

APPENDIX E: SECTION 8 - PROVIDING TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

ISSUE: SUPPORTING SUSTAINABLE ACCESS TO DEVELOPMENT

Policy 63 - Supporting Sustainable Access to Development

Development is permitted where it demonstrates that prioritisation of access is by walking, cycling and public transport, and is accessible for all. This will be achieved by:

- Ensuring major development on the edge of the city and in the urban extensions is supported by having high public transport accessibility within a highly walkable and cyclable travel time of Cambridge City Centre and major centres of employment.
- Supporting public transport, walking and cycling to, from and within a development by:
 - a. giving priority to these modes where there is conflict with cars;
 - b. conveniently linking the development with the surrounding walking, cycling and public transport networks;
 - c. prioritising networks of public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement so these are the best and safest means of moving around Cambridge. Areas where public transport, pedestrian and cycle movement is difficult or dangerous will be improved and, where possible have further capacity for these sustainable modes provided;
 - d. ensuring accessibility for those with impaired mobility, and
 - e. safeguarding existing and proposed routes for walking and cycling, and public transport from development that would prejudice their continued use and/or development for sustainable transportation use. In addition, funding for high quality physical provision of these routes will be required, both within and adjacent to the proposed development site. The proposed routes are identified on the proposals map.
- Ensuring that any development requiring a new road or road access accords with the following:
 - f. it is designed to give high priority to the needs of pedestrians and cyclists, including their safety;
 - g. it restricts through access for general motor traffic where appropriate;
 - h. it discourages speeding, and links to the existing network;
 - i. it minimises additional car traffic in the surrounding area; and
 - j. there is safe and appropriate access to the adjoining road, pedestrian and cycle networks.

Note: Public transport accessibility and walkability and cyclability definitions are provided in “Section 2. The Spatial Strategy”. – The definition of these will come through ‘point to point’ accessibility mapping, available by the May Development Plan Scrutiny Sub-Committee.

Supporting Text:

Good, easy access to a high quality and efficient transport network is essential to support new development and ensure that it is sustainable. Cambridge has an existing trend towards sustainable transport, particularly cycling, and the 2011 Census data served to reaffirm this by highlighting that 31.9% of residents in the city cycle to work, the highest proportion in the UK. Increases in walking and public transport use, combined with large decreases in single car trips underpin the long established policy approach to promote sustainable modes of travel over that of the private car. However, congestion remains a key issue on many of the city's roads and the need to push for further modal shift remains imperative, especially as growth in and around the city continues.

The City Council will work closely with partners, particularly with the County Council in their role as Highways Authority, to help promote good access to high quality sustainable modes of travel at new developments. This is especially key for edge of city developments.

Public Transport Accessibility

Public transport, and buses in particular, have a crucial role to play in meeting Cambridge's transport needs and embedding sustainable travel patterns from an early stage. This is particularly important for development on the city's edge and in the urban extensions, where key services and employment centres are not often within walkable distances to housing.

Developers will be required to ensure the provision of such services from first occupation of the development for a period of up to five years where this is a viable option for the development, in terms of practicality, convenience and cost.

Demand responsive and community transport provision will also be supported where they can be shown to be an appropriate alternative or addition to public transport.

Walking and Cycling

Walking and cycling are of high priority, being healthy, affordable and sustainable modes of travel. One of the best ways to encourage sustainable modes is to fully consider them at the design stage. Priority and convenience for walking and cycling should be ensured through design layout, traffic calming measures, and on-site facilities. (see Manual for Streets 1 and 2) The needs of all users should be considered as part of the plans approach to inclusive design, to ensure accessibility for pushchairs, the elderly and wheelchairs.

Land for Public Transport

A successful and high quality public transport network needs to be efficient, reliable and attractive. Congestion is a problem in Cambridge, and it is vital for buses to be free from other traffic, where possible, in order for them to deliver on reliability and speed of journey. For this reason, it is important to safeguard land for new public

transport infrastructure, such as bus lanes, interchange facilities and junction improvements.

Pedestrian and Cycle Network

Increases in walking and cycling levels within Cambridge are strongly influenced by the expansion of a safe and convenient network of routes. Therefore, new routes on land outside the public highway are identified on the Proposals Map

Developers will be required to fund high-quality paths, both along the identified routes, and any others that may be suitable for accessing the particular development. The design of these paths must accord with the guidance set out in the document 'Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network', or its successor documents, and with national guidance as set out in the Department for Transport Local Transport Notes. The City Council will seek provision that is proportionate to the scale of development being undertaken.

All paths should conform to established good practice. They should consider wildlife and landscape factors, so that any adverse impact in this respect is minimised. They should also be in place by first occupation of the development so that sustainable travel patterns can be established at an early stage.

New Roads

New roads should make suitable provision for the needs of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. This includes measures that adhere to their safety as a key priority, including measures to discourage speeding. Any potential negative impact on existing pedestrian and cycle routes must be mitigated.

Roads providing a new vehicular through route will generally not be supported, as these are likely to attract car traffic from more major roads. However, controlled through access for buses and cycles is encouraged. Where any new through route for all traffic is proposed, it is important that the potential impacts of this are minimised. The presumption should be that two metre wide uni-directional cycle lanes either at the edge of the carriageway or set back from the carriageway (but with priority over side roads) are provided on any new through-route. A suitable quantitative assessment of the likely effect of the new road will be essential.

How the Policy Came About:

1. Policy 63 (Supporting Sustainable Access To Development) represents a combination of a number of policy options that were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage (2012), notably:
 - Option 183: Promoting non-car modes of travel
 - Option 184: Appropriate Infrastructure
2. New development will only function correctly and successfully if the site is accessible for all, and the transport links in and around the site offer the

opportunity to access key services such as jobs, education and healthcare facilities and the services offered by local and town centres.

3. Cambridge is a small, compact city, which suffers from congestion on most major radial roads at peak times. Increased growth in the area over the next few years will place additional pressure on these roads. Unless the trend in using sustainable modes of travel for work commutes and leisure trips can be continued and improved. It is therefore important that the Local Plan promotes new development that is highly sustainable, and that promotes easy access to and from the site by sustainable modes of travel, such as walking, cycling and public transport.
4. As a consequence of this policy, two of the key Local Plan objectives will be delivered. Firstly, this policy will ensure that the environmental impacts of new development will be reduced, safety for all users will be enhanced and the impact on the existing network, particularly with regards to congestion, will be less. This accords with the objective to minimise adverse effects of transport on people and the environment. Secondly, aspects of this policy will help ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided in the early stages of new developments.
5. The following evidence base & national guidance documents were used in the development of the car parking aspect of this policy:
 - Cambridgeshire County Council (2011). Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3;
 - Cambridgeshire County Council (2012). Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire;
 - Building Sustainable Transport into New Developments (DfT 2008)
 - Manual for Streets (DfT 2007) [Manual for Streets 1 & 2](#);
 - Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen (DfT 2011);
 - Smarter Choices: Changing the way we travel (DfT 2005)
 - The Role of Soft Measures in Influencing Patronage Growth and Modal Split in the Bus Market in England (DfT 2009)
6. The National Planning Policy Framework is quite unequivocal in paragraph 29 that *“transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development, but also contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives”*. The National Planning Policy Framework states a clear requirement in the same paragraph for the transport system to be balanced in favour of sustainable modes of travel, and for a wide choice to be made available in terms of modes of travel. The policy ‘Supporting Access To New Development’ is considered to be in complete conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect.
7. This policy promotes walking, cycling and public transport access to developments, ensuring that high quality infrastructure for these modes is in

place from early occupation whilst also protecting current and future expansions to the pedestrian, cycling and public transport network by safeguarding land for its expansion. Furthermore, the policy ensures any new roads maintain the balance in favour of more sustainable modes of travel, by prioritising their movement in a new development.

8. The policy also supports solutions that reduce Greenhouse Gas Emissions, and will tie in with the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire to develop strategies for the provision of viable infrastructure necessary to support sustainable development. This increases conformity with the National Planning Policy Framework, as it echoes paragraphs 30 and 31.
9. This Sustainability Appraisal (SA) strongly supported the various aspects of this policy, stating that they should bring about positive effects on the uptake of walking, cycling and public transport across the city helping contribute to reducing transport related greenhouse gas emissions (GHG). It also indicated that ensuring there are non-car options for everyone using the development should help improve access, in particular for those with limited mobility, the disabled and the elderly. This policy should also help reduce car dependency and increase the attractiveness of the city for greater cycling and walking. A reduction in traffic impacts, such as noise and emissions, may also contribute to ensuring that new developments do not adversely impact local biodiversity. The SA concluded that this policy is likely to have positive benefits across the whole city.
10. The Supporting Access to New Development policy was consulted on as two individual options, which included a number of facets promoting non-car modes of travel, during the Issues and Options 1 consultation in summer 2012.
11. Each of these options all received very high levels of support, with many respondents stating the importance of ensuring that good existing levels of cycling in particular are built on further, and not taken for granted. This positive response, as well as the National Planning Policy Framework pushing for a balance towards more sustainable modes of travel meant that the formation of this policy would continue the current approach in the 2006 Local Plan of placing walking, cycling and public transport ahead of car use as the main means of accessibility to and from new developments.
12. A key aspect highlighted during the consultation is the need to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists features at the top of the list of priorities when designing the transport links in and around new developments, for example, for any new roads. This policy will help deal with such concerns by ensuring that any new roads put the needs of pedestrians and cyclists first. The 'new roads' part of the policy will also create the link to the phased citywide 20mph scheme that the City Council will be consulting upon during the life of the plan period. This will help integrate new development with the existing city road network.

13. In terms of safeguarding land, numerous calls were made during the consultation to specifically safeguard the Chisholm Trail. This policy will state that any scheme shown in either the County Council's Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (TSCSC), on the Local Plan Proposals Map or in the City Council document 'Protection and Funding of Routes for the Future Expansion of the City Cycle Network' (which is currently material consideration in the planning process), or its successor documents, will be safeguarded. The Chisholm Trail is a scheme that should be located within the TSCSC, and if so, this policy would provide protection of its route in terms of safeguarded land.
14. Each of the options consulted on during Issues and Options 1 have been combined to form a policy that supports accessibility to new developments, which balances the modal links in favour of sustainable modes. This conforms to the National Planning Policy Framework.

ISSUE: MITIGATING THE TRANSPORT IMPACT OF DEVELOPMENT

Policy 64 – Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development

Development will be permitted where the impact on transport networks is shown to be acceptable in accordance with national and local policy tests. Therefore, new development will require:

- a. sufficient information to be supplied to accompany all development proposals so that the transport impact can be suitably assessed, this should take the form of transport assessments for schemes above the thresholds set in guidance;
- b. a Travel Plan to accompany all major development proposals; and
- c. reasonable and proportionate financial contributions/mitigation measures will be required where necessary to make the transport impact of the development acceptable. This could include investment in infrastructure, services or behavioral change measures.

Such measures should be provided in a timely manner, to meet the first occupation of a site in order to set early travel behaviour.

Supporting Text:

New development often brings with it the need for new transport, with more pressure on the transport network a common consequence of this. Any additional strain on the transport network as a result of new development needs to be appropriately assessed and mitigated against.

The National Planning Policy Framework states that a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement should support all developments that generate significant amounts of movement. This ensures that the full transport impacts of any proposal are assessed and understood, allowing for the appropriate mitigation measures to be implemented.

Transport Assessments

Any proposals must include sufficient information in order for the likely impact to be assessed. A detailed Transport Assessment or a less detailed Transport Statement may be required in accordance with the thresholds in the County Council's current Transport Assessment Guidance.

In areas of the city where traffic congestion and/or pollution from traffic is particularly high, a zero increase or reduction in car traffic generation through any proposed redevelopment will be sought. This includes the city centre and on Newmarket Road.

Travel Plans

It is important that every opportunity is taken to mitigate the negative transport impacts of a development. Therefore, proposals classed as major development and those, which are shown to generate a significant amount of movement, will be required to provide a Travel Plan.

Financial Contributions and Mitigating Measures

Financial contributions will be sought towards schemes approved by the City and County Councils for any necessary improvements required as a result of development. Any increase in demand on the transport network over and above that from the existing use and already on the network will be taken into account.

These measures will be secured through Planning Obligations where there are essential site specific measures required and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). The infrastructure resulting from these contributions should be provided in a timely manner, to meet the first occupation of a site in order to influence travel behaviour from the earliest opportunity. For the larger growth area sites, the trigger points may vary according to the development phases.

How this Policy Came About:

15. Policy 64 represents a combination of a number of policy options that were consulted on at the Issues and Options stage, notably:
 - Option 182: Timely provision of infrastructure;
 - Option 193: Development only where the impact on the network is able to be mitigated against;
 - Option 196: Set a travel plan threshold; and
 - Option 197: Do not set a travel plan threshold.

16. It is important that the impact of a new development on the already congested transport network in Cambridge is significantly worsened. This policy will ensure that applicants provide sufficient information so that the impacts on the transport network can be demonstrated as part of any application. In addition, this policy will ensure measures to mitigate any transport impact are forthcoming. It will require Travel Plans for all developments classed as 'major',

and seek developer contributions towards paying for the transport infrastructure needed to mitigate any impacts. This will be vital in ensuring new development in Cambridge is sustainable.

17. As a consequence of this policy, two of the key objectives will be delivered. Firstly, this policy will ensure that the environmental impacts of new development will be less, safety for all users will be enhanced and the impact on the existing network, particularly with regards to congestion, will be less. This accords with the objective to minimise adverse effects of transport on people and the environment. Secondly, aspects of this policy will help ensure that appropriate infrastructure is provided in the early stages of new developments.
18. The following evidence base and national guidance documents were used in the development of the Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development policy:
 - Cambridgeshire Local Transport Plan 3 (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2011);
 - Draft Transport Strategy for Cambridge and South Cambridgeshire (Cambridgeshire County Council, 2012);
 - DfT (2010). The Effects of Smarter Choice Programmes in the Sustainable Travel Towns; and
 - DfT (2011). Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen
19. Paragraph 32 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment should accompany all developments that generate significant amounts of movement. This policy will ensure that this is a requirement for new development in Cambridge. Furthermore, this policy will ensure that the Plan conforms to the National Planning Policy Framework's requirement to undertake improvements to the transport network and mitigating any negative impacts, in order to help make a new development acceptable.
20. The National Planning Policy Framework also calls for Travel Plans to be a key tool in facilitating the use of sustainable modes of travel. This policy requires that any developments over the 'major developments' threshold (this is 10 dwellings for residential or 1,000 square metres of floorspace for non residential) submit a travel plan with their application, thus ensuring that travel plans play a key role in Cambridge's new development promoting sustainable travel. Evidence from the Department for Transport's 2010 study on Sustainable Travel Towns outlines how key travel plans are in bringing about positive changes in travel behaviour towards walking, cycling and public transport.
21. The Sustainability Appraisal (SA) states that this option will help contribute to increasing the modal share of cycling, walking and public transport. However, it also recognises that any new development is likely to place some additional pressure on the transport network. The SA also recognises that the further

promotion of travel plans is likely to have a positive impact on the uptake of sustainable modes of travel.

22. The aspects that make up the Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development policy were consulted on during Issues and Options 1 in summer 2012. 'Option 193: Development only where the impact on the network can be mitigated' covered the requirement to provide adequate information on the likely transport impacts of development along with any planning application. This received high levels of support, and ensures that early interaction between the County Council, as highways authority, the City Council and the applicant takes place.
23. In terms of the mitigation component of the option, this also received significant levels of support. There were also numerous calls for impacts on the network to be improved, and not just negated, in order for development to be supported. It is felt that the increased emphasis on travel plans, as well as continued promotion of non-car modes of travel will help to bring about further positive results in terms of modal share, as seen in the 2011 census.
24. Option 182: Timely provision of infrastructure also inputted into the resultant policy, with Issues and Options 1 discussing the delivery of infrastructure to aid development, as well as influencing planning conditions and planning obligations. The emergence of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will also impact on this policy, with contributions likely to be sought towards transport infrastructure improvements during the Plan period.
25. The final facet of this policy is the requirement to provide a travel plan for all developments classed as 'major'. This was consulted on at Issues and Options 1 also (options 196 and 197) and having a threshold to require a travel plan proved to be more popular than not having a threshold. It is considered that this provides more certainty for applicants submitting a planning application than simply requiring one where a Transport Assessment states there is a need, as is the current scenario. Indeed, the NPPF has placed much greater significance in the use of travel plans, and it seems sensible therefore to require these on a more certain basis.

ISSUE: PARKING MANAGEMENT

Policy 65: Parking Management

Developments should not breach the Parking Standards set out in Tables 1 and 2. This includes:

- a. providing no more than the car parking standards for new residential and non-residential development set out in Table 1, taking into account the accessibility of the site to public transport and the nature of the use. In Cambridge's city centre, and on streets with overnight parking stress, on and off street (non disabled bay), car parking levels are maintained at current levels for both shoppers, residents and workers;

- b. providing at least the cycle parking levels in Table 2;
- c. providing at least the disabled and inclusive parking requirements in Table 1.

Car free and car capped development is acceptable in the following circumstances:

- d. where there is good, easily walkable and cyclable access to a district centre or the city centre;
- e. where there is a high public transport accessibility; and
- f. where the car-free status of the development can realistically be enforced by planning obligations and on-street parking controls.

Contributions to, and provision for car clubs, where development takes place, is supported to help reduce the need for private car parking. Electric vehicle charging points should be provided within a development where reasonable and proportionate.

Development should also provide adequate provision for servicing and public service vehicles.

On street parking will be managed in partnership with Cambridgeshire County Council to ensure safety, passage of cyclist and pedestrians, emergency service access and to reduce nuisance from residents of commuter and shopper parking.

Supporting Text:

Car Parking

New developments will be favoured where they take a holistic, early and design led approach to the management of parking for motor vehicles and cycles. Car parking standards constitute an important means to managing traffic levels in and around a development, especially when combined with measures to increase access to alternatives to the private car. The City Council continues to promote lower levels of private car parking in order to help achieve modal shift, particularly for non-residential developments where good, more sustainable transport alternatives such as walking, cycling and public transport exist. This will be particularly important in the city centre, where the transport strategy is to increase access without a net increase in overall parking levels (other than disabled parking). In addition on streets with overnight parking stress, the levels of additional parking is capped. In both cases, development will have to be car free or car-capped (see below).

In accordance with national guidance, the level of car parking provided needs to take into account various local circumstances. This includes its proximity to services accessible by non-car modes, the development type and also the impact the development is likely to have on the surrounding network. Table 1 lists the matters developers need to consider when planning for the appropriate levels of car parking to be provided, as well as the levels of parking in terms of 'no more than'.

For residential developments, parking should be provided on-plot or in larger developments in the form of well designed parking courts or designed in on street

parking, with a presumption in favour of some non-allocated parking (see Parking What Works Where – Homes and Communities Agency and Manual for Streets 1 & 2). For residential developments where car parking is to be provided in garages, the dimensions of these must accord with the dimensions in Appendix 2.

Car free and car capped development (where new on street permits are restricted to existing not new residents) is supported by the City Council where the development will not impact negatively on the surrounding area by the displacement of car parking. It is therefore important that where car free development is proposed, the appropriate on-street parking management is in place, and this will involve strong input from Cambridgeshire County Council, as the Local Highways Authority. Suitable, high quality alternatives to the private car must also be available in order for any proposal to be acceptable. Access to shops and services close by is required.

The Council also encourages the provision of car club spaces at new developments, as these are shown to reduce car ownership, especially second car ownership. Similarly, where it is viable to do so, the City Council may seek Low Emission Vehicle Infrastructure at major new developments. This could include, but is not limited to, Electric Vehicle charging / plug in points.

Cycle Parking

The provision of good, high quality and easily accessible cycle parking is important to encourage cycling and also reduce the theft of bikes. Like car parking, cycle parking should be 'designed in' to developments from an early stage.

The City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (or any subsequent update to this) should be referred to as best practice for providing cycle parking at all new developments. For residential developments where cycle parking is to be provided in garages, the dimensions of these must accord with the dimensions in Appendix 2. Appendix 1 also provides information on what is permissible in terms of types of cycle parking at non-residential development.

Car & Cycle Parking Standards and Appendices:

Table 1 - Car Parking Standards

- A. The standards set here define the maximum levels (referred to as 'no more than') of car parking that Cambridge City Council, as a Local Planning Authority, will permit for various types of development in different areas of the city. These levels should not be exceeded but may be reduced where lower car use can reasonably be expected. The exception is parking for disabled people, which is a minimum standard. Under the Disability Discrimination Act, it is the responsibility of site occupiers to ensure that adequate provision is made for the needs of disabled people.
- B. Car parking standards are defined for most uses. However for some land use types whose transport patterns are difficult to generalise (for instance

hospitals) parking provision will be approved on merit, on the basis of a Transport Assessment.

- C. Some developments may have an exceptional need for vehicle parking in addition to that specified in the standards. Such additional parking may be necessary where there will be shift-working staff, for example.
- D. When a site is redeveloped which has an existing authorised level of car parking much higher than that specified in the following standards, the Planning Authority may consider allowing a level of car parking for the redevelopment that is higher than the standards, on the condition that parking is significantly reduced from the previous level.
- E. Where reference is made to staff numbers, this relates to the typical number of staff working at the same time. Floor area is gross internal floor area as measured in RICS Code of Measures Practice.

F. Local Circumstances

The impact of new development upon the surrounding streets and transport network should be considered. To account for this, this option requires developers to account for the following when proposing the level of car parking for a site:

- the location of the development, in terms of whether the site has convenient walkability and cyclability to the City Centre and local/district centres and whether or not it has public transport accessibility;
- the type of development (fringe site, infill site etc.) – i.e. infill sites are much more likely to be located in areas with existing travel patterns, behaviour and existing controls, and may be less flexible;
- the style of development (housing or flats etc.) – Evidence shows that houses have higher car ownerships than flats, even if they have the same number of habitable rooms; and
- for developments requiring a Transport Assessment*, it should be demonstrated that the level of parking proposed is consistent with the recommendation of this Transport Assessment.

*The need for a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement should accord to the thresholds in the current County Council Transport Assessment Guide and/or the advice of the County Council.

G. Dwellings (C3 class)

In addition to these ratios, provision should be made for visitors at the ratio of one space for every four units. Overall parking should be a mixture of allocated (to specific dwellings) with some parking provided as unallocated - particularly visitor parking and any parking above one space per dwelling (see manual for streets for advice on design). Allocated parking should be marked appropriately.

New developments do not qualify for residents' parking permits within an existing on-street parking scheme - they are 'car capped'.

Dwelling Size	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Up to 2 bedrooms	No more than 1 space per dwelling.	No more than a mean of 1.5 spaces per dwelling.
3 or more bedrooms	No more than 1 space per dwelling.	No more than 2 spaces per dwelling.

H. Hotels and Guesthouses (C1 use class)

Type of Development	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Hotels and Guesthouses	1 space for every 4 bedrooms and 1 space per resident staff.	2 spaces for every 3 bedrooms and 1 space per resident staff.
	<p>Off-street coach parking to be conveniently located in relation to developments of 40 or more bedrooms.</p> <p>Where there are rooms specifically designed for people with disabilities, disabled parking of at least 1 space for each room so designed should be provided.</p>	

I. Specialist Housing

Dwelling Size	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Nursing homes	1 space for every 10 residents, 1 space for every 2 members of staff.	1 space for every 8 residents, 1 space for every 2 members of staff.
	Provision must be made for ambulance parking.	
Retirement homes/ sheltered housing	1 space for every 6 units, 1 space for every 2 members of staff.	1 space for every 4 units, 1 space for every 2 members of staff.

J. Student Housing (C2 or C4 Use Class)

It is recognised that there is a functional difference between a development which is entirely or largely for student residential accommodation, and the non-residential elements of Colleges where there may be a variety of other uses including administrative and teaching activities. In these circumstances it may be appropriate to make additional car parking provision commensurate with the relevant standards for such uses as “offices” and “higher and further education”

Type	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Student residential accommodation where proctorial control or alternative control on car parking exists	1 space for every 10 bed spaces. A pickup and drop-off area could also be included if appropriate to the particular proposed development.	1 space for every 10 bed spaces. A pickup and drop-off area could also be included if appropriate to the particular proposed development.
	1 space for every resident warden/ staff.	1 space for every resident warden/ staff.
	Where there are rooms specifically designed for people with disabilities, disabled parking of at least 1 space for each such room should be provided.	
Student residential accommodation where proctorial control does not exist or where control exists but the development will house conference delegates	1 space for every 5 bed spaces.	1 space for every 3 bed spaces.
	1 space for every resident warden/ staff.	1 space for every resident warden/ staff.
	Where there are rooms specifically designed for people with disabilities, disabled parking of at least 1 space for each such room should be provided. Controls will be necessary to limit use of car parking outside conference times.	

K. Other Residential Institutions (C2 Use Class)

Type	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Residential schools, college or training centre	1 space for every 3 non-resident staff plus 1 space per resident warden/staff	On merit
	Where there are rooms specifically designed for people with disabilities, disabled parking of at least 1 space for each room so designed should be provided.	
Hospitals	On merit	On merit

L. Retail, Culture, Leisure and Sports Uses

Limited car parking will be allowed in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for these types of uses, no net additional parking in the city centre. Access will primarily rely on public transport, cycling and walking. Car journeys will be accommodated through public parking, including Park and Ride.

Outside the Controlled Parking Zone, transport assessments will play a key role in determining the optimal level of car parking, in particular for mixed use developments and retail parks where linked trips might lead to a level of parking below Cambridge Plan standards.

Where reasonable and proportionate picking up and dropping off point for taxis and mini-buses will need to be provided.

Use	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Food retail (A1 Use Class)	Disabled car parking only.	1 space for every 50m ² Gross Floor Area up to 1,400m ² and 1 per 18m ² thereafter, including disabled car parking.
Non-food retail (A1 Use Class)	Disabled car parking only.	1 space for every 50m ² Gross Floor Area, including disabled car parking.
Financial and professional services (A2 Use Class)	1 space for every 100m ² Gross Floor Area to include customer parking, plus disabled car parking.	1 space for every 40m ² Gross Floor Area, including disabled car parking.
Restaurants (A3), Pubs/Bars (A4) and food and drink takeaways (A5).	1 space for proprietor resident.	1 space for every 20m ² drinking/dining area, including disabled car parking. 1 space for proprietor when resident.
Museums, exhibition venues	Disabled only	On merit
Sports and recreational facilities, swimming baths	1 space for every 3 staff plus disabled car parking	2 spaces for every 3 staff, plus 1 space for every 4 seats, including disabled car parking
Cinema	Disabled and 1 space for every 2 staff	1 space for every 5 seats, including disabled car parking
Stadia	Disabled car parking only	1 space for every 15 seats, including disabled car parking
Places of assembly including, theatre, auditoria and concert hall (D2), Night Clubs	Disabled car parking and 1 space for every 2 staff	1 space for every 4 seats, including disabled and staff car parking
Place of worship	1 space per 100m ² floor area, plus disabled car parking	1 space for every 8 seats, including disabled car parking
Public halls/ community centres	1 space per 100m ² floor area, plus disabled car parking	1 space per 20m ² of public space, including disabled car parking

M. Business Uses (B Class Uses)

Limited car parking will be allowed in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) for these types of uses, no net additional parking in the city centre. Access will primarily rely on public transport, cycling and walking. Car journeys will be accommodated through public parking, including Park and Ride.

Use	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Offices, general industry	1 space per 100m ² Gross Floor Area plus disabled car parking	1 space per 40m ² Gross Floor Area, including disabled car parking
Storage	1 space per 300m ² Gross Floor Area plus disabled car parking	1 space per 100m ² Gross Floor Area, including disabled car parking

N. Non-Residential Institutions (D1 Class Uses)

Use	Inside Controlled Parking Zone	Outside Controlled Parking Zone
Clinics and surgeries	1 space for every 2 professional members of staff plus 1 space per consulting room	1 space for every professional member of staff plus 2 spaces per consulting room
Non-residential schools	1 space for every 3 staff	2 spaces for every 3 staff
Non-residential higher and further education	1 space for every 4 staff	2 spaces for every 3 staff
Crèches	1 space for every 3 staff	2 spaces for every 3 staff

O. Parking for Disabled People and those with Mobility Difficulties

Developments should provide at least one accessible on or off-street car parking bay designated for Blue Badge holders, even if no general parking is provided. For any development providing off-street parking, at least two bays designated for Blue Badge holders should be provided. The British Standards Institution, in their document Design of buildings and their approaches to meet the needs of disabled people – Code of practice (BS 8300:2009), provides advice on the numbers of designated Blue Badge bays that should be provided at various developments. This is shown in the table below.

As these standards are based on a percentage of the total number of parking bays careful assessment will be needed where maximum, or 'no more than' parking standards are reached, to ensure that these percentages make adequate provision for disabled people. The appropriate number will vary with the size, nature and location of the development, the levels of on and off street parking and the accessibility of the local area. However, designated parking spaces should be provided for each disabled employee and for other disabled people visiting the building.

The size and dimensions of the bays for Blue Badge holders should accord with those in Manual for Streets 1 and 2.

Designated Blue Badge parking bays, as recommended in BS 8300:2009			
Building Type	Provision from the outset		Future provision
General provision	number of spaces* for each employee who is a disabled motorist	number of spaces* for visiting disabled motorists	number of enlarged standard spaces**
Workplaces	one space	5% of the total capacity	a further 5% of the total capacity
Shopping, recreation and leisure facilities	one space	6% of the total capacity	a further 4% of the total capacity
Railway buildings	one space	5% of the total capacity	a further 5% of the total capacity
Religious buildings and crematoria	two spaces or 6% whichever is the greater.		a further 4% of the total capacity
Sports facilities	determined according to the usage of the sports facility***		
<p>* Parking spaces designated for use by disabled people should be 2.4m wide by 4.8m long with a zone 1.2m wide provided between designated spaces and at the rear outside the traffic zone, to enable a disabled driver or passenger to get in or out of a vehicle and access the boot safely.</p> <p>** Enlarged standard spaces 3.6m wide by 6m long that can be adapted to be parking spaces designated for use by disabled people to reflect changes in local population needs and allow for flexibility of provision in the future, as well as being able to be used by parents with young children.</p> <p>*** Further detailed guidance on parking provision for sports facilities can be found in the Sport England publication Accessible Sports Facilities 2010.</p>			

Table 2 - Cycle Parking Standards

Residential Standards

As well as according with this standard, residential cycle parking should have regard to designs, layouts, drawings and dimensions established in the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments and should:

- Be located in a purpose built area at the front of the house or within a garage (appropriate garage dimensions are shown in Appendix 2);
- Only be located within a rear garden if locating it at the front of the house is shown to not be in keeping with the character of the surrounding area, and there is no garage provision; and
- Be at least as convenient as the car parking provided.

Use	Minimum Standard
Residential dwellings	<p>1 space per bedroom up to 3 bedroom dwellings</p> <p>Then 3 spaces for 4 bedroom dwellings, 4 spaces for 5 bedroom dwellings etc</p> <p>Visitor cycle parking next to main entrances to blocks of flats</p> <p>Visitor cycle parking in the form of a wall ring/bar or Sheffield stand at the front of individual houses must be provided where cycle parking provision is located in the back garden</p>
Guesthouses and hotels	<p>2 spaces for every 5 members of staff</p> <p>2 spaces for every 10 bedrooms (minimum 2 spaces)</p> <p>Outside the city centre, this should include space for cycle hire</p>
Nursing homes	<p>2 spaces for every 5 members of staff</p> <p>1 visitor space for every 6 residents (minimum 2 spaces)</p>
Retirement homes / sheltered housing	<p>2 spaces for every 5 members of staff</p> <p>1 space for every 6 residents. 1 visitor space for every 6 residents (minimum 2 spaces)</p>
Student residential accommodation, residential schools, college or training centre	<p>1 space per 2 bedspaces within city centre</p> <p>2 spaces per 3 bedspaces for the rest of the city</p> <p>1 space for every 3 members of staff</p> <p>1 visitor space per 5 bedspaces</p>
Hospitals	<p>2 spaces for every 5 members of staff</p> <p>2 visitor spaces per consulting/treatment room</p> <p>1 visitor space for every 6 bedspaces</p>

Non-Residential Standards

As well as according with this standard, the cycle parking for non-residential development should:

- Reflect the design and dimensions for cycle parking established in the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (and Appendix 1);
- Accord with the guidelines for use of high capacity or two tier (double stacker/double decker) stands (see Appendix 1);
- Include parking for employees and students in a convenient, secure and covered location. Access to cycle parking should be as close as is practical to staff entrances, and closer than non-disabled staff car parking;

- Avoid being located in the basement if steps with ramps is the only access provided, unless it can be shown to be convenient and easy to use, and that alternatives are provided on the ground floor for less able users and those with tricycles; and
- Reference to staff or students should be taken to mean the peak number expected to be on the site at any one time.

All cycle parking should minimise conflicts between cycles, motor vehicles and pedestrians.

Short stay cycle parking, e.g. for visitors or shoppers, should be located as close as possible to the main entrances of buildings (no more than 10 meters) and should be subject to natural surveillance. For larger developments, covered cycle parking should be considered.

In addition to the above, some flexibility is applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances:

- Where strict adherence to the standards for a mixed use site it likely to result in duplication of provision; and
- For the historic core area of the city, where constraints may make application of the standards difficult for change of use or refurbishment.

In instances where part of a site with a known shortfall in cycle parking is redeveloped, provision in excess of the standards will be strongly recommended.

Retail, Culture, Leisure And Sports Uses	
Food retail	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff and 1 short stay space per 25m ² in the city centre or Mill Road district centres. For the rest of the city, 2 spaces for every 5 members of staff and 1 visitor space per 50m ² up to 1500m ² , thereafter 1 space per 100m ²
Non-food retail	As above
Financial and professional services	2 spaces per 5 members of staff and some visitor parking (on merit)
Food and drinks	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff 1 short stay space for every 10m ² of dining area in the historic core area
Museums, exhibition venues	2 space for every 5 members of staff Some visitor parking on merit
Sports and recreational facilities and swimming baths	2 space for every 5 members of staff 1 short stay space for every 25m ² net floor area or 1 short stay space for every 10m ² of pool area and 1 for every 15 seats provided for spectators

Places of assembly, including cinema, theatre, stadia, auditoria and concert halls	2 space for every 5 members of staff 1 short stay space for every 4 seats
Place of worship, public halls and community centres	1 short stay space for every 4 seats

Business Uses

Offices	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff or 1 per 30m ² Gross Floor Area (whichever is greater) Some visitor parking on merit
General Industry	1 space for every 3 members of staff Some visitor parking on merit
Storage and other B class use classes	On merit

Non-residential institutions

Clinics and surgeries	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff 2 short stay spaces per consulting room
Non-residential schools	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff Cycle spaces to be provided for 50% of primary school children to include a scooter parking area, and 75% of secondary school children. Some visitor parking.
Non-residential higher and further education	2 for every 5 members of staff Cycle parking for 70% of students based on anticipated peak number of students on site at any one time
Crèches and nurseries	2 spaces for every 5 members of staff 1 visitor space per 5 children An area to be provided for the parking of cargo bicycles/trailers

Appendix 1 - Non-Residential Cycle Parking Guidance

Sheffield stands are the preferred option for cycle parking, and the dimensions required for these can be found in the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development and its successor documents.

However, the use of high-low and two tier/double decker/double stacker racks will be considered on a case by case basis for new non-residential developments.

High-low racks should be a minimum of 400mm between centres at 90 degrees and 500-600mm between centres at 45 degrees. Any such stands must allow for cycles fitted with baskets and require as little lifting as possible. They must be of a design that supports the front wheel of cycles and allows the frame of the cycle to be locked to the rack.

Two tier/double decker/double stacker racks must be designed to allow the frame of the cycle to be locked to the rack and accommodate cycles with baskets. An aisle width of 2500mm is required to enable the cycle to be turned and loaded easily.

As with Sheffield Stands, drawings and illustrative dimensions to guide the implementation of high-low and two tier/double decker/double stacker stands can be found in the City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (and any subsequent update).

In order to allow for cycles with large baskets, folding bikes and those with additional attachments, etc. a minimum of 20% of the cycle parking spaces required should be of a Sheffield type design.

Appendix 2 - Garage Dimensions

Where car and cycle parking (and bin storage) at new residential developments is proposed to be provided in garages, the dimensions of the garages must accord with the dimensions set out in the drawings below:

Note: The single, double and tandem garage dimensions drawings from the Issues and Options 2 consultation will go here in the draft Local Plan for consultation.

How the Policy Came About:

26. The control of parking for motor vehicles and cycles at a new development is vital in Cambridge, as it is in all areas of new development, for a number of reasons.
27. Over providing car parking can lead to use of the car being more convenient than use of more sustainable modes of travel such as walking, cycling and public transport. This inevitably leads to more car trips and fewer trips on public transport and by foot and cycle. The consequence of this is additional congestion on what is often an already strained transport network in Cambridge. There are also associated negative impacts on the environment from too many car trips. Under provision of car parking can also impact negatively on a development, with the dispersal of car parking in an indiscriminate way on the surrounding streets. This can block bus and cycle lanes, and pavement parking can lead to reduced space for pushchairs and wheelchair users, and increase the parking pressures in existing settlements. All of this impacts upon safety as well as causing negative aesthetic effects for a development.

28. Sufficient car parking for disabled drivers is also imperative, in order to allow for access to new development for all. Furthermore, commercial and servicing vehicles also have requirements that need adhering to if they are not to cause blockages to the existing network.
29. Cycle parking needs to be of sufficient quality and quantity, if cycling is to be a more appealing mode of travel than the private car, and the upward trend in cycling as a mode of travel is to continue. Safe, secure cycle parking is essential to reduce the chance of bicycle theft, which is a common problem in Cambridge. Cycle parking also needs to be plentiful and of good, convenient access in order to prevent indiscriminate cycle parking surrounding development, another issue common to Cambridge.
30. The policy on Parking Management will help to ensure new development is delivered in a sustainable way, putting modes such as walking, cycling and public transport before car driving. As a consequence, the environmental impacts of new development will be less, safety for all users will be enhanced and the impact on the existing network, particularly with regards to congestion, will be less. This accords with the objective to minimise adverse effects of transport on people and the environment.

Car Parking

31. The following evidence base & national guidance documents were used in the development of the car parking aspect of this policy:
 - Residential Car Parking Research, Communities and Local Government (2007)
 - Guidance Note: Residential Parking, CIHT (2012)
 - Census, 2001 & Census, 2011
 - Manual for Streets, DfT (2007) [Manual for Streets 1 & 2](#)
 - Car Parking: What works where, Homes & Communities Agency (2006) [Parking What Works Where – Homes and Communities Agency](#)
 - Research into the Use and Effectiveness of Maximum Parking Standards, Department for Transport (June 2008)
 - Creating growth, cutting carbon: making sustainable local transport happen (DfT 2011)
 - Our towns and cities: the future - delivering an urban renaissance (DETR, 2000)
32. In terms of car parking, the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 39) and the latest national guidance on car parking standards explains the importance of Local Authorities using a series of key local considerations to help set any parking standards for a development. These local circumstances are listed by the NPPF as car ownership levels, access to public transport, walking and cycling as well as the size, mix and type of development. There is also a need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles. All of this means that Local Authorities must allow for flexibility within the standards to suit different

locations. This includes the type of parking provided, which should accord with best practice. This best practice is found in Manual for Streets 1 and 2 (Department for Transport) and in Car Parking: What Works Where? (Homes and Communities Agency 2006). Garage parking is also acceptable, and should accord with the dimensions consulted upon in Issues and Options 2.

33. The policy approach put forward for car parking accords well with the National Planning Policy Framework, as the standards, set out as maximums (though referred to in the plan as 'no more than' for ease of understanding) are based on projected future car ownership levels to 2031. In addition to this, a criteria has been developed which helps to ensure that when setting the level of parking within these maximum standards, developers as well as the Local Planning and Highway Authorities can consider the specific local circumstances of a development such as the ease of access to high quality public transport in the location.
34. The policy also ensures the provision of sufficient numbers of disabled car parking, as required by paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework.

Car Free and The Promotion Of Low Emission Vehicles

35. The car free aspect of the policy, along with promoting low emission vehicle infrastructure accords with paragraphs 35 and 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These both have bullet points that state the need to incorporate low emission vehicle infrastructure into development and reduce the overall need to use high-emission vehicles.
36. Car free development all but eradicates the use of private motor vehicles at a new development if delivered successfully. This conforms to many aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework, and is an approach being undertaken in a number of London boroughs, as well as comparative cities to Cambridge such as Oxford. Evidence from Cambridge's Census 2011 results, which show large increases in walking, cycling and public transport use in conjunction with drops in car trips for work purposes, show that there are real, viable options to the private car already in use in the city. This indicates that in some areas of Cambridge, where parking controls are feasible and alternatives to the car are viable, the option of delivering car free development is a good one.
37. The promotion of low emission vehicle infrastructure, such as car club bays and electric vehicle charging points, complement lower parking levels and even car free development, by providing genuine alternatives to the private car. Again, this conforms to the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 35).

Commercial and Servicing Vehicles

38. The National Planning Policy Framework's paragraph 35 calls for development to accommodate the need for efficient delivery of goods and supplies. This

policy ensures these needs are considered, and that there will not be subsequent impacts on the network surrounding a development.

Cycle Parking

39. The following evidence base and national guidance documents were used in the development of the cycle parking aspect of this policy:
 - Cambridgeshire County Council Traffic Monitoring reports;
 - Census, 2001 and Census, 2011;
 - Cambridge City Council - Cycle Parking Guide: for New Residential Development (2010);
 - Site visits to retail and residential developments around the city;
 - Danish Bicycle Parking Manual 2008.

40. The National Planning Policy Framework's paragraph 29 states that: "Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable transport" and that "the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes, giving people a real choice about how they travel". This policy accords with the National Planning Policy Framework in this respect, as the delivery of good quality, easily accessible cycle parking will allow for cycling to be given priority over cars as a mode at new development, facilitating the usage of this mode. The Census 2011 data indicates that this is an approach that has been largely successful in Cambridge, and something that should be continued and further promoted during the plan period. As a result of this, higher levels of cycle parking is being sought at most types of new development than is the case in the 2006 Plan, and in all cases the design, accessibility and quality of the cycle parking provided will be of a high standard.

41. The Sustainability Appraisal has promoted the various aspects of the parking management policy by stating that it should have a positive effects on addressing transport topic issues by encouraging sustainable transport, reducing Greenhouse Gas Emissions, helping climate change mitigation and having health and well being gains.

42. The various aspects to the parking management policy were consulted on as individual policy options at the Issues and Options 1 consultation during the summer of 2012. Further details on proposed car and cycle parking standards were then consulted upon during the Issues and Options 2 consultation in January and February of 2013.

43. In terms of car parking, three options were presented during Issues and Options 1, which asked whether or not the current parking standards in the 2006 Local Plan should remain as they are, or whether they should be partially or completely revised. Support was spread across these three options, with many people suggesting the current standards were about right, and others stating that more of a local consideration was needed in order to get the balance right. In addition, having lower levels of parking in Controlled Parking Zones was proposed for continuation in line with advice in national guidance.

This aspect of the policy has been taken forward as a consequence of the positive consultation results.

44. As a result of the Issues and Options 1 consultation, with a spread of support across the three options put forward, it was decided that the three options could be combined. The upshot of this is that maximum parking standards at 'origin' destinations (i.e. residential development) would be updated to accord with projected car ownership levels, as suggested by the National Planning Policy Framework and a number of other guidance documents, to ensure we weren't under or over providing car parking. In addition to this, the maximum parking standards at destination development were proposed to be kept the same, as these were seen by a number of respondents to the consultation to be around the right levels. This is a notion that was backed up by the 2011 Census results, which showed that the numbers of people driving to work dropped considerably, whilst those using more sustainable modes increased.
45. In order to further conform with national guidance, a local circumstance criteria was developed to ensure that each proposed new development was able to take account of the local issues set out in paragraph 39 of the National Planning Policy Framework when deciding what the level of parking provision (within the maximum levels stated) should be provided. This criteria was consulted on during Issues and Options 2, and received a number of supports.
46. However, one aspect of the criteria has been altered as a result of this consultation. Originally, one of the criteria read:

“For Major developments and developments that are likely to place significant increased demand for parking in an area, the current parking situation in the surrounding area should be considered, including the presence of parking controls; high demand for on-street parking and conflict with commuter parking. This would inform the setting of on-site parking levels within the development.”

47. Some respondents stated that they considered this facet of the criteria to be confusing, and also blurring the line between what are the City Council's and what are the Highways Authority's responsibilities. After discussion with the Transport Assessment team at the County Council, it is proposed that this part of the criteria is simplified to read:

“For developments requiring a Transport Assessment it should be demonstrated that the level of parking proposed is consistent with the recommendation of this Transport Assessment. “

This makes sense as a Transport Assessment would cover the issue of car parking and any dispersal of car parking on to surrounding streets anyway.

48. During Issues and Options 2, the appropriate dimensions for single, double and tandem garages was consulted upon. This was done to ensure that where parking (and bin storage) provision is to be in garages, the space provided is adequate enough to support this use. As a subsequence of this, displacement of parking will be minimised, and the parking provided will be secure. The dimensions for the 3 garage types are based on The City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (2010).
49. The option to pursue car free development was consulted on during Issues and options 1, and received a good level of 'in principal' support. Some concerns regarding its feasibility in areas of Cambridge were raised, and as a result of this it has been incorporated into the parking management policy with strict criteria about when and where it is appropriate. Although it was not consulted upon specifically during Issues and Options 1 and 2, 'car capping' is a tool used in many areas, particularly in London boroughs (for example Camden) that usefully sits alongside car free policies. Car-capped development is development in which all of the dwellings or units created are not entitled to on-street car parking permits, although some or all of the dwellings or units created may have a parking space on the site in accordance with the off-street parking standards in the Plan (Table 1). Car capping is particularly appropriate with streets suffering from existing overnight parking stress.
50. Similarly, providing for low emission vehicle infrastructure received good levels of 'in principal' support at Issues and Options 1. Concerns regarding its viability in smaller developments were raised, and as a result it was decided to only pursue this as an option where it is viable for a development to do so. This is likely to be large scale or 'major' developments.
51. Providing for commercial and servicing vehicles was also consulted on at Issues and Options 1, and received unanimous support. It is felt that this sits well within the parking management policy, as it helps to take a holistic approach to managing car and vehicle parking at a new development.
52. In terms of cycle parking, Issues and Options 1 asked whether the cycle parking standards should be updated and altered to ensure that the location, design and quality of the cycle parking provided should be of a higher standard. This was strongly supported on the whole, and as a result, further reviews of the cycle parking standards were undertaken ready for consultation in Issues and Options 2.
53. The new standards at Issues and Options 2 used the City Council's 'Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development 2010' as a starting point, and this was an approach that was well supported. This document is currently Material Consideration in the Planning Process, and provides great detail on the types and dimensions of cycle parking. These aspects of the Guide were proposed for continuation in the standards for the new Local Plan, and this was well received at consultation.

54. The Issues and Options 2 consultation also proposed that the standards (in terms of the numbers of cycle parking spaces to be provided at new developments) be consistent with those found in the 'Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development 2010', with some slight revisions to better reflect the usage levels in the latest travel to work figures. It was proposed at Issues and Options 2 that we should provide cycle parking for 1 in every 3 members of staff in Cambridge, given that previous travel to work figures put the numbers of residents cycling to work at between 25 and 30%, and there is a need to be positive and aspirational to the end of the plan period. This received good levels of support, though some respondents queried whether the standards went far enough, given the already good levels of cycling in Cambridge and the many areas, which have deficient levels of cycle parking available.
55. In light of the responses received calling for further increases in cycle parking and taking into account the 2011 Census results, which became available after Issues and Options 2 consultation had finished, further increases are proposed. The Census 2011 results showed increases in cycle to work in Cambridge from 28.3% in 2001 to 31.9% in 2011. Over the life of the plan period, it can reasonably be expected that these levels of cycle commuting will increase further, so the new levels in the standards reflect this. It is now proposed that 2 cycle parking spaces should be provided for every 5 members of staff.
56. In some cases, such as Addenbrooke's, completely new standards are proposed. The existing Addenbrooke's site has a severe shortage of cycle parking and so any new development on the site must provide good quality and abundant cycle parking. The Addenbrooke's survey shows 29% of staff cycled to work in 2011, with a trend of cycle usage going up steadily over the last 5 yrs. The visitor spaces at the site are the same as for existing clinics and nursing homes. Other cities and towns in the UK with cycle parking standards for hospitals have a requirement to provide 1 space per 10 bedspaces. It is proposed that this standard is too low for Cambridge, due to Cambridge's much higher cycling levels than is found elsewhere, and the existing under provision on the site. Therefore, 1 space per 6 bedspaces is proposed.
57. Another new feature of the cycle parking standards for the Local Plan is the greater differentiation between the needs of staff and visitors/customers (long and short stay cycle parking). This reflects the different needs of the different users. Short term users need provision as near to the main entrance as possible whilst long term users will travel further to park their cycles somewhere more secure and under cover.
58. Some respondents to Issues and Options 2 expressed concern about asking for cycle parking in terms of 'spaces per staff', citing that this created uncertainty. It is acknowledged that in some uses, particularly office uses for example, the number of staff on a site may not be finite. However, this is not the case for all uses and it is considered that where the number of staff is known, expressing

the standards in this way is easier to understand than by asking for numbers in terms of gross floor area (GFA) in metre squared (m²). In order to compromise, for some uses such as office, the standards will now be expressed as “spaces per staff” as well as the current method of spaces per m² of gross floor area, with whichever provides the greatest number of spaces given preference.

Delivery And Monitoring

Policy 63 - Supporting Sustainable Access to Development

- Implemented and monitored through the processing of Planning Applications. The policy usage will be counted in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.

Policy 64 - Mitigating the Transport Impact of Development

- Implemented and monitored through the processing of Planning Applications. The policy usage will be counted in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.

Policy 65 - Parking Management

- Implemented and monitored through the processing of Planning Applications. The policy usage will be counted in the Council’s Annual Monitoring Report.

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

18832 Object

O - 18832 - 3098 - J.1 - None

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Mr Robert Heap [3098]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The allocation of a maximum of 1 car parking space makes no allowance for visitor parking. This leads to local on-street parking congestion. All car parking provision should include 10% in excess of 1 space per dwelling, to be designated for visitor parking.

Full Text: The allocation of a maximum of 1 car parking space makes no allowance for visitor parking. This leads to local on-street parking congestion. All car parking provision should include 10% in excess of 1 space per dwelling, to be designated for visitor parking.

Change To Plan: N/A

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21184 - 1904 - J.1 - None

21184 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Line 6 Insert "inevitably" to replace "often", that is, it should read 'Too little parking inevitably resulting in indiscriminate on-street parking....'

Full Text: Line 6 Insert "inevitably" to replace "often", that is, it should read 'Too little parking inevitably resulting in indiscriminate on-street parking....'

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21653 - 1211 - J.1 - None

21653 Support (W/drawn 2013-02-15)

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Car parking in a city like Cambridge only encourages high-levels of car use. Indiscriminate parking can be avoided by proper enforcement and ensuring that developments are adopted quickly before people develop travel habits.

Full Text: Car parking in a city like Cambridge only encourages high-levels of car use. Indiscriminate parking can be avoided by proper enforcement and ensuring that developments are adopted quickly before people develop travel habits.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21659 - 1211 - J.1 - None

21659 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Allowing more than minimal levels of car parking in new developments in a city like Cambridge only encourages high levels of car use.

Productive use of the land for housing and public amenity is far better use of very limited land, compared to car parking.

Indiscriminate parking can be avoided by proper enforcement and ensuring that developments are adopted quickly before people develop travel habits. People should be made clear about what levels of car parking are available at the point they consider moving into a house.

Full Text: Allowing more than minimal levels of car parking in new developments in a city like Cambridge only encourages high levels of car use.

Productive use of the land for housing and public amenity is far better use of very limited land, compared to car parking.

Indiscriminate parking can be avoided by proper enforcement and ensuring that developments are adopted quickly before people develop travel habits. People should be made clear about what levels of car parking are available at the point they consider moving into a house.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22325 - 3991 - J.1 - None

22325 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Developments of housing and business premises (including university and colleges) in central Cambridge should not be allowed to provide any car parking spaces. Park and ride, cycling and buses provide good alternatives.

Developments further out from the centre need consideration dependant on their location. For instance any housing developments near the existing or Chesterton railway station should not have any car parking provided.

Full Text: Developments of housing and business premises (including university and colleges) in central Cambridge should not be allowed to provide any car parking spaces. Park and ride, cycling and buses provide good alternatives.

Developments further out from the centre need consideration dependant on their location. For instance any housing developments near the existing or Chesterton railway station should not have any car parking provided.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22934 - 2667 - J.1 - None

22934 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Michael Cahn [2667]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The premise ("Continued growth...") should be challenged. Nationally, car ownership and use declines. More importantly, locally, active transportation (cycling) accounts for a large proportion of all trips. This section of the document should begin with reference to high baseline figures for cycling locally. What is missing is a policy statement which connects CAR PARKING STANDARDS and BIKE PARKING STANDARDS in a coherent vision

Full Text: The premise ("Continued growth...") should be challenged. Nationally, car ownership and use declines. More importantly, locally, active transportation (cycling) accounts for a large proportion of all trips. This section of the document should begin with reference to high baseline figures for cycling locally. What is missing is a policy statement which connects CAR PARKING STANDARDS and BIKE PARKING STANDARDS in a coherent vision

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22959 - 2667 - J.1 - None

22959 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.1

Respondent: Michael Cahn [2667]

Agent: N/A

Summary: As a statement of the principles of parking standards, this section should include a reference to the cost of parking. It should contain a principle which affirms that those who use parking pay for it (and those who do not use parking should not cover the expenses of providing it). Parking is not a public benefit, but rather a benefit of those who drive a car. Such principle could lead to policies which require developers make the cost of parking provision fully transparent.

Full Text: As a statement of the principles of parking standards, this section should include a reference to the cost of parking. It should contain a principle which affirms that those who use parking pay for it (and those who do not use parking should not cover the expenses of providing it). Parking is not a public benefit, but rather a benefit of those who drive a car. Such principle could lead to policies which require developers make the cost of parking provision fully transparent.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21186 - 1904 - J.2 - None

21186 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

J.2

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We completely support the statement that 'A Local Plan should aim to limit car usage, not car ownership.'

Full Text: We completely support the statement that 'A Local Plan should aim to limit car usage, not car ownership.'

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22326 - 3991 - J.2 - None

22326 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

J.2

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support this objective but in central Cambridge no developments should include any car parking.

Full Text: Support this objective but in central Cambridge no developments should include any car parking.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22332 - 3991 - J.3 - None

22332 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

J.3

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support this statement as, for instance, it would back up a policy of not allowing car parking on any new development near the city centre.

Full Text: Support this statement as, for instance, it would back up a policy of not allowing car parking on any new development near the city centre.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21188 - 1904 - J.6 - None

21188 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

J.6

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree that consideration should be given to local circumstances. However, clarification is needed to ensure that there is sufficient on-site parking to prevent on-street parking in neighbouring areas. At present the emphasis seems to be on squeezing the number of parking spaces on-site to increase residential capacity.

Full Text: We agree that consideration should be given to local circumstances. However, clarification is needed to ensure that there is sufficient on-site parking to prevent on-street parking in neighbouring areas. At present the emphasis seems to be on squeezing the number of parking spaces on-site to increase residential capacity.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21660 - 1211 - J.9 - None

21660 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.9

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There should be a much stronger policy objective of car-free development (other than car-club spaces) in some areas. The Mill Road Depot site, for example, being very close to shopping, employment, etc. really should not require car parking, and the development plan should actively require this.

Full Text: There should be a much stronger policy objective of car-free development (other than car-club spaces) in some areas. The Mill Road Depot site, for example, being very close to shopping, employment, etc. really should not require car parking, and the development plan should actively require this.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22439 - 4035 - J.9 - None

22439 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.9

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035]

Agent: N/A

Summary: provision of too little parking is detrimental to the environment as it causes an indiscriminate on-street parking and difficulty in accessing garages -see Fairsford Place, where the developers' plans are ignored by the majority who park in the street rather than their garages. People are getting more obese, choosing bigger cars and often have more than one car. Developers and planners need to recognise how people choose to live their lives and not plan for some unenforceable utopia. Children need separate, safe, play space in gardens or parks and not in the road.

Full Text: provision of too little parking is detrimental to the environment as it causes an indiscriminate on-street parking and difficulty in accessing garages -see Fairsford Place, where the developers' plans are ignored by the majority who park in the street rather than their garages. People are getting more obese, choosing bigger cars and often have more than one car. Developers and planners need to recognise how people choose to live their lives and not plan for some unenforceable utopia. Children need separate, safe, play space in gardens or parks and not in the road.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21189 - 1904 - J.10 - None

21189 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

J.10

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We do not agree with the 'maximum' approach to car parking spaces. It is unnecessary as developers will incorporate as few spaces as they can get away with. We believe that a minimum requirement is more helpful and do not agree that 'car free developments' are viable options. Residents will still own cars that they will park elsewhere. The only reasonable 'no parking' sites might be those that accommodate students of Cambridge University where control of car ownership is exercised though, even then, cars are allowed for special circumstances, especially for graduate students (eg field work, teaching practice).

Full Text: We do not agree with the 'maximum' approach to car parking spaces. It is unnecessary as developers will incorporate as few spaces as they can get away with. We believe that a minimum requirement is more helpful and do not agree that 'car free developments' are viable options. Residents will still own cars that they will park elsewhere. The only reasonable 'no parking' sites might be those that accommodate students of Cambridge University where control of car ownership is exercised though, even then, cars are allowed for special circumstances, especially for graduate students (eg field work, teaching practice).

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22940 - 2667 - J.10 - None

22940 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

J.10

Respondent: Michael Cahn [2667]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Agree with the principle to set parking maximums. This is the principle which has been elaborated by Donald Shoup, author of The High Cost of Free Parking. Shoup is the leading authority on car parking. The economic arguments for parking maximums is overwhelming. As is the argument to better price parking: to secure that those who use it, pay for it.

Full Text: Agree with the principle to set parking maximums. This is the principle which has been elaborated by Donald Shoup, author of The High Cost of Free Parking. Shoup is the leading authority on car parking. The economic arguments for parking maximums is overwhelming. As is the argument to better price parking: to secure that those who use it, pay for it.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18660 - 1855 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

18660 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Reducing car parking doesn't reduce car usage - it just increases the level of nuisance parking in neighbouring areas. If you want to deny people adequate car parking space, you should also deny them ability to keep a car in or near Cambridge at all - as for example is done by the University of Cambridge for almost all students. Therefore I object on principle to any restriction of provision of adequate car parking for the number of cars people are likely to want to keep in Cambridge.

Full Text: Reducing car parking doesn't reduce car usage - it just increases the level of nuisance parking in neighbouring areas. If you want to deny people adequate car parking space, you should also deny them ability to keep a car in or near Cambridge at all - as for example is done by the University of Cambridge for almost all students. Therefore I object on principle to any restriction of provision of adequate car parking for the number of cars people are likely to want to keep in Cambridge.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 18726 - 3056 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

18726 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Mr Andrew Webb [3056]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Provision of parking on new sites is innadequate.
Provision of visitor parking is innadequate.
Enforcement of visitor parking needs to be made.

Full Text: I object to both councils policy on parking provisions for new developments.
Insuficient parking is being provided for new developments which will lead to pavement parking and a decline in standards - you are building the slums of the future. More parking should be provided to match the trend of children living with parents longer leading to 4 car families - yet your policy states 1 to 1.5 car parking spaces per household.
Also the provision of visitor parking is woefully lacking and innadequate, While a condition of planning may include the provision of a visitors space and even a restrictive covenant in the deeds or tenancy agreement that residents must not park in the visitors space more should be done to enforce the owner of the land, ie the organisation that holds the restrictive covenant, to enforce by whatever means necessary the terms of the restrictive covenant.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21346 - 3809 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

21346 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We approve the new standards set out in Option J.1. However, a lesson from Cambourne and Accordia is that it is a mistake to try to restrict car use by limiting provision for parking. If parking is provided round the back of houses or centrally, people will merely park illegally on the curb outside their front-door. The stretch of road outside the front-door is regarded as their private area for parking. The problem is not the size of a car parking space but its siting within the curtilage of the property.

Full Text: We approve the new standards set out in Option J.1. However, a lesson from Cambourne and Accordia is that it is a mistake to try to restrict car use by limiting provision for parking. If parking is provided round the back of houses or centrally, people will merely park illegally on the curb outside their front-door. The stretch of road outside the front-door is regarded as their private area for parking. The problem is not the size of a car parking space but its siting within the curtilage of the property.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21662 - 1211 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

21662 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Disagree with other commenters. This policy does not go far enough.

Allowing space for 1.5 cars per house in central areas is a massive waste of limited space.

Use of yellow-lined areas, enforcement of restrictions, and early adoption of sites, deals with the problem of overflow and would encourage people to look seriously at the (in)appropriateness of multi-car ownership in dense areas.

The fact that people wouldn't be stupid enough to move into, say a terraced street in Romsey and expect to own three cars there, demonstrates that people can, and already do, make such choices.

Full Text: Disagree with other commenters. This policy does not go far enough.

Allowing space for 1.5 cars per house in central areas is a massive waste of limited space.

Use of yellow-lined areas, enforcement of restrictions, and early adoption of sites, deals with the problem of overflow and would encourage people to look seriously at the (in)appropriateness of multi-car ownership in dense areas.

The fact that people wouldn't be stupid enough to move into, say a terraced street in Romsey and expect to own three cars there, demonstrates that people can, and already do, make such choices.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22002 - 2244 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

22002 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Jenny Blackhurst [2244]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I believe that the provision for occupants is probably adequate (particularly as it is fractionally higher than in the 2006 Local Plan) but that the new phrasing of "no more than..." might be taken by developers as justification for providing fewer (i.e inadequate) parking spaces.

I believe that the visitor parking provision of 1 space for every 4 units (and a unit could presumably be anything from a 1-bed flat to a 5-bed house) is completely inadequate unless accompanied by a sophisticated level of parking control, including advance booking of spaces, which should be a requirement of planning consent.

Full Text: I believe that the provision for occupants is probably adequate (particularly as it is fractionally higher than in the 2006 Local Plan) but that the new phrasing of "no more than..." might be taken by developers as justification for providing fewer (i.e inadequate) parking spaces.

I believe that the visitor parking provision of 1 space for every 4 units (and a unit could presumably be anything from a 1-bed flat to a 5-bed house) is completely inadequate unless accompanied by a sophisticated level of parking control, including advance booking of spaces, which should be a requirement of planning consent.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 22442 - 4035 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

22442 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035]

Agent: N/A

Summary: insufficient for three bedroom homes given young people returning to family homes; cohabitation and multiple occupancy through private rentals

Full Text: insufficient for three bedroom homes given young people returning to family homes; cohabitation and multiple occupancy through private rentals

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22932 - 3755 - Option J.1 Residential car parking standards - None

22932 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.1 Residential car parking standards

Respondent: CHS Group (Nigel Howlett) [3755]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support the proposed standards but would like to see something to prevent affordable housing being provided with no parking and all the parking provision retained for the market housing. This maximises land value to the developer but is socially inequitable and potentially divisive.

Full Text: Support the proposed standards but would like to see something to prevent affordable housing being provided with no parking and all the parking provision retained for the market housing. This maximises land value to the developer but is socially inequitable and potentially divisive.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18661 - 1855 - Option J.2 Non-residential car parking standards - None

18661 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.2 Non-residential car parking standards

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Failure to provide adequate car parking will not succeed in preventing people using cars to travel to work - it will just increase the amount of nuisance parking that happens (almost the whole of West Cambridge is already affected by such nuisance parking resulting from the excessive fees charged for city centre car parks, and the local paper frequently reports discontent from residents of the de Freville Rd area of Cambridge due to the same cause).
Reducing car travel into Cambridge can only effectively be done by encouraging/forcing/pricing businesses out of Cambridge.

Full Text: Failure to provide adequate car parking will not succeed in preventing people using cars to travel to work - it will just increase the amount of nuisance parking that happens (almost the whole of West Cambridge is already affected by such nuisance parking resulting from the excessive fees charged for city centre car parks, and the local paper frequently reports discontent from residents of the de Freville Rd area of Cambridge due to the same cause).
Reducing car travel into Cambridge can only effectively be done by encouraging/forcing/pricing businesses out of Cambridge.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21347 - 3809 - Option J.2 Non-residential car parking standards - None

21347 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.2 Non-residential car parking standards

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The standards in the 2006 Local Plan seem to be appropriate.

Full Text: The standards in the 2006 Local Plan seem to be appropriate.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 18662 - 1855 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

18662 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The fourth bullet point needs to be considered always as a potential reason for supplying ****more**** than the restrictive amount of car parking suggested in J1 and J2.

Full Text: The fourth bullet point needs to be considered always as a potential reason for supplying ****more**** than the restrictive amount of car parking suggested in J1 and J2.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21063 - 3790 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

21063 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Sainsbury's Supermarkets Ltd [3790] **Agent:** Indigo Planning Ltd (Mr Tom Darwall-Smith) [3789]

Summary: The proposed new criteria to calculate parking spaces (Option J.3: to use 'spaces per staff' as opposed to spaces per GFA) should not apply to food stores, as this could skew parking numbers adversely.

Full Text: The proposed new criteria to calculate parking spaces (Option J.3: to use 'spaces per staff' as opposed to spaces per GFA) should not apply to food stores, as this could skew parking numbers adversely.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21348 - 3809 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

21348 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809]

Agent: N/A

Summary: While we understand the desire to encourage use of public transport by restricting parking for non-residential use, a blanket policy has great danger while public transport remains limited in the areas it covers and in the hours and frequency of its services. Businesses need easy access for all their customers. Workers often need to stay beyond normal working hours or may live where public transport is limited or non-existent.

Full Text: While we understand the desire to encourage use of public transport by restricting parking for non-residential use, a blanket policy has great danger while public transport remains limited in the areas it covers and in the hours and frequency of its services. Businesses need easy access for all their customers. Workers often need to stay beyond normal working hours or may live where public transport is limited or non-existent.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21663 - 1211 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

21663 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If a site is not very accessible by non-car modes, then the response should be that the development funds improvements, not that more car parking should be allowed (thereby exacerbating the existing situation).

Full Text: If a site is not very accessible by non-car modes, then the response should be that the development funds improvements, not that more car parking should be allowed (thereby exacerbating the existing situation).

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 22810 - 4125 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

22810 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Brookgate CB1 Ltd [4125]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: We consider that Option J3 does not provide clarity on the required parking standards, indeed, it is contradictory. It will result in confusion with developers having no concise guidance upon which to rely when bringing schemes forward. Specifically, the fourth bullet point gives no justification for the distinction between major and significant development and other types of development with regard to parking standards. In addition, no information is provided on what constitutes "developments that are likely to place significant increased demand for parking in an area" which leaves this definition open to dispute.

Full Text: We consider that Option J3 does not provide clarity on the required parking standards, indeed, it is contradictory. It will result in confusion with developers having no concise guidance upon which to rely when bringing schemes forward. Specifically, the fourth bullet point states:

"For major developments and developments that are likely to place significant increased demand for parking in an area, the current parking situation in the surrounding area should be considered, including the presence of parking controls; high demand for on-street parking and conflict with commuter parking. This would inform the setting of on-site parking levels within the development."

There is no justification given for the distinction between major and significant development and other types of development with regard to parking standards. In addition, no information is provided on what constitutes "developments that are likely to place significant increased demand for parking in an area" which leaves this definition open to dispute.

The natural conclusion of this criteria will be to drive parking numbers up in urban areas well served by public transport. The thrust of policy is to discourage parking at accessible locations, these criteria pushes in the opposite direction. If parking problems exist the policy requirement should be to discourage car numbers not encourage more movements.

In addition, we would like to highlight that major developments are often located on key development sites, which are often within Controlled Parking Zones and Restricted Parking areas. Therefore there are controls already in place for those developments in areas considered sensitive for parking provision.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22821 - 4125 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

22821 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Brookgate CB1 Ltd [4125]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within Option J3 with regard to car parking type and style? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Full Text: Figure 2 provides clear guidance on the size of parking spaces required within garages, however the text in Option J3 is equivocal with regard to the type and style of car parking, stating 'this will need to comply with best practice guidance and is proposed to include...'. We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within this text? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Best use should be made of land; parking areas of this size are unjustified and will drive up the cost of development unnecessarily

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23876 - 4127 - Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances - None

23876 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Option J.3 Criteria based approach to addressing local circumstances

Respondent: Skanska Residential [4127]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within Option J3 with regard to car parking type and style? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Full Text: Question J1:
We would like to object to the proposed parking standards, specifically the supporting text which is unclear, contradictory and contrary to guidance in 154 of the NPPF (2012), which states:

Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

The supporting criteria to the parking standards fail to do this.

We consider that within Section J, the Planning Authority appears to be straying into Highway Authority territory. Issues such as impact on the highway network and 'on street' parking should be covered by a Transport Assessment, reviewed by the Highway Authority and the results considered by the Planning Authority. This is not matter to be covered by policy in the manner drafted.

In paragraph J4 it is stated that there was no consensus on which of the three options should be taken forward from the 'Issues and Options' report and that paragraph J.5 states that a mixture of the three options has been proposed. It is considered that this method of developing options is confusing for those consulted on the original Issues and Options report.

We would request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states that the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is therefore unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 makes it clear the current standards are satisfactory. Indeed, third parties interpretation of these criteria will lead to conflict with major developments in urban areas covered by CPZ's

Option J3:

We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Option J.3

Figure 2 provides clear guidance on the size of parking spaces required within garages, however the text in Option J3 is equivocal with regard to the type and style of car parking, stating 'this will need to comply with best practice guidance and is proposed to include...'. We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within this text? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Best use should be made of land; parking areas of this size are unjustified and will drive up the cost of development unnecessarily

Option K1 states:

"It is proposed that some flexibility could be applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances..."

As with the ambiguous parking standards, this proposed wording creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, for many developments, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. As with the car parking standards, we would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development, as surely there cannot be a finite number of staff per development.

We would also request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking to be provided. We consider that there is a missed opportunity to discuss the efficiency of the proposed cycle parking - particularly for commercial office buildings, where the use of double stackers would increase efficiency of space. Making the best use of land is a priority of the planning system

Change To Plan: N/A

Note: The composite reference number in the box at the top of the page is made up of the following information: Object/Support - Representation Number - Respondent Number - Plan Reference - Soundness Tests (if applicable).

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21097 - 1863 - Figure 2: Garage Dimensions - None

21097 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Figure 2: Garage Dimensions

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The idea that garages should be wide enough to fit cycles in as well as cars is excellent. Most residential garages, if the family own bikes cannot fit a car.

Full Text: The idea that garages should be wide enough to fit cycles in as well as cars is excellent. Most residential garages, if the family own bikes cannot fit a car.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21146 - 2304 - Figure 2: Garage Dimensions - None

21146 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Figure 2: Garage Dimensions

Respondent: PSRA Committee (Cornelis van Rijsbergen) [2304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Garage Dimensions:
As Councils wish to discourage car use, and as many house owners currently use their garages for general storage/workshop activities, there seems little point in demanding such generous dimensions.

Full Text: Garage Dimensions:
As Councils wish to discourage car use, and as many house owners currently use their garages for general storage/workshop activities, there seems little point in demanding such generous dimensions.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21192 - 1904 - Figure 2: Garage Dimensions - None

21192 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Figure 2: Garage Dimensions

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road
Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree with the minimum requirements for garages in order to be usable for modern cars, rather than a token.

Full Text: We agree with the minimum requirements for garages in order to be usable for modern cars, rather than a token.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21664 - 1211 - Figure 2: Garage Dimensions - None

21664 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Figure 2: Garage Dimensions

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The use of "could be used" for cycle storage basically is an invitation to developers not to bother. The standards should *require* such space to given for cycle parking. Otherwise developers will continue to suggest garage arrangements that simply do not leave spaces.

Full Text: The use of "could be used" for cycle storage basically is an invitation to developers not to bother. The standards should *require* such space to given for cycle parking. Otherwise developers will continue to suggest garage arrangements that simply do not leave spaces.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18663 - 1855 - Question J.1 - None

18663 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No I do not agree with them, because they will lead to increased nuisance parking in neighbouring areas. If you want to reduce car ownership you need to prohibit ownership, not reduce parking.

Full Text: No I do not agree with them, because they will lead to increased nuisance parking in neighbouring areas. If you want to reduce car ownership you need to prohibit ownership, not reduce parking.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18841 - 3106 - Question J.1 - None

18841 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Artek Design House Ltd (Mr Stephen Brown) [3106] Agent: Artek Design House Ltd (Mr Stephen Brown) [3106]

Summary: Cambridge has a major car parking problem. It covers the whole city area and has resulted from a poor parking policy being applied to new developments both residential and commercial over many years. The policy should be reviewed against actual need and all new development should provide sufficient spaces for residents/workers/visitors within the curtilage of the site in question. Pointless for instance providing one car parking space for a house with six bedrooms where at various stages of it life one would expect perhaps four cars owned by the occupiers and perhaps two visiting cars on a regular basis.

Full Text: Cambridge has a major car parking problem. It covers the whole city area and has resulted from a poor parking policy being applied to new developments both residential and commercial over many years. The policy should be reviewed against actual need and all new development should provide sufficient spaces for residents/workers/visitors within the curtilage of the site in question. Pointless for instance providing one car parking space for a house with six bedrooms where at various stages of it life one would expect perhaps four cars owned by the occupiers and perhaps two visiting cars on a regular basis.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 19574 - 1384 - Question J.1 - None

19574 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: While the drive to reduce car parking availability is understandable, cars will continue to be the biggest means of transport throughout the plan period and many families will own more than 1 car. Standards that are pitched too low against the reality of car ownership, merely drive the car parking issues to surrounding streets.

Standards suggested should be increased
Outside CPZ 2 bedroomed dwellings - increase to 2 spaces per dwelling
3+ bedroomed dwellings within a CPZ - increase to 2 spaces per dwelling.

More focus should be placed on the criteria based approach so each development is tailored to its particular situation.

Full Text: While the drive to reduce car parking availability is understandable, cars will continue to be the biggest means of transport throughout the plan period and many families will own more than 1 car. Standards that are pitched too low against the reality of car ownership, merely drive the car parking issues to surrounding streets.

Standards suggested should be increased
Outside CPZ 2 bedroomed dwellings - increase to 2 spaces per dwelling.
3+ bedroomed dwellings within a CPZ - increase to 2 spaces per dwelling.

More focus should be placed on the criteria based approach so each development is tailored to its particular situation.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21191 - 1904 - Question J.1 - None

21191 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We do not agree with the 'maximum' approach to car parking spaces. It is unnecessary as developers will incorporate as few spaces as they can get away with. We believe that a minimum requirement is more helpful and do not agree that 'car free developments' are viable options. Residents will still own cars that they will park elsewhere. The only reasonable 'no parking' sites might be those that accommodate students of Cambridge University where control of car ownership is exercised though, even then, cars are allowed for special circumstances, especially for graduate students (eg field work, teaching practice).

Full Text: We do not agree with the 'maximum' approach to car parking spaces. It is unnecessary as developers will incorporate as few spaces as they can get away with. We believe that a minimum requirement is more helpful and do not agree that 'car free developments' are viable options. Residents will still own cars that they will park elsewhere. The only reasonable 'no parking' sites might be those that accommodate students of Cambridge University where control of car ownership is exercised though, even then, cars are allowed for special circumstances, especially for graduate students (eg field work, teaching practice).

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21193 - 1904 - Question J.1 - None

21193 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is discrepancy between the suggested residential standards and the non-residential standards given at Appendix 2. In the latter it is specified that, for guest houses and hotels, student accommodation and food and drink take-aways, there should be one car parking space for each resident member of staff both within and outside the controlled parking zone. Why is it assumed that these people (who have no journeys to make to work) will own cars, whilst the 'allowance' for residential sites is suggested at considerably less than one space per potential adult occupant?

Full Text: There is discrepancy between the suggested residential standards and the non-residential standards given at Appendix 2. In the latter it is specified that, for guest houses and hotels, student accommodation and food and drink take-aways, there should be one car parking space for each resident member of staff both within and outside the controlled parking zone. Why is it assumed that these people (who have no journeys to make to work) will own cars, whilst the 'allowance' for residential sites is suggested at considerably less than one space per potential adult occupant?

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21368 - 1380 - Question J.1 - None

21368 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports option J.1 for residential parking. However, we object to the level of visitor and service parking in the new developments, where we believe there should be a higher provision. The proposed visitor provision of 1 space per 4 units may be inadequate in new developments where there are no alternative parking areas.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports option J.1 for residential parking. However, we object to the level of visitor and service parking in the new developments, where we believe there should be a higher provision. The proposed visitor provision of 1 space per 4 units may be inadequate in new developments where there are no alternative parking areas.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21665 - 1211 - Question J.1 - None

21665 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No, the standards are too generous. Central sites should be moving towards car-free development with proper enforcement of nearby yellow-lined areas.

Full Text: No, the standards are too generous. Central sites should be moving towards car-free development with proper enforcement of nearby yellow-lined areas.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21736 - 3775 - Question J.1 - None

21736 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Strike right balance

Full Text: Strike right balance

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21800 - 3880 - Question J.1 - None

21800 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: RAON does not agree with the increase in car spaces from 1 to 1.5 for 1-2 bedroom houses outside the Controlled Parking Zone; increasing the spaces will worsen Cambridge's already serious traffic problems. RAON agrees with the criteria based approach and with the standards being expressed as 'no more than'.

Full Text: RAON does not agree with the increase in car spaces from 1 to 1.5 for 1-2 bedroom houses outside the Controlled Parking Zone; increasing the spaces will worsen Cambridge's already serious traffic problems. RAON agrees with the criteria based approach and with the standards being expressed as 'no more than'.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22447 - 4035 - Question J.1 - None

22447 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Garages are better used on -plot and must accommodate three wheelie bins and sufficient bicycles for the size of the dwelling; family houses need double garages and people should be required to use them! Many garages are too small for cars and bikes and used for general storage.

Full Text: Garages are better used on -plot and must accommodate three wheelie bins and sufficient bicycles for the size of the dwelling; family houses need double garages and people should be required to use them! Many garages are too small for cars and bikes and used for general storage.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22557 - 2670 - Question J.1 - None

22557 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Developers will provide the minimum space they can get away with and still get a good price.

Full Text: Developers will provide the minimum space they can get away with and still get a good price.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22773 - 4130 - Question J.1 - None

22773 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Dr Isabelle de Wouters [4130]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In areas such as Romsey, limits on the number of parking spaces is resulting in more on street parking and is not limiting the number of cars. Many properties including new build 3 bed 'family homes' are now HMOs.

Full Text: In areas such as Romsey, limits on the number of parking spaces is resulting in more on street parking and is not limiting the number of cars. Many properties including new build 3 bed 'family homes' are now HMOs.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22813 - 3991 - Question J.1 - None

22813 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: For developments in and near the city centre there should be no parking spaces provided - to keep down traffic. Public transport and buses provide good alternatives.

Full Text: For developments in and near the city centre there should be no parking spaces provided - to keep down traffic. Public transport and buses provide good alternatives.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 22834 - 4125 - Question J.1 - None

22834 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Brookgate CB1 Ltd [4125]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: In summary, we consider that the current proposals for the Car Parking Standards have not been thoroughly considered, and will not result in clear, concise policy guidance - as required by the NPPF.

We request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 states the current standards are satisfactory.

Full Text: We would like to object to the proposed parking standards, specifically the supporting text which is unclear, contradictory and contrary to guidance in 154 of the NPPF (2012), which states:

Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

The supporting criteria to the parking standards fail to do this.

We consider that within Section J, the Planning Authority appears to be straying into Highway Authority territory. Issues such as impact on the highway network and 'on street' parking should be covered by a Transport Assessment, reviewed by the Highway Authority and the results considered by the Planning Authority. This is not matter to be covered by policy in the manner drafted.

In paragraph J4 it is stated that there was no consensus on which of the three options should be taken forward from the 'Issues and Options' report and that paragraph J.5 states that a mixture of the three options has been proposed. It is considered that this method of developing options is confusing for those consulted on the original Issues and Options report.

We would request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states that the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is therefore unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 makes it clear the current standards are satisfactory. Indeed, third parties interpretation of these criteria will lead to conflict with major developments in urban areas covered by CPZ's

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 23111 - 2531 - Question J.1 - None

23111 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Mr Joseph Adam [2531]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I agree in principle with the desire to reduce car parking, to prevent areas being car dominated, and reduce car use. However, the likely outcome of reduced car parking is not reduced car ownership, but inconsiderate parking. Some thought should be given to how to manage that situation - will new development have residents parking permit - restricted to the number of spaces provided? How will visitors spaces be maintained for visitors?

Full Text: I agree in principle with the desire to reduce car parking, to prevent areas being car dominated, and reduce car use. However, the likely outcome of reduced car parking is not reduced car ownership, but inconsiderate parking. Some thought should be given to how to manage that situation - will new development have residents parking permit - restricted to the number of spaces provided? How will visitors spaces be maintained for visitors?

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23485 - 1212 - Question J.1 - None

23485 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Waitrose Limited [1212]

Agent: Barton Willmore (Mr Mark Harris) [4292]

Summary: We note that it is proposed to retain the existing non-residential car parking standards in the adopted Local Plan (2006) Appendix 2. The provision of lower than maximum levels is possible where deemed appropriate and necessary subject to the criteria outlined in Option J.3. Waitrose objects to the absence of criteria which would allow for car parking that is higher than the standards to be considered subject to criteria.

Full Text:

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23874 - 4127 - Question J.1 - None

23874 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.1

Respondent: Skanska Residential [4127]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: In summary, we consider that the current proposals for the Car Parking Standards have not been thoroughly considered, and will not result in clear, concise policy guidance - as required by the NPPF.

We request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 states the current standards are satisfactory.

Full Text: Question J1:
We would like to object to the proposed parking standards, specifically the supporting text which is unclear, contradictory and contrary to guidance in 154 of the NPPF (2012), which states:

Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

The supporting criteria to the parking standards fail to do this.

We consider that within Section J, the Planning Authority appears to be straying into Highway Authority territory. Issues such as impact on the highway network and 'on street' parking should be covered by a Transport Assessment, reviewed by the Highway Authority and the results considered by the Planning Authority. This is not matter to be covered by policy in the manner drafted.

In paragraph J4 it is stated that there was no consensus on which of the three options should be taken forward from the 'Issues and Options' report and that paragraph J.5 states that a mixture of the three options has been proposed. It is considered that this method of developing options is confusing for those consulted on the original Issues and Options report.

We would request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states that the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is therefore unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 makes it clear the current standards are satisfactory. Indeed, third parties interpretation of these criteria will lead to conflict with major developments in urban areas covered by CPZ's

Option J3:

We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Option J.3

Figure 2 provides clear guidance on the size of parking spaces required within garages, however the text in Option J3 is equivocal with regard to the type and style of car parking, stating 'this will need to comply with best practice guidance and is proposed to include...'. We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within this text? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Best use should be made of land; parking areas of this size are unjustified and will drive up the cost of development unnecessarily

Option K1 states:

"It is proposed that some flexibility could be applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances..."

As with the ambiguous parking standards, this proposed wording creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, for many developments, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. As with the car parking standards, we would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development, as surely there cannot be a finite number of staff per development.

We would also request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking to be provided. We consider that there is a missed opportunity to discuss the efficiency of the proposed cycle parking - particularly for commercial office buildings, where the use of double stackers would increase efficiency of space. Making the best use of land is a priority of the

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

planning system

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18664 - 1855 - Question J.2 - None

18664 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No, you need to ensure that adequate car parking is provided for each development, not attempt to modify people's travel behaviour by restriction of parking spaces.

Full Text: No, you need to ensure that adequate car parking is provided for each development, not attempt to modify people's travel behaviour by restriction of parking spaces.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 18856 - 3106 - Question J.2 - None

18856 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Artek Design House Ltd (Mr Stephen Brown) [3106] Agent: Artek Design House Ltd (Mr Stephen Brown) [3106]

Summary: All commercial sites should provide adequate car parking for all workers and visitors within the site boundaries. Factors such as the percentage of people walking to the site, using cycles or public transport are generally miscalculated to minimise parking provision. The result of this is cars are generally parked along roads and streets in residential areas or simply on the surrounding roads in commercial situations. Examples are Addenbrooks, Hills Road Sixth Form Centre, Science Park the list is endless. Accurate figures should be used based on averages on sites where adequate parking is actually provided. These are few and far between!

Full Text: All commercial sites should provide adequate car parking for all workers and visitors within the site boundaries. Factors such as the percentage of people walking to the site, using cycles or public transport are generally miscalculated to minimise parking provision. The result of this is cars are generally parked along roads and streets in residential areas or simply on the surrounding roads in commercial situations. Examples are Addenbrooks, Hills Road Sixth Form Centre, Science Park the list is endless. Accurate figures should be used based on averages on sites where adequate parking is actually provided. These are few and far between!

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 19575 - 1384 - Question J.2 - None

19575 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Yes

Full Text: Yes

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21369 - 1380 - Question J.2 - None

21369 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association is concerned about the standard for car parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas, where there will be limited access to nearby on-street parking. In this context, the level of provision in the existing standard is inadequate for a number of the categories, including recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. Our specific concern is the likelihood that there will be limited visitor parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association is concerned about the standard for car parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas. Unlike established areas, there will be limited access to nearby on-street parking in residential areas at these local centres. In this context, the level of provision in the existing standard is inadequate for a number of the categories, including recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. Our specific concern is the likelihood that there will be limited visitor parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm. We consider that it is essential that these areas have adequate parking provision for users, including the large number of users of the community centre at the Trumpington Meadows Primary School and the community facility/health centre at Clay Farm. The provision in the standard of 1 space per 20m² for a community centre or 2 spaces per consulting room for a surgery would be completely inadequate.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21737 - 3775 - Question J.2 - None

21737 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Provide right degree of flexibility.

Full Text: Provide right degree of flexibility.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21801 - 3880 - Question J.2 - None

21801 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Yes but if the workforce is expected to cycle to work, then the newly built offices and industrial units MUST not only have safe, secure and covered cycle parks, but also lockers for cycling equipment (lights, waterproofs etc) and changing rooms to change from cycling gear into suits/work clothes

Full Text: Yes but if the workforce is expected to cycle to work, then the newly built offices and industrial units MUST not only have safe, secure and covered cycle parks, but also lockers for cycling equipment (lights, waterproofs etc) and changing rooms to change from cycling gear into suits/work clothes

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22558 - 2670 - Question J.2 - None

22558 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Reasonable level for most areas.

Full Text: Reasonable level for most areas.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22818 - 3991 - Question J.2 - None

22818 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.2

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Developments of businesses in and near the centre should have no off-street parking allowed - to keep down traffic.

Full Text: Developments of businesses in and near the centre should have no off-street parking allowed - to keep down traffic.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 19576 - 1384 - Question J.3 - None

19576 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: This is a much clearer way of expressing car spaces which is immediately understandable to lay people

Full Text: This is a much clearer way of expressing car spaces which is immediately understandable to lay people

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21194 - 1904 - Question J.3 - None

21194 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree that different criteria should be used for certain non-residential uses but there should be some flexibility over the basis for the calculation, depending on the use, including car parking for visitors/clients etc.

Full Text: We agree that different criteria should be used for certain non-residential uses but there should be some flexibility over the basis for the calculation, depending on the use, including car parking for visitors/clients etc.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21739 - 3775 - Question J.3 - None

21739 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Could be a useful option

Full Text: Could be a useful option

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21802 - 3880 - Question J.3 - None

21802 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Yes but if the workforce is expected to cycle to work, then the newly built offices and industrial units MUST not only have safe, secure and covered cycle parks, but also lockers for cycling equipment (lights, waterproofs etc) and changing rooms to change from cycling gear into suits/work clothes

Full Text: Yes but if the workforce is expected to cycle to work, then the newly built offices and industrial units MUST not only have safe, secure and covered cycle parks, but also lockers for cycling equipment (lights, waterproofs etc) and changing rooms to change from cycling gear into suits/work clothes

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22565 - 2670 - Question J.3 - None

22565 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Yes the measure should be actual need not floor area. The kind of mess we have at Addenbrookes with staff still parking in residential areas and on Babraham Park & Ride site rather than on site will be repeated if there is continuing under provision of parking space for new workspace developments.

Full Text: Yes the measure should be actual need not floor area. The kind of mess we have at Addenbrookes with staff still parking in residential areas and on Babraham Park & Ride site rather than on site will be repeated if there is continuing under provision of parking space for new workspace developments.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22823 - 4125 - Question J.3 - None

22823 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: Brookgate CB1 Ltd [4125]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Full Text: We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23875 - 4127 - Question J.3 - None

23875 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.3

Respondent: Skanska Residential [4127]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Full Text: Question J1:
We would like to object to the proposed parking standards, specifically the supporting text which is unclear, contradictory and contrary to guidance in 154 of the NPPF (2012), which states:

Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

The supporting criteria to the parking standards fail to do this.

We consider that within Section J, the Planning Authority appears to be straying into Highway Authority territory. Issues such as impact on the highway network and 'on street' parking should be covered by a Transport Assessment, reviewed by the Highway Authority and the results considered by the Planning Authority. This is not matter to be covered by policy in the manner drafted.

In paragraph J4 it is stated that there was no consensus on which of the three options should be taken forward from the 'Issues and Options' report and that paragraph J.5 states that a mixture of the three options has been proposed. It is considered that this method of developing options is confusing for those consulted on the original Issues and Options report.

We would request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states that the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is therefore unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 makes it clear the current standards are satisfactory. Indeed, third parties interpretation of these criteria will lead to conflict with major developments in urban areas covered by CPZ's

Option J3:

We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Option J.3

Figure 2 provides clear guidance on the size of parking spaces required within garages, however the text in Option J3 is equivocal with regard to the type and style of car parking, stating 'this will need to comply with best practice guidance and is proposed to include...'. We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within this text? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Best use should be made of land; parking areas of this size are unjustified and will drive up the cost of development unnecessarily

Option K1 states:

"It is proposed that some flexibility could be applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances..."

As with the ambiguous parking standards, this proposed wording creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, for many developments, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. As with the car parking standards, we would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development, as surely there cannot be a finite number of staff per development.

We would also request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking to be provided. We consider that there is a missed opportunity to discuss the efficiency of the proposed cycle parking - particularly for commercial office buildings, where the use of double stackers would increase efficiency of space. Making the best use of land is a priority of the planning system

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 19577 - 1384 - Question J.4 - None

19577 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Criteria seem sound

Full Text: Criteria seem sound

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21196 - 1904 - Question J.4 - None

21196 Object

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Bullet 1. We agree that car parking levels should consider both the impact of the new development upon the surrounding streets and the transport network. Define high quality public transport as widespread and of high frequency at all times of day and all days in the year. Without this people will want cars when car sharing and taxis are not suitable alternatives (eg for recreation, family transport, out of town shopping, work-related needs such as carrying samples and tools, travelling around as part of job). Therefore, sufficient car parking spaces must be provided.

Full Text: Bullet point 1
We agree that car parking levels should consider the impact of the new development upon the surrounding streets and that the transport network should be considered. However unless the transport is widespread and of high frequency at all times of day and all days in the year (and this should be specified since the phrase "high quality" is not sufficient unless defined precisely), people will need to own cars (for recreation, family transport, out of town shopping, work-related needs such as carrying samples and tools or doing visits, travelling around as part of job). Car sharing and taxis are not suitable alternatives in most cases and therefore sufficient car parking spaces must be provided.

Bullet point 2

What is the specific implication of this in terms of parking provision?

Bullet point 3

Sounds discriminatory to assume flat dwellers will not have cars. Although it may be true that current flat dwellers have a lower level of car ownership than house dwellers, this could well change in the future for two reasons:

1. the economic climate may mean that flat dwellers may be able to afford to and wish to own cars long before they can afford to move into houses; and

2. if the current pattern in the city of more and more apartments being built at the expense of family housing, then there will not be an adequate number of houses for these flat dwellers to move into as their economic situation changes.

Bullet point 4

Under-provision of parking for new residential developments is certain to lead to increased on-street parking locally and there is rarely capacity for this.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21371 - 1380 - Question J.4 - None

21371 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the criteria in option J.3.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association supports the criteria in option J.3.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21740 - 3775 - Question J.4 - None

21740 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: RICHMOND ROAD RESIDENTS' ASSOCIATION (MR RICHARD FOOTITT) [3775] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Essential that impact on surrounding streets is considered seriously - major problem in this area and seems to be scarcely considered at the moment with new applications.

Full Text: Essential that impact on surrounding streets is considered sweriously - major problem in this area and seems to be scarcely considered at the moment with new applications.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21803 - 3880 - Question J.4 - None

21803 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Yes

Full Text: Yes

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22569 - 2670 - Question J.4 - None

22569 Support

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.4

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Support the criteria but would add the need to take proper account of local community views on the potential impact of any new development. Often existing parking surveys are only done during the day rather than also at night when the picture can be very different.

Full Text: Support the criteria but would add the need to take proper account of local community views on the potential impact of any new development. Often existing parking surveys are only done during the day rather than also at night when the picture can be very different.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 18665 - 1855 - Question J.5 - None

18665 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If you want to encourage people to use modes of transport other than cars then you need to
1) encourage businesses to move out of Cambridge, and
2) achieve a culture change so that people are not expected to arrive at work or meetings smartly dressed but hot and sweaty from having cycled there, and
3) possibly do something to prohibit car ownership, and not something to reduce available car parking

Full Text: If you want to encourage people to use modes of transport other than cars then you need to
1) encourage businesses to move out of Cambridge, and
2) achieve a culture change so that people are not expected to arrive at work or meetings smartly dressed but hot and sweaty from having cycled there, and
3) possibly do something to prohibit car ownership, and not something to reduce available car parking

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 20523 - 2230 - Question J.5 - None

20523 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: Cherry Hinton Rd and rathmore Rd resident's Association (Mr Christopher Kington) [2230]

Agent: N/A

Summary: All new build -on site - out of sight parking mandatory. All areas special bays for shared / street cars ZIP. All areas safe cycle parking. Secure loops fitted outside existing town houses etc.
Recognise that residents have car(s) cycles, walk, use the bus and train and have visitors / deliveries that come by any mode but often on 4 wheels or more.
Stop parking on pavements (As Romsey Town area) by creating safe cycle hotels in every street. You have to be brave!

Full Text: All new build -on site - out of sight parking mandatory. All areas special bays for shared / street cars ZIP. All areas safe cycle parking. Secure loops fitted outside existing town houses etc.
Recognise that residents have car(s) cycles, walk, use the bus and train and have visitors / deliveries that come by any mode but often on 4 wheels or more.
Stop parking on pavements (As Romsey Town area) by creating safe cycle hotels in every street. You have to be brave!

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21349 - 3809 - Question J.5 - None

21349 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: We welcome the application of a criteria based approach to determine parking levels which will address local circumstances. However, we would encourage explicit consideration to be given to the promotion of car-free developments on sites in the City that are well served by local services and are highly accessible to no-car modes of travel.

Full Text: We welcome the application of a criteria based approach to determine parking levels which will address local circumstances. However, we would encourage explicit consideration to be given to the promotion of car-free developments on sites in the City that are well served by local services and are highly accessible to no-car modes of travel.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21804 - 3880 - Question J.5 - None

21804 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: No

Full Text: No

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22449 - 4035 - Question J.5 - None

22449 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The impact on and current situation in existing developments needs to be considered. If parking is restricted in new developments, the same restrictions must apply across the area or the problems are displaced to developments without restrictions-which may have been built to a poorer specification than those now under consultation..

Full Text: The impact on and current situation in existing developments needs to be considered. If parking is restricted in new developments, the same restrictions must apply across the area or the problems are displaced to developments without restrictions-which may have been built to a poorer specification than those now under consultation..

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22573 - 2670 - Question J.5 - None

22573 Comment

J. Car Parking Standards

Question J.5

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Can we have garages that can accommodate a car and a bicycle and allow space to get in and out of the car with a large bag as a minimum requirement. Car park spaces should also be wide enough to permit easy entry and exit form both sides of a parked family saloon.

Full Text: Can we have garages that can accommodate a car and a bicycle and allow space to get in and out of the car with a large bag as a minimum requirement. Car park spaces should also be wide enough to permit easy entry and exit form both sides of a parked family saloon.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22826 - 3991 - K.1 - None

22826 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: It would be more accurate to say that provision of cycle parking is an increasingly big issue in Cambridge.

Full Text: It would be more accurate to say that provision of cycle parking is an increasingly big issue in Cambridge.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22450 - 4035 - K.3 - None

22450 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.3

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Specific consideration to remedial measures and /or strict enforcement is needed in terraced streets eg Kingston Street, where it is often impossible to walk on the pavement due to cars parked on the kerb side of the pavement, and wheelie bins and bikes left outside on the other.

Full Text: Specific consideration to remedial measures and /or strict enforcement is needed in terraced streets eg Kingston Street, where it is often impossible to walk on the pavement due to cars parked on the kerb side of the pavement, and wheelie bins and bikes left outside on the other.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21667 - 1211 - K.4 - None

21667 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.4

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: "not always been of the appropriate standard" This is because the City Council have continued to let developers get away with obviously problematic provision such as cycle parking in basements accessible via steep ramps and via traffic lights on access ramps shared with cars. This clearly demonstrates the need for better development control, stronger County Council policy, and the need for two full-time Cycling Officers at the City Council.

Full Text: "not always been of the appropriate standard" This is because the City Council have continued to let developers get away with obviously problematic provision such as cycle parking in basements accessible via steep ramps and via traffic lights on access ramps shared with cars. This clearly demonstrates the need for better development control, stronger County Council policy, and the need for two full-time Cycling Officers at the City Council.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21668 - 1211 - K.4 - None

21668 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.4

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments basically gives too much emphasis to very secure (e.g. caged) cycle parking, whereas it is clear what people value most, and what will get them cycling more is CONVENIENT parking. The Guide should be changed so that there is a 25%/75% split (25% very secure, 75% on-street front-of-house convenient).

Full Text: The City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments basically gives too much emphasis to very secure (e.g. caged) cycle parking, whereas it is clear what people value most, and what will get them cycling more is CONVENIENT parking. The Guide should be changed so that there is a 25%/75% split (25% very secure, 75% on-street front-of-house convenient).

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22843 - 3991 - K.4 - None

22843 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.4

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The emphasis should be to require most cycle parking to be easy to use and adequate as to spaces provided. Too often the opposite has been allowed.

Full Text: The emphasis should be to require most cycle parking to be easy to use and adequate as to spaces provided. Too often the opposite has been allowed.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21198 - 1904 - K.5 - None

21198 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

K.5

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We strongly agree that standards for cycle parking should distinguish between different areas of the city and different uses of buildings.

Full Text: We strongly agree that standards for cycle parking should distinguish between different areas of the city and different uses of buildings.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21350 - 3809 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

21350 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The extreme lack of cycle parking in the City is more than a mere irritation - it is an active deterrent to cycling. Cambridge prides itself on being the cycle capital of the UK but the lack of provision in both public places and private sites is chronic and contributes to the hazard of indiscriminate parking. The cycle parking standards should cater for the needs arising from new developments as well as helping to address the legacy of the inadequate provision.

Full Text: The extreme lack of cycle parking in the City is more than a mere irritation - it is an active deterrent to cycling. Cambridge prides itself on being the cycle capital of the UK but the lack of provision in both public places and private sites is chronic and contributes to the hazard of indiscriminate parking. The cycle parking standards should cater for the needs arising from new developments as well as helping to address the legacy of the inadequate provision.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21669 - 1211 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

21669 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The garage dimension diagram in the car parking section uses "could" make space rather than "must" make space, so is currently useless as it stands.

Full Text: The garage dimension diagram in the car parking section uses "could" make space rather than "must" make space, so is currently useless as it stands.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21670 - 1211 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

21670 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: "At least as convenient as the car parking provided." Not good enough. Must be MORE convenient.

Full Text: "At least as convenient as the car parking provided." Not good enough. Must be MORE convenient.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22227 - 2376 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

22227 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Anglia Ruskin University [2376]

Agent: Savills (Mr Colin Campbell) [1299]

Summary: The revised standards are still considered to be too onerous given the location of the University close to the Grafton bus interchange and significant student accommodation within easy walking distance.

regular surveys show that walking is the most popular mode, and around 25% of students cycle. It is suggested that spaces should be provided for 1 in 3 students based on peak number of students on site at any time.

one space per 2 staff is also excessive. Surveys show that 1 in 3 staff cycle to work in Cambridge and this would be an appropriate level of provision.

Full Text: The University welcomes the intention to review the cycle parking standards. Cycling is an important mode of travel to the University, and it fully supports measures to encourage and maximise cycle use. However, the revised standards are still considered to be too onerous given factors such as the location of the University close to the Grafton bus interchange which offers excellent accessibility by public transport, and the location of significant student residential accommodation within easy walking distance.

Surveys of staff and students at the University demonstrate that walking is the most popular form of travel (28.2%) for Cambridge students followed by cycling (25%). The cycle parking standards as proposed would require that for D1 space, cycle provision is made for 70% of students based on peak numbers on site. Given that regular surveys show that walking is the most popular mode, and that around 25% of students cycle, the proposed standards are considered too high. To allow for some growth and capacity, it is suggested that spaces should be provided for 1 in 3 students based on peak number of students on site at any time.

The proposed standard of one space per 2 staff is also excessive. Surveys show that currently 1 in 3 staff cycle to work in Cambridge and this would be an appropriate level of provision.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 22304 - 4016 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

22304 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Robin Heydon [4016]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Cycle parking can also be provided in Utility rooms if such rooms have sufficient space for bicycle storage. This is used successfully in Holland.

Full Text: Cycle parking can also be provided in Utility rooms if such rooms have sufficient space for bicycle storage. This is used successfully in Holland.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 22576 - 2670 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

22576 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Mr Michel Bond [2670]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Proposals seem reasonable.

Full Text: Proposals seem reasonable.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 22852 - 4125 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

22852 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Brookgate CB1 Ltd [4125]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: The wording of Option K1 creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development.

We would request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking. There is a missed opportunity to discuss efficiency of cycle parking.

Full Text: Option K1 states:

"It is proposed that some flexibility could be applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances..."

As with the ambiguous parking standards, this proposed wording creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, for many developments, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. As with the car parking standards, we would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development, as surely there cannot be a finite number of staff per development.

We would also request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking to be provided. We consider that there is a missed opportunity to discuss the efficiency of the proposed cycle parking - particularly for commercial office buildings, where the use of double stackers would increase efficiency of space. Making the best use of land is a priority of the planning system

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23877 - 4127 - Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards - None

23877 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Option K.1 Cycle Parking Standards

Respondent: Skanska Residential [4127]

Agent: Savills (Melanie Wykes) [4124]

Summary: The wording of Option K1 creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development.

We would request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking. There is a missed opportunity to discuss efficiency of cycle parking.

Full Text: Question J1:
We would like to object to the proposed parking standards, specifically the supporting text which is unclear, contradictory and contrary to guidance in 154 of the NPPF (2012), which states:

Local Plans should be aspirational but realistic. They should address the spatial implications of economic, social and environmental change. Local Plans should set out the opportunities for development and clear policies on what will or will not be permitted and where. Only policies that provide a clear indication of how a decision maker should react to a development proposal should be included in the plan.

The supporting criteria to the parking standards fail to do this.

We consider that within Section J, the Planning Authority appears to be straying into Highway Authority territory. Issues such as impact on the highway network and 'on street' parking should be covered by a Transport Assessment, reviewed by the Highway Authority and the results considered by the Planning Authority. This is not matter to be covered by policy in the manner drafted.

In paragraph J4 it is stated that there was no consensus on which of the three options should be taken forward from the 'Issues and Options' report and that paragraph J.5 states that a mixture of the three options has been proposed. It is considered that this method of developing options is confusing for those consulted on the original Issues and Options report.

We would request that the benefits of the current parking standards are reviewed in more detail. Paragraph J8 states that the 'current standards are working well by continuing to keep the number of parking spaces low within commercial developments'. It is therefore unclear why criteria are being set out within Option J3 to determine the level and type of parking provision, when para J8 makes it clear the current standards are satisfactory. Indeed, third parties interpretation of these criteria will lead to conflict with major developments in urban areas covered by CPZ's

Option J3:

We would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed office development? It is unlikely that this number is fixed at any one time, and question J3 provides no definition of what constitutes staff numbers - is it FTE or peak usage? Is this to take part time staff consideration? The proposed use of staff numbers will create more uncertainty and less guidance for developers.

Parking numbers should be based on floor areas, a fixed quantum.

Option J.3

Figure 2 provides clear guidance on the size of parking spaces required within garages, however the text in Option J3 is equivocal with regard to the type and style of car parking, stating 'this will need to comply with best practice guidance and is proposed to include...'. We would query which 'best practise guidance' is referred to within this text? We consider that car parking for commercial developments should be based on the 'Manual for Streets' for above ground / surface car parking and 'Design recommendations for multi-storey and underground car park' Inst of Str Engineers, for below ground car parks with a minimum car parking size of 2.4m x 4.8m. In this way efficient use is made of available development land.

Best use should be made of land; parking areas of this size are unjustified and will drive up the cost of development unnecessarily

Option K1 states:

"It is proposed that some flexibility could be applied to applications of the standards, in the following instances..."

As with the ambiguous parking standards, this proposed wording creates uncertainty, and does not provide developers with clear guidance on the number of cycle parking spaces required.

In addition, for many developments, cycle parking requirements are set out as 1 space per 3 members of staff, as opposed to 1 space per 30sqm GFA in the existing document. As with the car parking standards, we would query how it is possible to provide a robust defence of the number of employees for a proposed development, as surely there cannot be a finite number of staff per development.

We would also request that the document includes information on the type of cycle parking to be provided. We consider that

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

there is a missed opportunity to discuss the efficiency of the proposed cycle parking - particularly for commercial office buildings, where the use of double stackers would increase efficiency of space. Making the best use of land is a priority of the planning system

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 18666 - 1855 - Question K.1 - None

18666 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Dr Roger Sewell [1855]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Cycling is a healthy way of getting from A to B. However, to be maximally useful, a lot needs to change in our culture, which at present places far too much emphasis on personal appearance for cycling to be a useful way of transport for business.

Full Text: Cycling is a healthy way of getting from A to B. However, to be maximally useful, a lot needs to change in our culture, which at present places far too much emphasis on personal appearance for cycling to be a useful way of transport for business.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 19578 - 1384 - Question K.1 - None

19578 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If we are genuinely serious about achieving a radical increase in cycle journeys, the proposed standards are too low. We need over provision rather than under provision and assume virtually everyone will own a bicycle.

So we suggest:-
Residential - at least 1.5 spaces per bedroom, preferably 2 spaces:
Student - 1 space per bed space wherever situated

Full Text: If we are genuinely serious about achieving a radical increase in cycle journeys, the proposed standards are too low. We need over provision rather than under provision and assume virtually everyone will own a bicycle.

So we suggest:-
Residential - at least 1.5 spaces per bedroom, preferably 2 spaces:
Student - 1 space per bed space wherever situated

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 20525 - 2230 - Question K.1 - None

20525 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Cherry Hinton Rd and rathmore Rd resident's Association (Mr Christopher Kington) [2230]

Agent: N/A

Summary: But ensure covered cycle parking does not double up as smoking shelter. Ban smoking from cycle parking areas by putting one side on the structure

Full Text: But ensure covered cycle parking does not double up as smoking shelter. Ban smoking from cycle parking areas by putting one side on the structure

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 20576 - 3642 - Question K.1 - None

20576 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: . Wookey [3642]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The historic core exemption must not allow future developments like Bradwells court to proceed without compliant cycle parking.

Full Text: Broadly the cycle parking standards are very good, but the exception for the historic core is a problem. This has allowed things like the Bradwells court redevelopment which _reduced_ cycle parking in a area of huge shortage, when it would have been possible to adjust the outline to fit in parking. Any exception must be very strict about only allowing reduced provision when it is genuinely impossible to fit it in.

Would that development count as refurbishment and thus potentially be allowed reduced (or no) provision under these new Standards? If so they need tightening. If that would no longer be permitted then I will withdraw my objection.

I support the standards apart from this point.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21110 - 1863 - Question K.1 - None

21110 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I largely agree with the new cycle parking standards but note that there is an absence to reference to the section in the Cycle Parking Guide for new Development which gives the detail of cycle parking provision. This section must be included in the policy.

Please also see my answer to K3, since there appears to be a serious omission of exact design and layout standards.

Full Text: I largely agree with the new cycle parking standards but note that there is an absence to reference to the section in the Cycle Parking Guide for new Development which gives the detail of cycle parking provision. This section must be included in the policy.

Please also see my answer to K3, since there appears to be a serious omission of exact design and layout standards.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21148 - 2304 - Question K.1 - None

21148 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: PSRA Committee (Cornelis van Rijsbergen) [2304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: There is never enough cycle parking anywhere. To encourage cycle use more cycle parking is needed.

Full Text: There is never enough cycle parking anywhere. To encourage cycle use more cycle parking is needed.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21199 - 1904 - Question K.1 - None

21199 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

Option K1:
Too few cycle parking spaces.
Page 121 Residential cycle parking, point 1, purpose built area need not necessarily be at the front of the house or within a garage if suitable access to rear garden.
Page 121 Non residential development, point 3, add all users/visitors/shoppers/clients etc to mean peak numbers.
Page 121 Sentence at bottom. Change "strongly recommended" to "required unless a strong special case is made otherwise".
Pages 122 -124 more cycle parking spaces needed in all cases, including 100% of bedspaces in student accommodation and 100 % of peak numbers in non-residential. (more details below)

Full Text:

Page 122-124
Residential dwellings. Increase to at least 1 space per bedspace..
Change all "1 space for every 3 members of staff" to "2 spaces for every 3 members of staff" for guesthouses, hotels, nursing homes, hospitals. 1 visitor space for every 5 bedspaces in hospitals.
Student residential accommodation, residential schools, college or training centre, change to 1 space per bed space within the historic core and for the rest of the city; change to 1 space for every 2 members of staff and 1 visitor space per 3 bedspaces.

Page 123
Food retail and non food retail, change to 1 space for every 2 members of staff in City Centre or Mill road District Centres. For rest of city change to 1 space for every 2 members of staff and visitor space per 25m2 up to 1500 and thereafter 1 space per 50 m2.
Sports etc 2 spaces for every 3 members of staff
Places of assembly 2 spaces for every 3 members of staff, 1 visitor space for every 2 seats.
Places of worship 2 visitor spaces per 15 m 2
Business use.
Offices and general industry 1 space per 2 members of staff.
Page 124
All cases listed, 2 spaces for every 3 members of staff.
Higher and further education
Cycle parking for 100% of students based.....

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21228 - 3803 - Question K.1 - None

21228 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Elizabeth Cox [3803]

Agent: N/A

Summary:

I object to the proposed standard for cycle parking. I consider that the level of provision is inadequate in many of the categories listed in the report, including residential dwellings, hospitals, recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. For example, in my experience, the provision of 1 space per 15m2 in a community centre or 1 space per 5 children for a crèche would be completely inadequate. The standard also needs to take into account the use by families with young children of large-scale buggies rather than conventional bikes.

Full Text:

I object to the proposed standard for cycle parking. I consider that the level of provision is inadequate in many of the categories listed in the report, including residential dwellings, hospitals, recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. For example, in my experience, the provision of 1 space per 15m2 in a community centre or 1 space per 5 children for a crèche would be completely inadequate. The standard also needs to take into account the use by families with young children of large-scale buggies rather than conventional bikes.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21372 - 1380 - Question K.1 - None

21372 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association objects to the proposed standard for cycle parking. We consider that the level of provision is inadequate in many of the categories listed in the report, including residential dwellings, hospitals, recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. For example, in our experience, the provision of 1 space per 15m² in a community centre or 1 space per 5 children for a crèche would be completely inadequate. The standard also needs to take into account the use by families with young children of large-scale buggies rather than conventional bikes.

Full Text: The Trumpington Residents' Association objects to the proposed standard for cycle parking. We consider that the level of provision is inadequate in many of the categories listed in the report, including residential dwellings, hospitals, recreational facilities, places of assembly and halls/community centres, surgeries and crèches/nurseries. For example, in our experience, the provision of 1 space per 15m² in a community centre or 1 space per 5 children for a crèche would be completely inadequate. The standard also needs to take into account the use by families with young children of large-scale buggies rather than conventional bikes.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21626 - 3900 - Question K.1 - None

21626 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Cambridge Cycling Campaign agrees with the contents of the option. It particularly commends the intention that the standards will reflect the design and dimensions for cycle parking as set out in the excellent comprehensive City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development.

Full Text: Cambridge Cycling Campaign agrees with the contents of the option. It particularly commends the intention that the standards will reflect the design and dimensions for cycle parking as set out in the excellent comprehensive City Council's Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21674 - 1211 - Question K.1 - None

21674 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: There is a serious omission of exact design and layout standards. These have been ESSENTIAL under the current standards in ensuring that developers ACTUALLY provide the space.

Full Text: There is a serious omission of exact design and layout standards. These have been ESSENTIAL under the current standards in ensuring that developers ACTUALLY provide the space.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21805 - 3880 - Question K.1 - None

21805 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: In part but parking bicycles in front of properties will be a temptation to thieves, no matter how well locked. Need to be out of site, at the back of houses. For cycle parking for non residential developments, see RAON's response to J2 and J3. Adequate storage and changing facilities are essential.

Full Text: In part but parking bicycles in front of properties will be a temptation to thieves, no matter how well locked. Need to be out of site, at the back of houses. For cycle parking for non residential developments, see RAON's response to J2 and J3. Adequate storage and changing facilities are essential.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22452 - 4035 - Question K.1 - None

22452 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Dr Anne McConville [4035]

Agent: N/A

Summary: insufficient provision for houses and flats-should be one space per BED SPACE (not bedroom) to recognise double rooms, families and having more than one bike per person; similarly for student accommodation-one per bed space

Full Text: insufficient provision for houses and flats-should be one space per BED SPACE (not bedroom) to recognise double rooms, families and having more than one bike per person; similarly for student accommodation-one per bed space

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 22875 - 3991 - Question K.1 - None

22875 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: These standards will not provide enough cycle parking spaces. Cycling is being taken up increasingly and we need to make sure that there are enough secure spaces at every shop, leisure facility and place of business for both employees and visitors.

Full Text: These standards will not provide enough cycle parking spaces. Cycling is being taken up increasingly and we need to make sure that there are enough secure spaces at every shop, leisure facility and place of business for both employees and visitors.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 23120 - 2531 - Question K.1 - None

23120 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Mr Joseph Adam [2531]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I object as I feel the standards are inadequate - especially for offices (my office is 50% cycle commuters already, the cycle parking is normally overflowing)
Student residential - this should be 1 space per bed

In addition I note there is no provision for 'unusual bikes' - cargo bikes etc.

The cycle parking should be MORE convenient than the car parking, to encourage use. Not hard to access, down stairs etc, as often proposed in existing developments.

Full Text: I object as I feel the standards are inadequate - especially for offices (my office is 50% cycle commuters already, the cycle parking is normally overflowing)
Student residential - this should be 1 space per bed

In addition I note there is no provision for 'unusual bikes' - cargo bikes etc.

The cycle parking should be MORE convenient than the car parking, to encourage use. Not hard to access, down stairs etc, as often proposed in existing developments.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 23457 - 688 - Question K.1 - None

23457 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.1

Respondent: Cambridge Colleges' Bursars' Building and Planning Sub Committee (BBPSC) [688]

Agent: Savills (Mr William Lusty) [257]

Summary: It is important to encourage sustainable means of transport and with Proctorial control of student car ownership in the City, the bicycle is an important means of transport for students. As such, we welcome the continued use of cycle standards through the Local Plan to ensure that sufficient, secure and covered cycle parking is provided as part of new development.

Full Text:

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 19579 - 1384 - Question K.2 - None

19579 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Rustat Neighborhood Association (Mr Roger Crabtree) [1384]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Broadly support a standard for parks and perhaps open spaces but do not see a need for allotments.

Full Text: Broadly support a standard for parks and perhaps open spaces but do not see a need for allotments.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21111 - 1863 - Question K.2 - None

21111 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No requirement for separate standard.

Full Text: I don't think that a separate standard is required for cycle parking at parks or open spaces, as I believe that people who wish to stop on the Commons to picnic or visit specific features will wish to have their bikes close by (possibly as the picnic will be carried on the bike), even if this means laying them on the grass. I have no opinion about the need at allotments. Again it is likely that the cycle might be parked within sight of the allotment, especially if heavy tools have been transported on the cycle to avoid carrying them from a distant point.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21149 - 2304 - Question K.2 - None

21149 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: PSRA Committee (Cornelis van Rijsbergen) [2304]

Agent: N/A

Summary: No

Full Text: No

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21200 - 1904 - Question K.2 - None

21200 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: The I&O Working Group of Windsor Road Residents' Association (The Secretary) [1904]

Agent: N/A

Summary: We agree this should be introduced

Full Text: We agree this should be introduced

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

S - 21352 - 3809 - Question K.2 - None

21352 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Cambridge Past, Present & Future (Mr Terence Gilbert) [3809] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Such provision should be well designed and managed.

Full Text: Such provision should be well designed and managed.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21628 - 3900 - Question K.2 - None

21628 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Cambridge Cycling Campaign believes that no separate standard is required for cycle parking at parks, open spaces, as we think people who wish to stop on the Commons to picnic or visit specific features will wish to have their bikes close by, even if this means laying them on the grass.

Full Text: Cambridge Cycling Campaign believes that no separate standard is required for cycle parking at parks, open spaces, as we think people who wish to stop on the Commons to picnic or visit specific features will wish to have their bikes close by, even if this means laying them on the grass.

Change To Plan: N/A

S - 21807 - 3880 - Question K.2 - None

21807 Support

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Yes: parks should have a good number of proper racks.

Full Text: Yes: parks should have a good number of proper racks.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 21912 - 3900 - Question K.2 - None

21912 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900] Agent: N/A

Summary: Cambridge Cycling Campaign has no opinion about the need at allotments.

Full Text: Cambridge Cycling Campaign has no opinion about the need at allotments.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 22883 - 3991 - Question K.2 - None

22883 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.2

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: If there is a focus at a park or open space (play area with strictures for instance) then some cycle parking should be provided. Otherwise no. Allotments do not need cycle parking as allotment holders invariably cycle to their plot and would not expect to leave a bike near the entrance or site centre.

Full Text: If there is a focus at a park or open space (play area with strictures for instance) then some cycle parking should be provided. Otherwise no. Allotments do not need cycle parking as allotment holders invariably cycle to their plot and would not expect to leave a bike near the entrance or site centre.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 20529 - 2230 - Question K.3 - None

20529 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Cherry Hinton Rd and rathmore Rd resident's Association (Mr Christopher Kington) [2230]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Serious consideration to manned city centre cycle "hotels" with small fee and open 20 hrs per day. Perhaps the rail station could be an example., but given success of far too small cycle park in Corn Exchange St a major 3500 space build is required in city centre (also Grafton area too)

Full Text: Serious consideration to manned city centre cycle "hotels" with small fee and open 20 hrs per day. Perhaps the rail station could be an example., but given success of far too small cycle park in Corn Exchange St a major 3500 space build is required in city centre (also Grafton area too)

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21109 - 1863 - Question K.3 - None

21109 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Heather Coleman [1863]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Lack of exact specifications for design and layout of cycle parking.

Full Text: There are no design standards. These are essential as otherwise a developer will allegedly put in the correct number of spaces, which in practice will be unuseable. The previous local plan (page 146 of Local Plan 2006) has design standards, albeit with spacings which are substandard. The local plan must specify Sheffield-type stands with the below spacing.

See the Department for Transport document 'Cycle Infrastructure Design' Local Transport Note 2/08, October 2008. This states:

"11.4.4 The usual dimensions are: length 700-1000 mm (700 mm recommended); height 750mm (+/- 50 mm); tube diameter 50-90 mm (larger diameter is more secure, since there is less space to lever apart "Dtype" locks); corner radii 100-250 mm. Stands placed 1000-1200 mm apart will accommodate two bicycles on each stand. The ends of stands should be 600 mm clear of walls and kerbs to allow for the bicycle wheels. A stand placed parallel to a wall or kerb should be at least 300 mm from the wall to allow use on one side only, or 900 mm to allow use of both sides. A bikelength of clear space in front of the stand is required to enable cyclists to wheel their bikes into place. "

These specifications must be clearly and explicitly included. It should be stated that exceptions can only be made (reduction of spacing between Sheffield Stands to 0.9m) where the design is trying to optimize cycle parking into an existing space.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21229 - 3803 - Question K.3 - None

21229 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Elizabeth Cox [3803]

Agent: N/A

Summary: I think it is essential that there is sufficient provision of cycle parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas. I am aware that there is the likelihood that there will be very limited cycle parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm. I consider that it is essential that these areas have adequate parking provision for users. I am also concerned at the absence of any strategy for significantly increasing the level of secure cycle parking within the city centre.

Full Text: I think it is essential that there is sufficient provision of cycle parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas. I am aware that there is the likelihood that there will be very limited cycle parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm. I consider that it is essential that these areas have adequate parking provision for users. I am also concerned at the absence of any strategy for significantly increasing the level of secure cycle parking within the city centre.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21374 - 1380 - Question K.3 - None

21374 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Trumpington Residents Association (Mr Andrew Roberts) [1380] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The Trumpington Residents' Association considers it is essential that there is sufficient provision of cycle parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas. We are aware that there is the likelihood that there will be very limited cycle parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm. We consider that it is essential that these areas have adequate parking provision for users. We are also concerned at the absence of any strategy for significantly increasing the level of cycle parking within the city centre.

Full Text: As with car parking, the Trumpington Residents' Association considers it is essential that there is sufficient provision of cycle parking spaces for users of local centres and community facilities in the new development areas. We are aware that there is the likelihood that there will be very limited cycle parking at the local centre in the Trumpington Meadows development and the significant local centre at Clay Farm. We consider that it is essential that these areas have adequate parking provision for users, including the large number of users of the community facility/health centre at Clay Farm.

We are also concerned at the absence of any strategy for significantly increasing the level of cycle parking (particularly secure parking) within the city centre. With the expected increase in homes and population in the next 20 years (28% additional homes projected in para. 3.10), the existing inadequate level of provision will be overstretched.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21630 - 3900 - Question K.3 - None

21630 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Shirley Fieldhouse (Miss Shirley Fieldhouse) [3900] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: Cambridge Cycling Campaign believes there are no points which have been missed.

Full Text: Cambridge Cycling Campaign believes there are no points which have been missed.

Change To Plan: N/A

O - 21675 - 1211 - Question K.3 - None

21675 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211] **Agent:** N/A

Summary: The absence of exact specifications for design and layout of cycle parking MUST be addressed. These have been critical in the current Local Plan standards.

Full Text: The absence of exact specifications for design and layout of cycle parking MUST be addressed. These have been critical in the current Local Plan standards.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

O - 21684 - 1211 - Question K.3 - None

21684 Object

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Mr Martin Lucas-Smith [1211]

Agent: N/A

Summary: The new standards must completely disallow the use of high-capacity stands for all developments (except in the very specific case of minor changes to an existing site in the historic core).

The current standards allowed these stands to be used - without specifying where this would be appropriate, resulting in developments squeezing in cycle parking with inconvenient stands rather than requiring developers to treat cycle parking as a proper, first-class 'citizen' in the development.

The inspector's notes shown at <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cycleparking/standards/city.html> demonstrate the deficiency that was allowed through.

Full Text: The new standards must completely disallow the use of high-capacity stands for all developments (except in the very specific case of minor changes to an existing site in the historic core).

The current standards allowed these stands to be used - without specifying where this would be appropriate, resulting in developments squeezing in cycle parking with inconvenient stands rather than requiring developers to treat cycle parking as a proper, first-class 'citizen' in the development.

The inspector's notes shown at <http://www.camcycle.org.uk/resources/cycleparking/standards/city.html> demonstrate the deficiency that was allowed through.

Change To Plan: N/A

C - 21809 - 3880 - Question K.3 - None

21809 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: RAON (Mr Andrew Tucker) [3880]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Cycle racks need to be well spaced. In order to lock the bicycle to a fixed object (Cyclists may be in cycling gear, in which case they need storage & washing facilities, but equally they may be dressed for work or for socializing. Closely spaced cycle racks and those which grip only the front wheel force the cyclist to get dirty or oily in order to lock the bike.) Hotels: is there really a need to allocate two spaces per ten bedrooms? Who arrives by bicycle to stay in a hotel? Primary schools need scooter parks as well as cycle racks.

Full Text: Cycle racks need to be well spaced. In order to lock the bicycle to a fixed object (Cyclists may be in cycling gear, in which case they need storage & washing facilities, but equally they may be dressed for work or for socializing. Closely spaced cycle racks and those which grip only the front wheel force the cyclist to get dirty or oily in order to lock the bike.) Hotels: is there really a need to allocate two spaces per ten bedrooms? Who arrives by bicycle to stay in a hotel? Primary schools need scooter parks as well as cycle racks.

Change To Plan: N/A

Issues & Options 2: Part 2 - Site Options Within Cambridge

C - 22889 - 3991 - Question K.3 - None

22889 Comment

K. Cycle Parking Standards

Question K.3

Respondent: Richard Robertson [3991]

Agent: N/A

Summary: Setting standards is one thing but it is essential that they are then enforced. The failure to require cycle parking in Christs Lane has inevitably lead to bikes being left locked insecurely and in unsuitable places. We want to encourage more cycling, not deter people.

Full Text: Setting standards is one thing but it is essential that they are then enforced. The failure to require cycle parking in Christs Lane has inevitably lead to bikes being left locked insecurely and in unsuitable places. We want to encourage more cycling, not deter people.

Change To Plan: N/A