development, the rounded up numbers of required spaces for each size/type of dwelling should be added together to give the overall required parking provision.</p>	3.33 to 3.34	<p>The application of the standards in this SPD will often result in figures which are not whole numbers. Where this is the case, the figures should be rounded up to the nearest whole number. The only exception is where a figure is equal to less than 0.5, in which case it may be rounded down to zero.</p> <p>In all cases, rounding should only be done after any relevant accessibility reductions have been applied.</p>	<p>For clarity. Previously this was only stated in the residential section, whereas it is now clear that it applies to both residential and non-residential schemes.</p>

<p>9.1 to 9.17</p>	<p>The County Council document Roads in Hertfordshire provides more general design standards and advice in relation to parking provision for vehicles, as well as other modes of transport. In addition, a number of best practice guidance documents covering parking provision also exist nationally. Manual for Streets provides detailed advice on the design and layout of parking provision including dimensional requirements for all types of spaces, requirements for disabled parking provision, cycle parking standards and advice, and guidance on motorcycle parking.</p> <p>The above publications should be used, in conjunction with this SPD, when creating an integrated development proposal.</p> <p>This chapter provides locally specific guidance, in terms of which types of provision work best, and provides an overview of the more specific design details. The following guidance should be followed when creating a development proposal.</p> <p>Unallocated parking will be the preference for most developments, and some unallocated parking should be included in all residential layouts, where possible.</p>	<p>3.35 to 3.40</p>	<p>Parking spaces (including garages) will only be counted as such where they comply with the most up-to-date standards of design, which at the time of writing, are found in Hertfordshire County Council's <i>Place & Movement Planning and Design Guidance for Hertfordshire (2024)</i>, Part 4, Chapter 6. Further guidance can also be found in the council's Design Guide SPD.</p> <p>This applies to both new and existing spaces. It is recognised that there are many parking spaces which do not meet the standards but are nonetheless frequently used without issue. However, the average size of vehicle has steadily grown over time and the council has no control over which vehicles people own. The council must therefore ensure that parking spaces are fit for a range of vehicle sizes today and in the future.</p> <p>Where visitor, PTW, disabled persons', and cycle parking is provided, it should be reasonably spread out such that it benefits the entire site. For example, on</p>	<p>For brevity, clarity, and to reflect HCC Highways parking design standards.</p>
--------------------	---	---------------------	--	--

	<p>On-street parking is a significant issue in Stevenage with many cars still parking on the street. This is often despite there being dedicated spaces allocated. The reasons for this include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Allocated parking does not always allow for differing levels of car ownership between different properties, and over time. Some dwellings have a higher level of car ownership than their allocated number of spaces, and some may have less/not own a car meaning their spaces may be completely unused. • Available spaces are not in a convenient location i.e. not situated next to the property. Evidence shows that car owners prefer to park as near to their dwellings as possible, both for convenience, and for security reasons, so that parked cars can be overlooked. <p>Unallocated parking may provide a solution to these problems by offering a more flexible approach. Unallocated parking allows for differing levels of car ownership at different properties and over time, and provides for the needs of both residents and visitors. It can also provide the opportunity for spaces to be used</p>		<p>very large sites, it will not normally be appropriate for all such parking to be provided in one location, even if the overall number of spaces provided is sufficient.</p> <p>Any spaces which are not for PTWs, disabled persons, lorries or cycles should meet the design criteria for standard car parking spaces.</p> <p>Where garages are provided, they should be laid out individually and in close proximity to the unit they serve. Garage blocks will rarely be considered acceptable.</p> <p>Where cycle parking is provided, it should be secure and sheltered, with convenient access to the street. For non-residential development, consideration should be given to providing supplementary facilities such as changing rooms, showers and lockers to improve the attractiveness of cycling as a mode of transport.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--

	<p>for non-residential use during the daytime.</p> <p>Unallocated off-street parking should be designed to be well integrated with the overall site layout and offer a proximate parking to residents. Spaces should be overlooked by nearby dwellings, ideally provided at the front of properties, but without being allowed to dominate the development. If blocks of parking are to be provided, these should be as small as possible, and should be dispersed through the development area, to allow for convenient and safe use.</p> <p>Where allocated parking is to be provided, the layout and design of this should be carefully considered. Each space should be located in close proximity to its associated dwelling, but should not be allowed to dominate the street scene.</p> <p>Developments should be designed with layouts which ensure that additional on-site provision cannot easily be achieved informally (to the detriment of amenity). However, designing developments to achieve these objectives should not compromise other residential design principles.</p> <p>Parking provision should be designed in line</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

	<p>with Secured by Design objectives. Parking should be overlooked by nearby properties to create a high level of natural surveillance. Where security may be an issue, car parking areas should also be well lit throughout the night.</p> <p>Guidance within Manual for Streets and the Stevenage Design Guide SPD should be referred to for further details on the design and layout of car parking.</p> <p>Garages should be located close to the property that they serve. Segregated garage courts should be avoided. Experience of these within Stevenage shows that they are often not well used, and create dead frontages and security concerns.</p> <p>The Manual for Streets recognises that, in some developments, less than half the garages are used for parking cars; many are used primarily for storage or have been converted to living accommodation. To take this into account, a minimum size requirement for garages has been set within this SPD. Garages that do not meet these dimensions can be provided, but these will not be counted towards car parking provision. However, they would still count towards cycle parking requirements.</p>			
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>Designated motorcycle parking provision should be provided close to the use it is serving. This will help to avoid the informal use of vehicle and cycle parking spaces, or other areas close to the building curtilage.</p> <p>Parking spaces specifically for motorcycles are not required for residential development as standard, as in most cases spaces for cars can be used. Where designated spaces are provided, these should ideally be covered, to increase security and allow for protection against the elements.</p> <p>Manual for Streets sets out the recommended dimensions for effective motorcycle parking.</p> <p>For further, more detailed, advice on parking provision for motorcycles, the guidance issued by the Institute of Highways Engineers should be followed.</p>			
-	-	3.41 to 3.42	When assessing proposals for additions or alterations to existing sites, the council will take levels of existing parking provision into account. This means that in cases where	For clarity.

			<p>existing parking provision does not comply with the standards, proposals for new development which is non-compliant may be acceptable, provided that the degree of non-compliance would remain the same before and after the development is implemented. However, proposals for entirely new development or comprehensive redevelopment will generally be expected to comply with the standards regardless of existing levels of provision.</p> <p>The council will also take existing conditions on surrounding roads into account. Where parking on surrounding roads is oversubscribed and especially where there is evidence of inconsiderate parking, it will be expected that proposed parking provision will be at or close to the maximum level allowed by the standards. In exceptional cases where these issues are deemed to be severe, provision above the standards may be considered necessary.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--

<p>4.1 to 4.6</p>	<p>Exact parking standards are not provided for mixed-use sites. Parking provision for such developments should be calculated on a site by site basis, and assessed via the TA process.</p> <p>As a starting point, parking requirements for each individual land-use should be calculated, incorporating the reductions allowed by residential and non-residential Accessibility Zones. However, this is merely a starting point as mixed-use sites offer great potential for different land-uses to share parking provision. This means that overall parking could be reduced significantly below the accumulated demand of each individual land use on-site. An assessment should be undertaken to take account of linked trips on site and the fact that time profiles of car parking demand will vary according to use.</p> <p>It is expected that parking provision on mixed-use sites would be below the accumulated demand of each individual land-use's requirements from Tables 4 and 6, however, if that is deemed inappropriate by a TA, the Council would seek parking provision in line with the lower end of the percentages in Tables 4 and 6. As an additional method of reducing parking provision, residential parking on mixed-use sites should be predominantly</p>	<p>3.43 to 3.46</p>	<p>On mixed-use sites, there may be opportunities for parking to be shared between different land uses, either because trips are linked or because the uses have differing time profiles for parking demand. In these cases, applications should be supported by an assessment of the potential for shared parking. Subject to this assessment, it may be possible to reduce parking provision below the accumulated requirements for each individual land use.</p> <p>The above applies especially to retail and leisure parks, which are known to attract a significant number of linked trips. For this reason, parking provision for all proposals for retail and leisure parks will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>Single-use sites which serve multiple functions can also give rise to similar considerations. Schools, for example, may be used as community sports facilities outside of teaching hours. In these instances, consideration should be given to the use of dual-purpose surfaces (e.g. school playing areas</p>	<p>No meaningful change.</p>
-------------------	--	---------------------	---	------------------------------

	<p>unallocated to maximise the opportunity to share parking spaces between different land-uses. Developers are advised to submit a Parking Management Plan to show how shared parking will work.</p> <p>Research shows that trip rates for retail parks are significantly lower than the sum of the individual land use components. Linked trip-making can reduce parking demand by up to 50% and a reduction of 25% appears readily attainable. A similar pattern will apply to mixed leisure developments. Developers should demonstrate such effects in their TAs.</p> <p>Single land use sites that have multiple functions e.g. schools used for community purposes outside of the school day raise similar issues to be addressed through TAs. In these instances, consideration should be given to the use of dual purpose surfaces such as school playing areas doubling as car parks if occasional overspill parking is envisaged.</p> <p>Where a new use is being added to an existing site, parking provision should be based on the parking requirements of the site as a whole. Parking requirements should not just be based on the needs of the individual land-use being introduced to the site. For example, if adding</p>		<p>doubling as car parks) if occasional overspill parking is envisaged.</p> <p>In all cases where parking is to be shared, it should be predominantly unallocated to facilitate sharing.</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>residential properties to a site with existing offices, the applicant should look to provide a quantum of new parking spaces that, in combination with existing levels of parking, meets the demand of the existing and proposed uses. The overall parking requirements should take account of the new Accessibility Zones and should assess the opportunity for shared parking as a way of reducing levels of parking on-site.</p>			
<p>2.30 to 2.32 & 3.11 to 3.12</p>	<p>The Stevenage Local Plan (adopted 2019) contains three strategic sites identified for large scale residential-led, mixed-use development in Policies HO2: Stevenage West, HO3: North of Stevenage, and HO4 South East of Stevenage. Each site will contain land-uses other than residential dwellings, including important local facilities such as primary schools, shops, community services and leisure facilities. In line with Policy IT6: Sustainable Transport, the sites should also be well served by public transport.</p> <p>Many of the non-residential requirements of these sites match the criteria of determining the extent of the Accessibility Zones (contained in Appendix 1). At the point of a Full or Reserved Matters application being submitted for any of these sites, the proposed layout of the</p>	<p>3.47 to 3.50</p>	<p>It is recognised that development, especially large-scale development, can result in sites having better access to local services and public transport than they did prior to the development being carried out. In these circumstances, it may be appropriate to reduce parking provision for later stages of a development as accessibility improves. In determining whether this is the case, regard should be had to the accessibility zone designation criteria set out in appendices 1 and 2.</p> <p>However, it must also be recognised that travel patterns tend to become established at the point of occupation of a</p>	<p>No meaningful change.</p>

	<p>development should enable the applicant and Council case officer to determine whether or not parts of the site are suitable to be categorised as an Accessibility Zone. If so, a reduced level of parking provision may be appropriate. If strategic sites are subject to phased applications, it could be that one phase meets the criteria to be categorised as an Accessibility Zone, whilst another phase does not.</p> <p>Due to Stevenage's tight borough boundary, numerous strategic sites within our neighbouring authorities lie adjacent to strategic sites within Stevenage. Parking requirements in adjoining strategic sites should not be different merely because of the location on either side of a authority boundary. Parking levels in each site should be consistent with one another, where possible, and should take account of the services / facilities that reduce the need for car-use in the wider area, not just in the same authority as the development. Cross boundary authorities should also be prepared to work together to ensure that potential vehicle displacement, which may well occur cross-boundary where developments are close to the boundary, are resolved.</p> <p>Phased introduction of restraint may be</p>		<p>property or the start of a new job and dependence on private vehicles can be hard to break once established. Therefore, a balanced judgement will be required such that any reductions in parking provision are not excessive.</p> <p>The above is particularly relevant to the three strategic housing sites allocated in the local plan. These sites are designated for large-scale development comprising a mix of homes, schools, shops and other local facilities. Once developed (or following a particular phase of development), they may meet the designation criteria for one or more accessibility zones, such that reduced levels of parking would be appropriate. Any full or reserved matters applications for these sites should therefore include sufficient information to enable the council to determine whether this is the case.</p> <p>Neighbouring authorities have also planned for development on the borough boundary, adjacent to the council's own strategic sites. Parking provision at these developments should be</p>	
--	---	--	--	--

	<p>acceptable at some new developments e.g. the removal of parking spaces/reduction in the number of spaces per phase of built development, after a specified period or when accessibility to the site by non-car modes is improved. Appropriate developments are likely to be large scale and for regeneration areas or large brownfield sites not ideally located in transport terms. Developments completed in line with the old Parking Provision SPD could also now be suitable a reduction in parking level and could apply to reduce levels of on-site parking in line with these new requirements.</p> <p>Nevertheless, travel patterns (particularly those of employees) tend to become established at the outset of starting a new job and initial car dependence may subsequently be hard to break. It is therefore important not to exaggerate allowances made in these circumstances.</p>		<p>consistent with that of development within the boundary, having regard to the availability of local services and public transport within the cross-boundary area as a whole.</p>	
2.33	<p>Where there is evidence of parking under-provision that is currently causing unacceptable impacts in the surrounding area, or where a loss of spaces would induce such effects, a proposed development must include measures that ensure such problems are not exacerbated or created. Measures may include providing</p>	3.51 to 3.53	<p>Proposals involving the loss of existing parking spaces will be assessed against the standards in the usual way, with any losses taken into account.</p> <p>Unmarked on-street parking spaces will not be protected</p>	For clarity.

	<p>replacement on-site parking spaces, but only after consideration is given to improvements to accessibility by non-car modes and a Travel Plan has been formulated. The package of measures will need to be justified in a TA.</p>		<p>unless there is evidence that their loss would cause or exacerbate issues of inconsiderate parking, to the detriment of highway safety. Marked on-street spaces will be protected and should be replaced as close as possible to their existing location unless there is evidence that they are not required. In any cases where development would result in the loss of on-street spaces, whether marked or unmarked, a parking survey should normally be carried out to determine the extent of any impact.</p> <p>Public car parks and cycle parking facilities will also be protected. Where they are lost, equivalent replacements should be provided within reasonable proximity to the destinations they serve unless it can be demonstrated that the parking is no longer required.</p>	
3.3	<p>The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020, granted freedom for a wider variety of changes-of-use without requiring planning permission.</p>	3.54 to 3.55	<p>Parking requirements can vary considerably between uses, even when they fall within the same use class. Changing use within the same class does not</p>	<p>No meaningful change.</p>

	<p>To reduce the potential for subsequent changes-of-use causing more significant impacts than initially mitigated for, the Council will assess applications for development within broad Use-Classes such as E - Business, Commercial and Service for the Highways/parking impacts of a worst case scenario based on what could be permitted by granting planning permission for that Use Class. If an application merely mitigates against the initially proposed land use rather than the worst land use within a broad Use Class, the Council may look to include restrictive conditions or covenants in a Section 106 agreement to prevent a subsequent change-of-use. This approach would be used to ensure that the Council can request that developers provide sufficient mitigation for the potential increased impacts caused by a change-of-use.</p>		<p>normally require planning permission and changing from one use class to another can sometimes constitute permitted development.</p> <p>When assessing applications, the council will be mindful of the possibility for such changes of use to occur. When granting permission for a development where parking is adequate for the proposed use but would be inadequate for another use within the same class or another use which could be implemented through permitted development rights, the council may impose conditions to restrict a change of use from taking place.</p>	
<p>2.21 to 2.24 & 4.7 to 4.10</p>	<p>Car-free residential developments may be permitted in the Town Centre, as identified by the TC Accessibility Zone on Map 1 and Inset Map 1.</p> <p>The town centre has excellent accessibility by non-car modes and is within easy walking distance of shops, supermarkets, restaurants, bars and other facilities. The town centre</p>	<p>3.56 to 3.63</p>	<p>The town centre is a unique location within the borough because of its excellent public transport links and wide array of shops and services. It is also set to undergo a comprehensive programme of regeneration, on which work has already begun. This will no doubt be supplemented by residential,</p>	<p>For clarity.</p>

<p>regeneration is a unique, dense, place-making scheme in the town, and is therefore the one place in the borough where transport related to the development could be able to focus entirely on sustainable modes.</p> <p>As well as reduced levels of parking at development sites within the town centre, developers may be asked to contribute to on-street parking controls to prevent residents living in these developments from parking on the street in surrounding areas. Due to the excellent non-vehicular connections and the range of proximate services and activities, the Council does not consider that residents living here have need for a car and we are keen to prevent the issue of overspill from Town Centre residents parking their cars on streets in the surrounding area.</p> <p>Developers will be encouraged to provide car-share schemes for residents, run by the relevant management company, as specified in any legal agreements upon occupation of each development as an additional measure to reduce parking requirements.</p> <p>Non-residential development within the town centre will not follow the maximum standards provided in Table 5. Parking provision for such</p>	<p>non-residential and mixed-use development on unallocated sites.</p> <p>The council will place the town centre at the forefront of its efforts to transition to sustainable modes of transport. This will not only involve limiting new car parking but also providing new sustainable travel facilities and measures to ensure that car parking is not simply displaced to surrounding areas.</p> <p>Residential development in the town centre should provide parking spaces at no more than 25% of the baseline maximum level. Ideally, it should not provide any parking apart from disabled persons' parking, cycle parking and dedicated bays for car sharing schemes. Applications for residential development in the town centre should always be supported by a transport assessment or technical note to justify the proposed level of parking.</p> <p>Non-residential development in the town centre will be assessed on a case-by-case basis. Any parking that is provided should be unallocated and publicly</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>developments will be calculated on a site by site basis, and assessed via a Transport Assessment.</p> <p>Town centre developments should meet any parking needs through shared public parking provision. Dedicated provision for customers and staff will only be permitted in exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>It will be important to ensure that the supply of town centre parking is sufficient to support the vitality and viability of the retail economy. Town centre developments may necessitate changes in public parking supply. To ensure that an appropriately balanced level of town centre parking is maintained, Transport Assessments should justify the level of parking proposed having regards to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The existing level of parking on the site; 2. The uses proposed to be developed on the site; 3. The status and progress of other town centre developments and their net parking change; <p>The acceptability of proposals for parking provision within these areas will be assessed in relation to the adequacy of the existing public parking supply. A Transport Assessment will</p>		<p>available, such that it can be shared by the staff and customers of other nearby businesses. Only in exceptional circumstances will private or allocated parking be considered acceptable. Applications for non-residential development in the town centre should always be supported by a transport assessment which provides justification for the proposed level of parking with reference to existing, planned and committed parking provision across the town centre as a whole.</p> <p>The need for car parking in the town centre may decline over time. With this in mind, any new car parking in the town centre should be designed so that it can be readily converted to other uses in the future, with due consideration given to floor-to-ceiling heights, outlook, pedestrian access, and materials.</p> <p>Where car-free development is proposed in the town centre, it may be challenging to find sufficient on-street space to provide new disabled persons' parking. In these circumstances,</p>
--	--	--	--

	<p>form the basis for this assessment. This will be informed by the Stevenage Parking Strategy 2004 (or replacement strategy document), the Retail Capacity Study and the town centre allocations included in the Local Plan.</p>		<p>reduced or zero provision may be acceptable provided that it can be demonstrate that the development will be adequately served by existing spaces.</p> <p>Developers should also note that much of the town centre is pedestrianised and the council want to avoid encouraging cycling in the areas where it is prohibited. Therefore, where there is no suitable cycle access to a site, it may be considered appropriate to develop off-site facilities or contribute to the council's cycle hire scheme in lieu of on-site cycle parking provision.</p> <p>In many cases, town centre development will necessitate planning obligations secured by a section 106 agreement. For further details, please refer to the Developer Contributions SPD.</p>	
--	---	--	---	--