

Annex 2 – Parking Standards

Q. 30. Policies EB22 and 23 – *the parking standards are considered to be too prescriptive and inappropriate for planning policy. I am proposing to recommend that they should be included in an Annex to the Design Guide. Would the QB provide me with the evidence that has been collected to justify these local standards in accordance with NPPF 105.*

EBF RESPONSE

Parking issues have been identified as a major problem in discussions with those who live and work in the Forum area. The March 2019 Forum consultation event questionnaire (113 respondents) evidenced grave concerns about high levels of parking in areas within village, particularly in the streets near the Metro station (93%), including outside the shops on Station Road and Langholm Road. The vast majority of responses (74%) agreed that parking standards should be set (22% nil responses) and favored the introduction of parking restrictions. As highlighted in the 'Well Being Report' (February 2019) parking was identified as a current 'threat' and potential future restriction by 50% of businesses surveyed.



St Bedes/Station Road, 19.10.19

A meeting on 8th March 2018 with South Tyneside Council Officers and NEXUS (Metro railway operator) included discussion about parking problems, particularly the issue of visitors outside East Boldon using the free Metro Car Park, or parking on-street. Nexus provided survey information highlighting Metro use and the response of passengers to the idea of a combined parking charge and ticket cost ([link to survey](#)). Forum representatives confirmed that the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan would need to address parking due of the high level of community concern.

Parking and parking provision is set out in section 3.29 and 3.30 of the Transport and Movement Background Paper ([link to transport background paper](#)). Within the Plan area there are two off-street car parks providing 107 spaces (71 at the Metro Station and 36 at the rear of the Grey Horse pub) and 17 lay-by parking spaces along Cleadon Lane next to the Industrial Estate. A further 55

spaces are provided on street or in lay-bys with limited waiting. In addition, there are 60 on street spaces with unlimited waiting, and 7 residents only parking spaces in Grange Terrace.

As stated in the Transport Background Paper (Paragraph 3.2), the plan area does not fall completely within any 2011 census geographies, the most appropriate data is considered to be data for the Cleadon and East Boldon Ward. This data shows that the ward has 87% of households with access to a car or van compared with only 62% for South Tyneside as a whole. The proportion with access to two cars or vans was 35% and is more than double the figure for the Borough. There are similar ratios for access to three or more cars and vans and four or more.

A report published in 2007 on 'Car Ownership in Tyne and Wear' using data from the 2001 census found that the ward had the highest level of car ownership in the county. This was at 13,829 cars per 10,000 households, with 86.4% of households having access to a car. The ownership of two cars per household was also the highest in the county and the ownership of three or more cars was in the top three wards. (Source - Tyne and Wear Research and Information)

The 2019 pre-publication draft Local Plan (withdrawn 2021) proposed 950 dwellings in the Forum Area spread over a number of sites, some of which are remote from the village centre and each has varying levels of accessibility and proximity to public transport. As part of its response to parking proposals set out in the draft NP, the Forum made the following comment:

Regarding policy IN6 a) xi "Ensure that sufficient car parking spaces will be provided having regard to the Parking Standards SPD6 (or its successor document)":

- With regard to SPD6 Parking Standards for residential development, we have concerns that this is now not fit for purpose and that guidance in the NPPF acknowledges the need for a more pragmatic approach. We would ask that this is reviewed and updated alongside the Local Plan.*
- We believe that private parking provision should be proportionate to the number of bedroom spaces/size/occupancy of the property, and SPD6 must be amended accordingly.*
- The proposed Cleadon Lane site (R5) next to the East Boldon Metro Station, a site where higher density is prescribed, illustrates the seriousness of the issue for the Forum. Not only will on street parking problems result from the maximum private parking levels imposed by SPD6, but additional on street parking will result because of the site's proximity to the Metro Station and the inadequate park and ride facilities that currently exist.... a perfect storm!*
- We anticipate a much greater take up of cycle use, especially with the advent of battery assisted cycles, and consider that there should be a greater provision made in family housing.*
- We also think that secure storage with charging points should be a requirement and not just "considered" in areas of high-density housing, flats etc.*
- We do not think there is a compelling reason to distinguish between private and social housing.*

South Tyneside Council's parking standard SPD6, sets a maximum provision of normally 2 spaces per dwelling, plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors. It was adopted in December 2010 and, in line with the national policy at that time, was set at a maximum standard with the intention (para 1.4 of the document) to try and reduce car ownership.

The Forum believe that the standard does not accurately reflect current planning guidance, is contradictory and unclear in what it seeks to achieve. The policy imposes a maximum standard with the aim of reducing car ownership yet identifies within the same document (2.14 to 2.16) the problems that this may cause. At the same time, the policy states that it may be appropriate *‘to allow provision above the figure set out in the case of larger dwellings where provision can be linked to the number of bedrooms per proposed dwelling’* but fails to translate how this should be quantified or actioned.

Although the Forum’s ‘Housing Needs Assessment’

[https://www.eastboldonforum.org.uk/ebnfDocs/WebsiteDraftPlan/SupportingPapers/Housing/EastBoldonHNAFinal\(Aecom\).pdf](https://www.eastboldonforum.org.uk/ebnfDocs/WebsiteDraftPlan/SupportingPapers/Housing/EastBoldonHNAFinal(Aecom).pdf)

recognises that there is not a general need to build more 4-bedroom homes in the Forum area, para. 148 notes that “the STLDF states that urban fringe villages like East Boldon should primarily focus on 2-bedroom starter and 3 and 4 bed family/executive homes...”; while the pre-publication draft Local Plan in sections 5.55 to 5.59 makes the case for a greater level of executive housing and points the way to the probability of larger, higher occupancy dwellings, scenarios which will in all probability increase the number of vehicles per building plot.

In developing the parking standards for the NP (EB23), the approach has been to adopt a policy that reflects likely car ownership but not seek to impose a maximum provision as a means of reducing it. The NP follows a similar approach highlighted by Locality and used in the Alton Neighbourhood Plan: https://neighbourhoodplanning.org/case_study/ensuring-parking-within-development-will-hall-farm/ linking parking provision to the mix and use of development, whatever that may be. We are also mindful of the issue where garages, which count toward parking spaces, are not always used for that purpose.

The Forum is confident that EB23 is reasonable and proportionate in setting the provision for in curtilage parking provision. Whilst acknowledging that a Neighbourhood Plan must respond to its own set of circumstances, it is noted that where parking provision policy has been included in other NPs, a greater degree of in curtilage provision is set out, as illustrated in the following:-

<https://www.midsussex.gov.uk/media/6037/2-copthorne-neighbourhood-plan-2021-2031-february-2021.pdf>

<https://www.buntingford-tc.gov.uk/neighbourhood-plan.html>

<https://southwater.joomla.com/referendum.html>

In outer urban fringe areas such as East Boldon, EB23 only exceeds SPD6 for dwellings above three bedrooms, and indeed sets out a smaller provision for one-bedroom dwellings. (a. One-bedroom dwellings must provide one off street parking space; b. Two- and three-bedroom dwellings must provide two off street parking spaces; c. Four or more-bedroom dwellings must provide three off street parking spaces). The slight increase in visitor parking is justified because of the increase in

vehicle use, especially delivery vans, and the likely future displacement of in cartilage parking through the conversion of garages and extensions built on parking areas.

Whilst not seeking to encourage unsustainable modes of travel, the intention of policy EB23 is to ensure that new development is better placed to cope with the likely level of car ownership, avoids illegal and potential safety issues such as parking on pavements (including in front of homes) and junctions, as well as avoiding adverse impacts on the local highway network in the vicinity.

EB23 therefore seeks to ensure that sufficient visitor parking is provided on new development, not only to lessen the problems frequently experienced on many new estates, but also by nearby residents who experience the knock-on effects of under provision. This is of particular concern in East Boldon given the close proximity to the villagecentre and existing houses of two of the housing sites identified in the pre-publication draft Local Plan.

In addition, EB23 will help prevent the situation seen all too often in new estates where cars are parked on landscape areas, or cycle lanes are blocked, as such it will improve the aesthetics of new developments.



The Forum very much identifies with National Planning Practice Guidance/Other Planning Policies/Parking Policy and the point made by the Secretary of State for HC&LG who said in 2015:

'The imposition of maximum parking standards under the last Administration led to blocked and congested streets and pavement parking. Arbitrarily restricting new off-street parking spaces does not reduce car use, it just leads to parking misery. It is for this reason that the Government abolished national maximum parking standards in 2011...'

The increased provision of car parking spaces proposed in policy EB23 may seem counterintuitive in the context of global warming and the need to move to more sustainable means of travel. However, given the location of the plan area, the poor availability of buses and the move toward electric cars, it is reasonable to assume that private vehicles will remain the principal mode of travel over the plan period. The NP does provide, through other policies, measures to increase the use of walking, cycling and public transport to get about.

The Forum welcomes the move by Government towards encouraging cycling and believes that EB22 responds directly to this. The intention of Policy EB22, is to encourage development proposals to include sufficient cycle parking, so that cycling to work, to the shops or for leisure is an attractive and practical option, helping to encourage a more sustainable mode of transport. It recognizes that if cycle use is to be encouraged among those moving into new housing or using new non-residential developments, then good storage and parking facilities need to be available. Providing cycle lanes and other incentives, without ensuring that other essential facilities such as cycle storage exists, does not seem to be the best approach.

East Boldon Neighbourhood Forum is committed to working collaboratively with South Tyneside Council and has made itself available to discuss common areas of interest, including SPDs such a parking standard. There has been little or no progress in collaborative working in the area of policy, although we do appreciate the pressures to NPPF 106. Yet NPPF106 states that *'Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary...'* Clearly the Pandemic has distorted parking patterns since March 2020 and has also influenced the way in which the Forum could carry out its work and collect information. We are not aware that South Tyneside Council has commissioned work to identify car ownership in the Forum area, but week commencing 14th June 2021, some Forum residents received an Ipsos MORI survey commissioned by the Council to identify issues such as footpaths, road, bus services and cycling. The Forum was unaware of this new survey.

The Council seems to be committed to maximum parking standards as a principle, as witnessed in their comments to the East Boldon Neighbourhood Plan consultation and refer *'...development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification...'* However, EBF will do its utmost to resolve this aspect of the Neighbourhood Plan to the satisfaction of the Examiner.