

The East Hampshire District Local Plan: Draft Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Regulation 12 Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012

Persons consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document

The Vehicle Parking Standards SPD was subject to public consultation for a period of 8 weeks between 4 December 2017 and 29 January 2018. Copies of the draft document and supporting information (namely a Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening, Equalities Impact Assessment and the Statement of Matters and Availability (see Appendix 1) were made available to view at the following locations during opening hours:

- East Hampshire District Council Offices
- Alton Information Office
- Bordon Information Office
- Bramshott and Liphook Parish Office
- Horndean Parish Office
- Alton Library
- Bordon Library
- Horndean Library
- Liphook Library
- Petersfield Library

The SPD and supporting information was also made available to view online at:

<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation>

<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/draft-vehicle-parking-standards-spd>

(see Appendix 2 and Appendix 3).

Representations were invited via our online consultation portal, post or via email.

Documents available on the Council's Local Plan Consultation Portal

The Draft SPD was available to view online using our consultation portal. The portal enables users to submit comments on the document as they read it. The consultation portal can be accessed from the following link:

<https://easthants.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>

Consultation letters and emails

The Council notified all registered members on the East Hampshire District Local Plan consultation database. The database covers a wide range of stakeholders including local residents, businesses, and statutory bodies. In total, there are approximately 1,100 contacts on the database. The majority of members were contacted via email (see Appendix 4) and those without an email address were contacted via post (see Appendix 5).

Documents available on the Council's website

Copies of the Consultation Draft SPD, the Statement of SPD Matters and Availability, the Strategic Environmental Assessment and Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Assessment; and Equalities Impact Assessment were made available to view/download on the Council's website at:

<http://www.easthants.gov.uk/draft-vehicle-parking-standards-spd>

Summary of the main issues raised by those persons

A total of 19 individuals and organisations responded to the draft SPD. The comments made are summarised in the schedule attached as Appendix 6.

Six Statutory Consultees Responded to the consultation and five of these organisation (listed below) did not request any changes to be made to made to the Draft SPD:

- Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks
- Highways England
- Southern Water
- Natural England
- Historic England

Hampshire Police were the only statutory consultee that suggested modifications to the SPD. Hampshire Policy have recommended that the reference in the SPD to Secure By Design is not prescriptive enough and that the SPD should include some detailed requirements in relation to communal parking.

In terms of other respondents, the key response themes can be summarised as:

- Concern that insufficient flexibility is given to enable lower standards to be provided in parts of the Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Area (e.g. the new Town Centre).
- The minimum parking standards for office and residential uses should be set higher
- Minimum cycle parking standards should be set higher and cover more uses (e.g. retail).
- Visitor parking provision is set too high
- Minimum Parking Space Sizes and Garage Sizes – differing views.
- Some support for Electric Vehicle Standards for major residential developments but also an objection.
- New schools could be designed with drop off facilities and Greater reference should also be made to HCC's On-site School Parking Guidelines of April 2013
- Clarity required on some of the non-residential parking standards

How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

The Officer comments relating to these concerns and how they have been addressed in the final version of the SPD can be found in Appendix 6.

Appendix 1: Statement of SPD Matters and Availability

The East Hampshire District Local Plan: Draft Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Statement of SPD Matters and Availability

Regulation 12 Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England)
Regulations 2012

Title: Consultation Draft Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning
Document

Area Covered: The parts of East Hampshire District that lie outside of the South Downs National Park Authority Area. Whilst the SPD does not directly apply to the area designated as forming part of the Alton Neighbourhood Plan, in some instances, it is a consideration. Further detail is set out in the SPD.

Subject Matter: The document details the vehicle parking standards to be applied in those parts of the district covered by the document. The document contains standards for residential and non-residential developments.

Representation Period: The draft document is available for public consultation for a period of eight weeks between 4 December 2017 and 5pm on 29 January 2018.

Copies of the draft documents and the supporting information are available to view at the following locations:

Online at: http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation	At all times
East Hampshire District Council Penns Place, Petersfield GU31 4EX	Monday - Friday 09:00 – 17:00
Alton Information Office, 7 Cross and Pillory Lane GU34 1HL	Monday – Friday 09:00 – 16:30 (closed 13:00-13:30) Saturdays 09:30-12:00
Bordon Information Office, Forest Community Centre GU35 0BS	Monday – Friday 09:00 – 16:45 (closed 13:00-13:30)
Bramshott and Liphook Parish Office, The Haskell Centre, Midhurst Road GU30 7TN	Monday – Friday 10:00 – 16:00 (closed 13:00-14:00)

Horndean Parish Office, Tyfield House,
Blendworth Lane PO8 0AA

Monday to Friday
09:00 – 16:30

Local Libraries at Alton, Bordon, Horndean,
Liphook and Petersfield

During normal opening times

Representations to be sent to: Representations to the consultation draft
Supplementary Planning Document can be made in writing using one of the following
methods:

Through our online portal: <http://easthants.jdi-consult.net/localplan/>

By email: localplan@easthants.gov.uk

By writing in person to:

Planning Policy
East Hampshire District Council,
Penns Place,
Petersfield,
Hampshire, GU31 4EX

Adoption Notification: if you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Vehicle
Parking Standards SPD, please request this as part of your submissions.

Appendix 2: Planning Policy Consultation Webpage

A - Z My EHDC Contact us

Site search (keywords or phrases) 



- ✓ Excellent Service
- ✓ Free & Quick Delivery
- ✓ Confidential & Discreet
- ✓ Regulated & Approved
- ✓ UK based Call Centre

An EHDC advertisement. Supporting local businesses.

Planning services » Planning policy

 Consultation

- > Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD
- > Draft Residential Extensions & Householder Development SPD
- > Local Planning Application Requirements

The Planning Service at East Hampshire District Council is currently consulting on the following three documents

- Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD
- Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD
- Local Planning Application Requirements

Supplementary Planning Documents

The council is currently consulting on the two Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs):

- Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD
- Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD

Further information on how to respond to the consultations and electronic copies of each of the draft Supplementary Planning documents and supporting information can be accessed using the links above.

It is important to note that only those representations that are made in writing and are received by the council within the eight week period ending at 5pm on Monday 29 January 2018 will be considered. Comments received during this consultation cannot be treated as confidential. Responses will be published on the Council's website, together with the name and/or organisation name of the respondent.

Local Planning Application Requirements

The council is currently consulting on an update to its Local Planning Application Requirements document which sets out the planning authority's policy on the information which must be provided in support of all planning application types, for the council to determine their validity. It is important to note that this draft document does not apply to development located within the South Downs National Park Authority (SDNPA).

Further information on how to respond to the consultation and electronic copies of the supporting documentation be accessed using the links above.

It is important to note that only those representations that are made in writing and are received by the council within the eight week period ending at 5pm on Monday 29 January 2018 will be considered.

If you want to be kept informed on consultations from the Planning Policy team please email your contact details to localplan@easthants.gov.uk to be added to our database.

Live help

Available Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm. Please use the portal outside of these hours.



Planning maps

 [Interactive map](#)

View planning policy boundaries and other map based information

Related Pages

[Planning policy](#)

Email alerts

 **Sign up for updates**

More from East Hampshire

Animal welfare	Benefits	Bin collection	Businesses	Council Tax
Elections	Housing	Latest news	Planning services	Where I live

[Acceptable use](#) [Accessibility](#) [Complaints](#) [Cookies](#) [Freedom of Information](#) [Privacy](#) [Terms and conditions](#)

5

Appendix 3: Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document Webpage



East Hampshire DISTRICT COUNCIL

A - Z My EHDC Contact us

Site search (keywords or phrases)



Safety 1st Putting your safety first

Hampshire First Aid Training.
Ofqual Certified First Aid Training Across Hampshire

An EHDC advertisement. Supporting local businesses.

[Planning services](#) » [Planning policy](#) » [Consultation](#)

Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD

The draft Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document sets out East Hampshire District Council's off-street parking standards relating to new development in the District that is located outside of the South Downs National Park (SDNP). This SPD will support the Council's implementation of strategic policy CP31 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Comments are now invited from all interested persons on the draft document and its suitability for informing future planning decisions in East Hampshire (outside of the South Downs National Park).

The draft Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, Statement of SPD Matters and Availability, SEA/HRA Screening and Environmental Impact Assessment can be accessed as follows:

- [Statement of Matters and Availability](#) (pdf 151 kb)
- [Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD](#) (pdf 1.95 mb)
- [SEA/HRA Screening Statement](#) (pdf 442 kb)
- [Equality Impact Assessment](#) (pdf 197 kb)

It is important to note that only those representations that are made in writing and are received by the council within the eight week period ending at 5pm on Monday 29 January 2018 will be considered.

Representations to the consultation draft Supplementary Planning Documents can be made in writing using one of the following methods:

Through our [online portal](#) or by email to localplan@easthants.gov.uk.

Alternatively you can write to us in person: *Planning Policy, East Hampshire District Council, Penns Place, Petersfield, Hampshire, GU31 4EX.*

Live help

Available Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm. Please use the portal outside of these hours.



Email alerts



More from East Hampshire

[Animal welfare](#)

[Benefits](#)

[Bin collection](#)

[Businesses](#)

[Council Tax](#)

[Elections](#)

[Housing](#)

[Latest news](#)

[Planning services](#)

[Where I live](#)

Appendix 4: Email to Consultees

From: EHDC - Local Plan
To:
Cc:
subject: Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Documents

Sent: Mon 04/12/2017 12:35

Dear Sir/Madam,

As an individual or organisation that has registered on our Planning Policy database, we are contacting you to inform you that East Hampshire District Council is currently consulting on the two Supplementary Planning Documents:

Consultation Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD

The document sets out East Hampshire District Council's off-street parking standards relating to new development in the District (excluding the South Downs National Park). This SPD will support the Council's implementation of strategic policy CP31 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD

The document provides detailed guidance to address design and amenity issues for residential extensions and other householder development in the District (excluding the South Downs National Park). This SPD will support the Council's implementation of strategic policies CP27: Pollution and CP29: Design of the Joint Core Strategy.

We would therefore welcome your comments on the Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Documents. The eight week consultation period will commence on **Monday 4 December 2017** and close at 5pm **Monday 29 January 2018**.

Full details of the consultations and all the supporting documents, can be found on our website: <http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation>

In addition, local libraries and information centres within East Hampshire District will be supplied with copies of the following consultation documents:

- Consultation Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD
- Consultation Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD
- Statement of SPD Matters and Availability for both SPDs
- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening for both SPDs
- Equalities Impact Assessment Scoping Assessment for both SPDs

Representations to the consultations can be made in writing using one of the following methods:

Through our online portal: <http://easthants.idi-consult.net/localplan/>

By email: localplan@easthants.gov.uk

By writing in person to:

Planning Policy
East Hampshire District Council,
Penns Place,
Petersfield,
Hampshire, GU31 4EX

Please note that the comments received during this consultation cannot be treated as confidential. Responses will be published on the Council's website, together with the name and/or organisation name of the respondent.

Only those representations that are made in writing and are received by the Council within the eight week period ending at 5pm on Monday 29 January 2018 will be considered.

If you would like any more information on the Consultation draft Supplementary Planning Documents, or to be removed from our consultation database, then please contact the Planning Policy team on 01730 234102 or visit the Council's website at <http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation>

Yours faithfully,

Victoria Potts



Planning Policy Manager

Appendix 5: Letter to Consultees



Penns Place, Petersfield, Hampshire GU31 4EX
Telephone 01730 266551 • DX100400 Petersfield
info@easthants.gov.uk • www.easthants.gov.uk

 @EastHantsDC
 /EastHampshireDistrictCouncil

Enquiries to: Jenny Woodgate
Direct line: 01730 234102
Email: localplan@easthants.gov.uk
My reference: Consultation Draft SPD's
Your reference:
Date: 4 December 2017

Dear Sir/Madam,

As an individual or organisation that has registered on our Planning Policy database, we are contacting you to inform you that East Hampshire District Council is currently consulting on the two Supplementary Planning Documents.

Consultation Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD

The document sets out East Hampshire District Council's off-street parking standards relating to new development in the District (excluding the South Downs National Park). This SPD will support the Council's implementation of strategic policy CP31 of the Joint Core Strategy.

Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD

The document provides detailed guidance to address design and amenity issues for residential extensions and other householder development in the District (excluding the South Downs National Park). This SPD will support the Council's implementation of strategic policies CP27: Pollution and CP29: Design of the Joint Core Strategy.

We would therefore welcome your comments on the Consultation Draft Supplementary Planning Documents. The eight week consultation period will commence on **Monday 4 December 2017** and close at 5pm **Monday 29 January 2018**.

Full details of the consultations and all the supporting documents, can be found on our website: <http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation>

In addition, local libraries and information centres within East Hampshire District will be supplied with copies of the following consultation documents:

- Consultation Draft Residential Development and Householder Extensions SPD
- Consultation Draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD
- Statement of SPD Matters and Availability for both SPDs

- Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening for both SPDs
- Equalities Impact Assessment Scoping Assessment for both SPDs

Representations to the consultations can be made in writing using one of the following methods:

Through our online portal: <http://easthants.idi-consult.net/localplan/>

By email: localplan@easthants.gov.uk

By writing in person to:

Planning Policy
East Hampshire District Council,
Penns Place,
Petersfield,
Hampshire, GU31 4EX

Please note that the comments received during this consultation cannot be treated as confidential. Responses will be published on the Council's website, together with the name and/or organisation name of the respondent.

Only those representations that are made in writing and are received by the Council within the eight week period ending at 5pm on Monday 29 January 2018 will be considered.

If you would like any more information on the Consultation draft Supplementary Planning Documents, or to be removed from our consultation database, then please contact the Planning Policy team on 01730 234102 or visit the Council's website at <http://www.easthants.gov.uk/planning-policy/consultation>

Yours faithfully,

Victoria Potts



Planning Policy Manager
Victoria.potts@easthants.gov.uk

Appendix 6: Vehicle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document – Summary of Consultation Responses and Officer Comments

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
1	Scottish and Southern Electricity Networks	Where existing infrastructure is inadequate to support the increased demands from the new development, the costs of necessary upstream reinforcement required would normally be apportioned between developer and DNO (Distribution Network Operator) in accordance with the current Statement of Charging Methodology agreed with the industry regulator (OFGEM). Maximum timecales in these instances would not normally exceed around 2 years and should not therefore impede delivery of any proposed housing development.	Comments noted. No changes required.
2	Mr David Restell	<p>Proposed requirement is insufficient to cope with current car ownership and the number of homes put on developments. Sword Close, Clanfield is an example of too few parking spaces. It has been observed that 1 bedroom homes have 2 occupants, both with cars and sometimes a works van too. With rising housing costs more teenagers stay at home into their late 20's and cause an additional car ownership. Therefore minimum standard should be 1 more space than there are bedrooms for each home. Additionally social events in a home can cause 5 or 6 cars per home to visit. Several such events in one street e.g. on a bank holiday, require far more visitor parking. An increase in visitor parking would also facilitate space for delivery vehicles as more companies are using large vehicles for this purpose.</p> <p><u>SUMMARY:</u> Proposed standard does not reflect the practical current need for parking for dwellings. The minimum standard should be 1 more parking space than there are bedrooms per home.</p>	<p>The standards are minimum, meaning that more parking can be provided in accordance with local circumstances. It is important to note that parking provision should be within the overall aim of encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport, and excessive amounts of parking will be discouraged as this can result in poor design and harsh urban landscapes, and lessen the amount of open space provided.</p> <p>No change.</p>
3	Medstead Parish Council	Medstead Parish Council have read the proposals and are supportive of the aims of the proposed document.	Support noted. No changes required.

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
4	Southern Water	I can confirm Southern Water do not have any comments to make on this occasion.	Noted. No changes required.
5	Tony Ransley	<p>Office Parking Standards: Please review your requirements for offices in the light of a car per desk and the HSE desk space requirements which are “In a typical room, where the ceiling is 2.4m high, a floor area of 4.6m² (for example 2.0 x 2.3m) will be needed to provide a space of 11 cubic metres.</p> <p>Garages: The “Modern” estate home typically has garages narrower than 2.5. The Gardor range for example starts at 2.134m. Consider that the 3m minimum width is insufficient and should be 3.5m.</p> <p>Parking space sizes: Given that 2.4 meter does not allow for two larger cars to be parked next to each other and their occupants to exit . Can I request you revisit that and allow at least 2.8 meters and more properly 3 meters.</p> <p>Reference is made to a Smart Parking Model Byelaw which makes provisions for implementing smart parking strategies to address three distinct issues relative to off-street parking:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Reducing the standards for required parking; 2) Providing innovative solutions for shared and off-site parking; and 3) Parking area design <p>http://www.mass.gov/envir/smart_growth_toolkit/bylaws/SP-Bylaw.pdf</p>	<p>The standards are minimum, meaning that more parking can be provided in accordance with local circumstances. It is important to note that parking provision should be within the overall aim of encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport. We anticipate that new office provision will be located within town centres or the main settlements where there will be opportunities for employees to use transport.</p> <p>The garage sizes are minimum and therefore larger garages can be provided.</p> <p>The parking space sizes are minimum and therefore larger spaces can be provided.</p> <p>Section 2 of the SPD provides flexibility for utilising parking standards lower than the prescribed minimums in certain circumstances which will be considered on a case by case basis.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
6	Highways England	We have reviewed the consultation and have no comments.	Noted No change.
7	Four Marks Parish Council	<p>Four Marks Parish Council wholeheartedly support the proposals in this document and firmly believe that the adoption of minimum parking standards is essential for any future development in the EHDC area.</p> <p><u>Policy Standards:</u> We agree the standard of 2 spaces for 2/3 bed dwellings and 3 spaces for 4 plus bed dwellings. However from our own experience we question just one space for all one bedroom dwellings. On our new housing developments these often go to young couples as first time buyers, who both work, and each run a car to get to work.</p> <p>We question if the parking space size of 2.4m X 4.8m is adequate for vehicles on Traveller sites, recognising that many vehicles that use these sites are of commercial or semi commercial type.</p> <p>Retail: We question whether provision for A1 shops is adequate.</p> <p>For future school development the site should be sufficiently large to include as a condition, the provision of on site off street drop off zones similar to those provided at airports.</p> <p>Paragraph 3.1.6 As a slight aside, we identify an inconsistency in the way that settlements appear to be categorised. In this document Horndean is shown as a Large local service centre. In an accompanying Document both Horndean and Four Marks are shown as Small local service centres, whilst</p>	<p>The standards are minimum, meaning that more parking can be provided in accordance with local circumstances. It is important to note that parking provision should be within the overall aim of encouraging use of sustainable modes of transport, and excessive amounts of parking will be discouraged as this can result in poor design and harsh urban landscapes, and lessen the amount of open space provided.</p> <p>Change: Reference has been added to the Hampshire County Council On Site School Parking Guidelines (2013)</p> <p>Change: This section has been updated with references to a number of settlements removed.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>Liphook is simply classed as a large village. It would be helpful to understand these classifications and the inconsistencies.</p> <p>Garage sizing: we recognise that garages are all too often only used for storage, and to be realistic perhaps they should not be included as a parking space.</p> <p>Layout: (Paragraph 4.2.2) We agree that tandem parking can reduce the likelihood of the rear parking space being used, and that such arrangements should be discouraged. The document says that triple tandem parking should be discouraged. We believe it should not be permitted at all in future design. We also support the statement that it is not a given that garages will count as parking space. In fact we believe the inclusion of the garage in calculations, to be the cause of most on street residential parking, as they are mostly used for storage. A rethink is needed here.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.3 - We firmly believe that overall policy should afford higher importance to the provision of parking and recognise that the required standards may well justify and result in a lower housing density to accommodate the required number of parking spaces as well as retaining 'green' and landscaped front gardens. This is especially important</p>	<p>Garages will only be counted as a parking space where they meet or exceed the minimum sizes detailed in the document.</p> <p>Tandem parking (i.e. one car behind another) can reduce the likelihood of the rear parking space being used. Where a minimum of three parking spaces is required, 'triple' tandem parking (as shown below) where two spaces are provided in front of each other, in front of a garage, will <u>only be allowed in exceptional circumstances where evidence is provided demonstrating that such an approach is the only feasible way of accommodating the required standards of parking provision within the development. The reason for this is because it is discouraged, as it is unlikely the garage will be used as parking.</u></p> <p>The standards are minimum, meaning that more parking can be provided in accordance with local circumstances. Excessive amounts of parking will be discouraged as this can result in poor</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>in rural and semi rural areas. This may well be a contentious suggestion but deserves serious discussion and realistic consideration to ensure future environments are not purely vegetation free urban environments blighted by on street parking.</p> <p>Four Marks Parish Council strongly support this document, and your assertion that use of maximum standards can cause parking difficulties, safety concerns, and adversely impact on the overall visual appearance of the area, and are clearly not adequate to improve parking issues in future developments.</p>	<p>design and harsh urban landscapes, and lessen the amount of open space provided.</p>
8	Headley Parish Council	<p>We support the comment that there is greater need for additional parking in rural developments and wish to highlight that the already addressed issue that a parking width measurement of 2.4 x 4.8m is inadequate for many modern cars and would like to see this increased. Minimum standards are not always sufficient, and the Council should have the ability to be flexible with every application being considered on its own merits.</p>	<p>Noted. The standards are expressed as a minimum and therefore larger spaces can be provided.</p>
9	Paul Basham Associates on behalf of Barratt David Wilson Homes	<p><u>Visitor Parking</u></p> <p>There is a concern however with the level of visitor parking for cars being a minimum of 1 space per 4 dwellings (0.25 per unit). This standard is above those set within any other council under Hampshire</p> <p>County Council jurisdiction. Visitor car parking standards for other Hampshire Authorities are lower (typically 0.2 per unit).</p> <p>There does not appear to be sufficient evidence to support the increase in visitor parking when councils such as the New Forest District and Hart</p>	<p>Comments noted. The Council acknowledge that the visitor parking standards for residential units are greater than those for other local authorities with similar characteristics and that no evidence has been provided to justify the minimum requirement of 0.25 per unit.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>District have similar car ownership levels given the similar rural nature. The evidence does state that car ownership in East Hampshire is higher than the national average and than values in many other districts within the county, although this does not necessarily follow through to the need for increased visitor parking provision.</p> <p>Given that visitor parking cannot be provided within curtilage and truly remain free-for-all, the proposed level of visitor parking is therefore likely to dominate the streetscape, and have a negative impact on the urban realm. The provision is therefore in direct conflict with the key objective of the standards (identified in Para 2.6.1) which states ‘without an unacceptable detrimental impact on the local road network, or the visual appearance of the development (from excessive and inconsiderate on street parking).’ It is therefore felt that the visitor parking standards should be reduced to reflect other borough/district standards which would result in a less detrimental urban realm design.</p> <p>The draft standards do not provide any guidance regarding the formality of the visitor parking spaces as to whether these have to be formally marked out bays off-street or whether a number of spaces could be informal on-street spaces similar to Eastleigh Borough Council’s standards and clarity should be provided on this point.</p> <p>An overprovision of visitor parking would therefore result in a direct conflict with Policy CP31 of the Joint Core Strategy which aims to reduce the reliance on the private vehicle.</p>	<p>Change: The requirements for minimum Car parking requirements for short stay (visitor) parking have been amended to 1 space per 5 dwellings (0.2 per dwelling).</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>Change: Section 4.2 has been updated to state:</p> <p>‘In new residential developments, visitor parking must be provided in public areas where it can be accessed by all. Visitor parking must be readily apparent from a visitors view point and easily accessible from the street. It must also be equally distributed through the development. Signing is recommended to identify the status and location of visitor parking spaces.’</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p><u>Parking bay sizing and garage sizing</u></p> <p>The bay dimensions proposed in EHDC's draft standards are 2.4m x 4.8m for cars (Table 1, Para 4.1.2), single garages being a minimum of 3m in width by 6m in length (internally) and double garages being a minimum of 6m by 6m (internally) (para 5.1.1) is in accordance with standards provided by many other council standards and is also in line with many developers' own design guidance/standard garage product.</p> <p><u>Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure</u></p> <p>The draft standards also provide guidance on the provision of parking for electric vehicles (under section 3: Parking Standards) which are claimed to be more feasible on major developments of 10 homes or more. The standards state that such a provision should be considered on a 'case by case basis' (Page 11) where private driveways and garages are treated as parking spaces. However clearer guidance is needed regarding the requirement and specification for electric cars at residential uses as per the other land uses, if these are realistically to be provided.</p>	<p>Please note that due to the varied nature of the District which is predominantly rural, the Council do not wish to provide detailed guidance on visitor parking. Types of provision will be considered on a case by case basis.</p> <p>Comments noted. No change</p> <p>Supported Noted. However, the document has been revised to encourage the provision of electric vehicle charging provision from different development types and further supporting guidance has been added in Section 4.6.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
10	Bramshott and Liphook Parish Council	The draft Vehicle Parking Standards have taken account of increased sizes of private vehicles and the high dependence on vehicle use in this area of Hampshire. Improved design guidance should have a positive effect on road safety, aesthetics and landscaping. Bramshott and Liphook Parish Council supports efforts to encourage and promote sustainable development including the provision of facilities for electric powered vehicles in new developments.	Support Noted. No change.
11	Tim Pickering	<p>Given the expected development within the East Hants area, including the "Land East of Horndean", and the continued redevelopment of Whitehall and Bordon, I request that the council take this opportunity to strengthen the SPD for the benefit of all East Hants residents, and the council themselves.</p> <p>Specifically, the document fails to provide suitable rules for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fails to implement and enforce what appears to be the latest East Hampshire Cycle Strategy Document, "A Cycle Plan for East Hampshire, dated 2004" • 2004" Recommendations (Section Longer term parking and security risks; • Cycle parking for wet weather conditions; • Various types of Bicycle, including Bicycle used as a Mobility Aid; • Appropriate locations of cycle parking; • A Minimum Cycle parking Provision for all Building Use Classes. <p><u>Section 3</u></p> <p>The lack of definition of any minimum cycle parking numbers for anything other than C3 and B1, B2, and B3 standards is inadequate, especially given the lack of any minimum specification for the provision of wider</p>	<p>The SPD provided cycle parking standards for a range of uses including Retail (A1 uses), Education Establishments (D1 uses and the</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>cycling (or wider Active Travel) facilities, such as Showers and Lockers, is a fundamental failure, especially as part of large developments.</p> <p>Any formula for short stay visitor cycle parking that results in the lack of a requirement for a visitor space for developments of less than 10 houses is fundamentally flawed. At least 1 visitor cycle space should be provided for any development in excess of 2 dwellings.</p> <p>I recommend that the formula be adjusted to the following, which takes into consideration the difficulty of adding provision later, given the length of time that developments last for, and considers the period between SPD updates:</p> <p>“Short stay (visitor) cycle parking requirement –2 visitor spaces is always required for developments of 2 or more dwellings , and increases dependent upon the number of dwellings proposed. Where the number of dwellings proposed is not a multiple of 10, provision will be rounded up. For example, for a proposal of 33 homes, 6 short stay (visitor) cycle parking spaces is the minimum requirement ($2+(33/10)=5.3$, rounded up to 6). For single dwelling developments, a single visitor space is required.”</p> <p>This is a similar approach utilised within the Portsmouth City Supplementary Planning Document,</p> <p><u>Non residential cycle parking</u></p> <p>I recommend that, for simplicity reasons, East Hants utilise the same minimums as defined by the Basingstoke and Deane Non-Residential Parking SPD (published 2003). It utilises a general rule of 1 space per 6</p>	<p>majority of Health Centres) and a range of there uses (e.g.eating and drinking establishments and community / village halls).</p> <p>Change: residential parking standards has been amended from ‘one space per 20 dwellings’ to ‘visitor cycle spaces will be expected at 10% of the long stay spaces in developments of 5 units or more’.</p> <p>Basingstoke and Deane and currently consulting on an updated parking supplementary planning document which requires standards based on floor area that is broadly aligned with what is</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>member of staff, a really good target to aim for. This also shows how far behind similar councils the East Hampshire Council SPD is.</p> <p>The current non-residential cycle storage is only defined for B1, B2 and B3 classes of building, leaving the following completely uncovered.</p> <p>Without covering these classes, the economic benefit of cycling cannot be unlocked.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Class A – shops (including some services) • Class A1 – shops and retail outlets • Class A2 – professional services • Class A3 – food and drink • Class A4 – drinking establishments • Class A5 – hot food and takeaway • Class D – non-residential institutions 	<p>contained within the Consultation East Hampshire Parking Standards SPD or provision based on the number of staff.</p> <p>Change: for B1(a), B1(b/c) and B2 uses the following text has been added to the long stay parking requirements ‘or 1 space per 8 staff (whichever is greater)’.</p> <p>Change: for B8 uses the following text has been added to the long stay parking requirements ‘or 1 space per 10 staff (whichever is greater)’</p> <p>The SPD provided cycle parking standards (both long and short stay) for a range of uses including Retail (A1 uses), Education Establishments (D1 uses and the majority of Health Centres) and a range of there uses (e.g.eating and drinking establiushments and community / village halls).</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Class D1 : Many “Public” services, ie Medical or health services premises, Crèches, Schools, Museums, Libraries, Exhibition halls, places of workshop. Class D2: Cinemas, Concert halls, Bingo halls or casinos, Dance halls, Swimming baths, skating rinks, gymnasiums or “area for other indoor or outdoor sports or recreations <p><u>Section 6.3: Cycle parking design and layout</u></p> <p>I request that the document be updated to utilise the excellent rules and advice laid out in Section 5 of the Portsmouth Parking SPD, modified as per recommendations elsewhere in this document.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: Section 5 (Bicycle Parking) of the Supplementary Planning Document has been updated to include additional guidance on Long Stay and Short Stay Cycle Parking provision.</p>
12	Southern Planning Practice	<p>Clarification sought on the draft parking standard for petrol stations is the appropriate retail category (of which there are two). To my way of thinking a petrol station with a Tesco Express, Budgens or M&S must fall within the A1 Shops (food retail) category and require car parking at 1 space per 14m² covered area. However if a petrol station shop is not operated by a supermarket company but is run by the garage owner and provides a range of goods along the lines of:</p> <p>Car related products, newspapers & magazines, sandwiches and other hot and cold food to go and some convenience goods lines would this fall within the A1 Shops (non-food retail and general retail) category?</p> <p>Clarification is required on whether the car parking standard be calculated on the basis of the gross floor area of the building or can customer toilets and back of house staff facilities be excluded from the floor area calculation? In other words is it the gross floor area of the sales area that should be used?</p>	<p>This will be consider on a case by case basis dependant upon the type of retail offer being proposed at the petrol filling station.</p> <p>The SPD states that Gross External Area (GEA).</p> <p>Change: the text supporting non residential standards has been amended to state Floorspace is Gross External Area (GEA) <u>which will include the thickness of the external wall.</u></p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
13	Hampshire Police	<p>If insufficient residential parking is provided any on site visitor parking spaces will be used to accommodate resident's overflow parking and after that vehicles will continue to be parked wherever a space can be found. Which is the situation now, and an issue this SPD seeks to address.</p> <p>Comments in relation to Primary Schools: At drop off and pick up times the pressure to park on the road network is so great that often motor vehicles are parked within the prohibited zone, which compromises the safety of the children. There are many reasons why guardians drive their wards to school. At the planning stage it is difficult to foresee the parking requirement at drop off and pick up time. However, schools could be designed with drop off facilities, nearby roads could be designed with greater 'on street' parking opportunities, and schools could be positioned to take advantage of other nearby parking opportunities.</p> <p>Planning guidance advises that "Natural surveillance of parked cars is an important consideration." To reduce the opportunities for crime it is important that there is natural surveillance of parked motor vehicles from the associated dwelling.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.2.6 advises that Secured by Design should be considered in relation to the design and layout of car parks, this is not prescriptive and allows for none of the requirements to be incorporated into the design. Specific requirements should be stated; such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Where communal car parking areas are necessary they should be in small groups, close and adjacent to homes and must be within view of active rooms (See Note) within these homes. • Note: The word 'active' in this sense means rooms in building elevations from which there is direct and regular visual connection between the room and the street or parking court. Such visual connection can be expected from rooms such as kitchens and living 	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: The SPD has been updated to include references to the Hampshire County Council School Parking Guidelines.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: Section 3.2 (Layout) of the SPD has been updated to include the suggested text.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>rooms, but not from more private rooms, such as bedrooms and bathrooms.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rear car parking courtyards are discouraged for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ They introduce access to the vulnerable rear elevations of dwellings where the majority of burglary is perpetrated ○ In private developments such areas are often left unlit and therefore increase the fear of crime ○ Un-gated courtyards provide areas of concealment which can encourage anti-social behaviour • Where rear car parking courtyards are considered absolutely necessary they must be protected by a gate, where gardens abut the parking area an appropriate boundary treatment (e.g. a 1.5m fence supplemented by trellis to a height of 1.8m) must be installed • Communal parking facilities must be lit to the relevant levels as recommended by BS 5489:2013. <p>Paragraph 4.4.4 states “If underground or multi storey parking is to be provided, particular attention should be paid to the provision of lighting and safety, to ensure all attempts are taken to design out opportunities for crime.” However, the SPD should take the stance that all parking should be designed to reduce the opportunities for crime.</p> <p>Paragraph 4.5.1 advises that residential parking should not normally be allocated unless there are concerns that persons other than residents might use the spaces. Dwellings that do not have in curtilage parking should have a minimum number of allocated parking spaces, this provides for a fair</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: An additional paragraph has been added to the section 4.3 (Design) to state ‘All parking should be designed to reduce the opportunities for crime’.</p> <p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: Section 3.5 has been amended to reflect the benefits of allocating parking provision for long stay (resident) parking.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		distribution of parking opportunities and prevents a few residents owing a high number of motor vehicles dominating the parking opportunities.	
14	Whitehill Bordon Project Team (EHDC)	<p>It is noted in the document that you cite the availability of services and facilities at Whitehill and Bordon in the new town.</p> <p>Combined with the transport hub this will make the new town centre and some surrounding sites more accessible.</p> <p>The ability to consider less car parking for application sites that are in more accessible locations is welcomed, and very much desired, as we understand there will be small future development sites close to the new town centre in Whitehill and Bordon which may only be able to comply with the minimum standard, this may indeed also be the case in other locations across the district.</p> <p>The inclusion of standards for electric vehicle charging points is also welcomed.</p>	<p>Support Noted.</p> <p>Changes: Modifications have been made to section 2.1 to reflect the sustainability of WHB and the significant investment in transport infrastructure (including public transport) that is committed as part of the Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Project.</p>
15	Natural England	No comments to make.	Noted
16	Historic England	We welcome the recognition of the need for sensitivity in conservation area in paragraph 6.3.3.	Comment Noted
17	Persimmon Homes South Coast	<p>As a house builder, the Company's operations are not affected by the majority of the provisions within the draft SPD.</p> <p>However, the requirement for electric vehicle charging points set out in the draft SPD would have a significant bearing on our operations. As such it is this element which forms the basis of our representations to the consultation on the draft Vehicle Parking Standards SPD.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Change: The requirements for Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure have been revised.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>From the policy basis cited within the adopted Local Plan, there is clearly no requirement for or mention of the provision of charging points on residential parking spaces. Based on the approach advocated by the NPPF and PPG which states that the role of SPDs is to amplify rather than introduce new policy.</p> <p>It is our view therefore that the requirement for EV charging points as set out in the draft SPD is an introduction of new policy, contrary to the role of SPDs.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that there is a policy requirement within the adopted Core Strategy for new development related to the Whitehill & Bordon Allocation to deliver electric vehicle charging points.</p> <p>While this is an issue that has been subject to the examination process and consequential viability assessment, the evidence and examination on this point related to Whitehill and Bordon only. Therefore, if the council wishes to introduce a new policy requirement for charging points it should do so through the local plan making process where the issues can be sufficiently examined and viability tested.</p> <p>It is evident that at present while there is a clear national policy direction towards charging provision for EVs the emphasis is on commercial locations and not residential locations.</p> <p>We request therefore that the council with draw the requirement for electric vehicle charging points on new residential development. This is to ensure that the Parking Standards SPD accords with the NPPF, PPG and East Hants adopted policy.</p>	<p>Change: The minimum requirements for residential development and all other land uses where a minimum requirement for electric vehicle provision have been removed.</p> <p>The following text has been inserted:</p> <p><i>'The Council will encourage the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure.</i></p> <p><i>Further guidance is provided in Section 4.6.'</i></p> <p><i>Section 4.6 provides standards for within the Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Area and states</i></p> <p><i>'In those parts of the district located outside of the Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Area, the Council will encourage provision in accordance with the standards detailed in para 4.6.5. However, as a minimum all new development should ensure that the electricity infrastructure for the development is sufficient to enable supply to be provided for electric vehicle charging'.</i></p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
18	Rowlands Castle Parish Council	<p>The SPD appears well-argued and sound, recognising that policy by itself will not bring about lower car use in a rural location with essentially minimal public transport alternatives.</p> <p>Section 3:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rail: The station in Rowlands Castle may be accessible but it has very limited parking provision and many users park in the surrounding area instead. With reference to paras 3.1.2 and 3.1.3, the train service is not sufficient to allow for less parking than the minimum standard. • Bus: The reference in para 3.1.8 to bus routes to Havant, Emsworth and beyond is misleading. There is only one bus route, running at two-hourly intervals, with just 5 daily buses from Monday to Saturday. The service does not warrant inclusion in the SPD. • Education Establishments: The minimum car parking requirements for visitors (p19/20) should be much more prescriptive and quantifiable than the proposed text. Greater reference should also be made to HCC's On-site School Parking Guidelines of April 2013, from which EHDC appears to have taken various details for its SPD. <p>Section 4 – We support proposals on layout / design in order to encourage as much off-road, and particularly off pavement, parking. However sufficient green space for environmental as well as drainage reasons is also necessary.</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>Change: Section 3 has been updated and all references to Rowlands Castle and a several other settlements have been removed.</p> <p>Comments Noted. Change: Reference has been added to the Hampshire County Council School Parking Guidelines.</p> <p>Noted.</p> <p>Change: additional text has been added to the Section 3.3 - Design to state 'permeable surfaces should be used wherever possible to reduce surface</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>Section 5 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Electric Vehicles. support the provision for future increased use of electric vehicles and the parking standards for larger developments (p11 and 5.6). • HGVs: support the provision of HGV parking (para 5.10) where necessary for deliveries to appropriate new commercial/retail developments. <p>Section 7 (Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Travel Statements). We would suggest the title of this section be amended to ‘Transport’ rather than ‘Travel’ Statements because that is the terminology used throughout the rest of the section. The standardisation of terminology throughout avoids confusion.</p> <p>From local experience we believe the threshold for requiring a TA should be lower than 50 residential units (para 7.1.5) and would suggest 30 units instead for any one development or, where there are adjacent development proposals, a combined threshold of 30 units.</p>	<p>water runoff and assist with sustainable drainage measures’.</p> <p>Support noted. However, the document has been revised to encourage the provision of electric vehicle charging provision from different development types and further supporting guidance has been added in Section 4.6.</p> <p>Comment noted. Change: the title of Section 7 has been amended to state ‘Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Transport Statements’.</p> <p>Comments noted. The thresholds are set by HCC, however flexibility is acknowledged in the supporting text (para. 6.1.6). No change required.</p>
19	GVA on behalf of Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Company	<p>Our comments, on behalf of the Whitehill & Bordon Regeneration Company, are made in the context of the on-going redevelopment of Bordon Garrison through the creation of Prince Philip Park, a residential led (2,400 dwellings) mixed use project which received HPA consent in late 2015 (ref 55587/001).</p> <p>Whitehill & Bordon has been designated by the NHS as the pilot lead for the built environment. A lead component of this workstream, championed by the EHDC portfolio holder and deputy leader, is an emphasis on</p>	<p>Comments Noted.</p> <p>Change: Additional information has been added in Section 2 (Accessibility and Opportunities for Public Transport) to provide further detail on the proposals for Whitehill and Bordon including the</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>sustainable movement, notably walking and cycling, and modal shift from car based travel to healthier means</p> <p>Whitehill & Bordon is also designated as a Green Town. Policy objectives for this are set out in the adopted Joint Core Strategy (JCS 2014). Indeed, JCS paragraph 3.22 sets out the combined objectives for the Green Town, and in particular Objective WB4 states: To increase local jobs, minimising the need to travel outside the town to work and supporting walking, cycling and public transport over the car.</p> <p>The JCS includes numerous policies specific to specific to Whitehill & Bordon, including in relation to car -parking, as Policy CSWB17 states: Development proposals will provide car parking in accordance with the Car Parking Strategy for Whitehill & Bordon. The strategy balances the need for car parking with the need to promote sustainable transport.</p> <p>A HPA S.106 contribution towards transport totalling nearly £10m includes a substantial proportion towards increasing the number/frequency of bus services, which isn't reflected in paragraphs 3.1.9/3.1.10 of the draft SPD.</p> <p>The draft SPD's change in approach from now seeking to set minimum, rather than maximum, parking standards is very significant in the Whitehill & Bordon context and would fundamentally change the approach taken to date. EHDC has also approved a HPA site-wide 'Structuring Plan' (as required under HPA condition 6) (as revised in 2017) which includes addressing movement and transport matters, including street hierarchy, connectivity, public transport and parking. Indeed Section 6 of the approved Structuring Plan Explanatory Document sets out parking standards (both relating to town centre parking and parking outside the centre), which for reasons above, including sustainability, take a different approach to parking standards contained in the draft SPD.</p>	<p>significant investment in public transport improvements.</p> <p>Change: A paragraph in Section 2 (Accessibility and Opportunities for Public Transport) has been amended to state:</p> <p>In light of the above, there are likely to be situations where less parking than the minimum standards are appropriate, such as proposals in locations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • close to sustainable transport interchanges • close to a range of services / facilities, • That are strategic development areas such as the Whitehill Bordon Regeneration Project Area. <p>In addition, paragraph 2.1.4 has been updated to state</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>The HPA Structuring Plan (and subsequently approved Town Centre Design Code ref 55587/050) has formed the basis upon which, for example, the latest town centre Phase 1 RMA proposals have been prepared and submitted to EHDC. This RMA includes residential development (177 units) which are mostly 2-bed and proposed with 1 vehicle parking space (and 2 cycle spaces) per unit, with no separate dedicated visitor spaces to be provided, which is in line with the approved Structuring Plan. This approach directly conflicts with proposed draft SPD standards which set a minimum requirement for 2 vehicle spaces for a 2 bed unit, with an additional 1 short stay visitor space per 4 units.</p> <p><u>Visitor Parking</u> The need to provide visitor parking, could in some locations (and specific HPA parcel designs) be integrated readily easily, especially when integrated within green verges or street tree planting. In other locations, such as smaller HPA parcels or quieter streets, this could add unnecessary regulation as a natural/self-regulated on-street visitor parking could work equally well. However different considerations apply to creating a new town centre in Whitehill & Bordon and as stated above.</p> <p>There is a 'place-making' concern about the inclusion of visitor bays which tend to lead to very engineered solutions, which often (in order to save space) create footpaths that weave around these bays, thereby not supporting a straight desire line route for pedestrians.</p>	<p><i>'Where parking provision is being proposed below the minimum standards, the applicant should submit evidence to demonstrate that the level of parking provision proposed is sustainable, adequate and will not have a detrimental impact on the local highway network. <u>For strategic development areas this could consist of any agreed Structuring Plans.</u> Where such evidence does not exist, a Car Parking Survey should be produced (See Section 3.7). These will be considered on a case by case basis'.</i></p> <p>Comments Noted. The requirements for visitor parking have now been reduced to 1 space per 5 dwellings for residential uses.</p> <p>In addition, and as noted above, there is flexibility for departure from the minimum standards in specific circumstances, including where the proposal is located within a strategic development area such as the Whitehill and Bordon Regeneration Project Area.</p>

ID	Respondent	Response Summary	Officer Response
		<p>The blanket application of the emerging visitor space standard could add the need to create around a further 600 parking spaces for visitors to serve the consented 2,400 HPA dwellings which is very significant in terms of land-take/parcel densities and WBRC's place-making agenda.</p> <p>Unless the draft SPD can take a more flexible approach to parking standards within the Whitehill & Bordon regeneration project area, then we would invite EHDC to amend the draft SPD to exclude the whole of the Whitehill & Bordon regeneration project area.</p> <p>Whilst draft SPD paragraphs 2.5.4/2.5.5 do allow for a departure from the SPD parking standards if 'robust evidence' can be provided, we contend that we have already passed this point (particularly with the approval of the HPA Structuring Plan) thereby reinforcing the need for Whitehill & Bordon to be excluded from the scope/applicability of the SPD.</p>	<p>Updates have been made to the document which we consider will provide sufficient flexibility for future applications to be determined against in the Whitehill and Bordon Regeneration Project Area.</p>