

REVISED COUNTY PARKING STANDARDS AND TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY

Supplementary Planning Guidance adopted by West Sussex County Council November 2003

Text which is ~~struck through~~ was superseded in September 2010 by new County Council Guidance on Car Parking in Residential Developments.

This Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) document was adopted by Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport in November 2003 following consultations with District & Borough Councils, Government Departments and agencies, the building industry, other interested groups and individuals and the general public via the County Council website and a local press notice.

The SPG has been prepared in partnership with officers from each of the West Sussex District and Borough Councils. It is anticipated that the SPG will be used by the County, District and Borough Councils when considering development proposals.

The SPG sets out:

- Revised parking standards for all development use classes (these standards have been developed through two separate consultation exercises – ~~PPG13 and PPG3 (residential) standards were approved by Cabinet Member following consultation in July 2003.~~ Parking standards for all 'other' use classes were approved by Cabinet Member following consultation in November 2003);
- A contributions methodology to be applied to commercial and residential development.

The SPG is supplemental to policies DEV3, DEV4 and DEV5 of the Deposit Draft West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 and policies T14 and G4 of the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 1993. The SPG also complements Supplementary Guidance adopted in July 1999 – 'The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1'

Additional copies of this document can be obtained from West Sussex County Council, Highways and Transport, Development Control Group, The Grange, Tower Street, Chichester, West Sussex, PO19 1RH.

Telephone 01243 777155.

CONTENTS	Page
SECTION 1 : BACKGROUND	3
SECTION 2 : PARKING STANDARDS	5
APPENDIX A – PARKING STANDARDS	6
APPENDIX B – ACCESSIBILITY CRITERIA	25
SECTION 3 : CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY	27
APPENDIX C – CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY APPROVED AND ADOPTED IN CRAWLEY – TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – B1 USES	29
APPENDIX D – CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY – TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – COMMERCIAL AND RESIDENTIAL USES	32
APPENDIX E – TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY – COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY, LOCAL POLICY AND CIRCULAR 1/97	37
APPENDIX F - TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – JUSTIFICATION FOR THE LEVELS OF CONTRIBUTION	47
APPENDIX G : THE STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT AS SPG	52
APPENDIX H : STRUCTURE PLAN POLICIES	56

SECTION 1 – BACKGROUND

Parking Standards

- 1.1 Parking Standards set the levels of parking provision permitted in association with new development. Previous County standards were set in 1995 and are now no longer consistent with national guidance.
- 1.2 Transport policy and recent planning guidance recognises that the availability of car parking has a major influence on the means of transport people choose for their journeys. Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 : Transport:
 - requires that maximum standards be set for broad classes of development;
 - sets out maximum standards, for some use classes, which should be applied nationally;
 - allows more rigorous standards to be adopted locally;
 - suggests that revised parking standards should be used as part of a package of measures to promote sustainable travel choices.
- 1.3 National planning guidance requires that local authorities review their parking standards with a view to reducing the level of parking permitted at new developments.
- 1.4 Revised maximum standards proposed in this SPG reflect the aims and objectives of national guidance.

Contributions Methodology

- 1.5 SPG adopted in July 1999 stresses that developers will be required to provide improvements, or contribute towards the costs, of ensuring that development is acceptable in terms of capacity, safety and sustainable travel.
- 1.6 PPG13 now makes it clear that it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based on the lack of parking provided at a site. However, it is still appropriate to seek contributions to secure transport improvements to mitigate the impact of development and improve accessibility by all modes, in particular public transport, walking and cycling.
- 1.7 County and District officers have developed an alternative contributions methodology, set out in this SPG, which will increase the consistency with which contributions are sought, conforms with the objectives of national and local policy and guidance and has received support from GOSE.

Planning Process

- 1.8 The approach set out in this SPG provides a framework within which the County Council (as highway authority) can work with District and Borough Councils (as local planning authorities) to manage new development to assist the achievement of transport and environmental objectives.

SECTION 2 -THE REVISED PARKING STANDARDS

- 2.1 This SPG revises all parking standards. Appendix A includes the proposed standards and details where these standards have been amended from the 1995 standard.
- ~~2.2 This SPG also sets out cycle parking, motorcycle parking and disabled parking requirements.~~
- 2.3 It is proposed that the standards will apply to all development within the associated class. Generally no thresholds are proposed with the exception of small commercial development in rural areas (see Appendix A).
- 2.4 In proposing revised standards consideration has been given to evidence from recent applications, views of Development Control officers and work progressed by other County Councils.
- 2.5 PPG13 proposes that maximum standards be reduced in accessible areas. A relaxation is proposed to permit maximum standards to be reduced based on levels of accessibility. District and Borough Councils will define accessibility zones based on the criteria set out in Appendix B. Reductions to maximum standards will be allowable to reflect the accessibility of the site and the impact that this may have on travel by car. The level of reduction will be established by the District / Borough Council in consultation with the Head of Highways and Transport and the Head of Planning Services. It is anticipated that District and Borough Councils will consult on their zoning approaches, and the consequent impacts on standards, as they are developed.

APPENDIX A

PARKING STANDARDS

1. PPG13 & RESIDENTIAL STANDARDS

Use Class	PPG13 Maximum Standard	PPG13 Threshold	West Sussex Maximum Standard	West Sussex Threshold
Food Retail	1 space per 14sqm	1000sqm	1 space per 14sqm	All development
Non Food Retail	1 space per 20sqm	1000sqm	1space per 20sqm	All development
Cinemas and Conference Facilities	1space per 5 seats	1000sqm	1 space per 5 seats	All development
D2 Assembly And leisure (other than cinemas, conference facilities and stadia)	1 space per 22sqm	1000sqm	1 space per 22sqm	All development
B1 Business including office	1 space per 30sqm	2500sqm	1 space per 30sqm	500sqm in less accessible areas
Higher and Further Education	1 space per 2 staff + 1 space per 15 students	2500sqm	1 space per 2 staff + 1 space per 15 students	All development
Stadia	1 space per 15 seats	1500 seats	1 space per 15 seats	All development
Residential – 1 bed dwellings			1 space per dwelling	All development
2 & 3 bed dwellings			2 spaces per dwelling	All development
4 bed dwellings			3 spaces per dwelling	All development

Notes

1. Threshold – the threshold from which the standard applies. For developments below the threshold of 500 sqm for B1 development the standard of 1 space per 25 sqm will be acceptable.
2. Parking provision should be reduced below that permitted by the maximum standard in accessible locations where appropriate. Accessibility criteria set out in Appendix B. The level of parking provision appropriate for developments will be established by the District Council in consultation with the Head of Highways and Transport and the Head of Planning Services having regard to the Accessibility Criteria and other objectives such as Town Centre regeneration initiatives.
3. District Councils will monitor the application of residential standards to ensure that PPG13 requirements are met.
4. With regard to all planning applications consideration will be given to the need to restrict or manage the possibility of parking related to the development overspilling into local streets.

2. Parking Standards for Classes other than PPG13 / Residential

i) Other Residential Uses

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
DWELLING TYPE	SPECIFIC REQUIREMENTS	TOTAL CAR PARKING PROVISION PER DWELLING	ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003	COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD
<u>SHELTERED ACCOMODATION AND FLATS FOR THE ELDERLY</u>	(a) For each flat with 2 or less habitable rooms:- 0.3 CAR SPACES and 0.2 CAR SPACES FOR VEHICLES AND SERVICES VEHICLES	0.5	No longer to be split into separate age categories This category will apply where the development is provided with internal communal facilities and warden accommodation. In other cases the residential standard will apply.	Based on recent analysis it is considered appropriate to propose a revised maximum standard of 1 space per 2 units, plus staff space. Revised standard
	(ii) Where occupation is restricted to persons of 55 or over 0.55 CAR SPACES and 0.2 CAR SPACES FOR VISITORS AND SERVICE VEHICLES	0.75	1 space per 2 sheltered units (0.5 per unit)	
	(iii) Resident staff at i) and ii) above 1 CAR SPACE AND 0.2 CAR SPACES FOR VISITORS AND SERVICE VEHICLES	1.2	1 CAR SPACE FOR EACH MEMBER OF RESIDENT STAFF	
	1 CAR SPACE FOR EACH MEMBER OF RESIDENT STAFF			

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>USE CLASS C2</u> (CARE, NURSING MENTALLY AND PHYSICALLY HANDICAPPED AND ELDERLY PERSONS HOMES)	1 CAR SPACE FOR EVERY 20 RESIDENTS OR INCREMENT OF UP TO 20 RESIDENTS PLUS 1 CAR SPACE FOR VISITORS AT THE RATIO OF 1 SPACE FOR 8 RESIDENTS OR INCREMENTS OF UP TO 8 RESIDENTS PLUS ADDITIONAL CAR SPACE FOR STAFF BASED ON A RATE OF 1 SPACE PER 5 RESIDENTS (All to be provided within the layout near to dwellings) PLUS SPACE FOR SERVICE VEHICLES AS REQUIRED		As per existing	In reviewing the C3 use class standards it was felt that the existing standards remained appropriate maximum standards given the nature of the use. No change
<u>HOUSES IN MULTIPLE OCCUPATION</u>	0.5 CAR SPACE PER ROOM/UNIT	0.5	As per existing	Whilst some recent application have had no/little parking provision, it is not considered appropriate to have a zero standard for such a use. It is considered that there may be sites where parking can be accommodated and should be sought. No change

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>HOSTELS</u>	CAR SPACES FOR RESIDENTS AT THE RATIO OF 1 SPACE FOR EVERY 4 RESIDENTS PLUS CAR SPACES FOR VISITORS AT THE RATIO OF 1 SPACE FOR EVERY 20 RESIDENTS SPACES FOR SERVICE VEHICLES AS REQUIRED		As per existing	In reviewing the hostel standards it was felt that the existing standards remained appropriate maximum standards given the nature of the use. No change

ii) Other Non Residential Uses – Associated Retail Uses

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
DWELLING / USE	CAR PARKING REQUIREMENT	LORRY PARKING PROVISION	ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003	COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD
<u>GARDEN CENTRES</u> (a) Independent	(a) 1 SPACE PER 30 SQUARE METRES OF permanent sales display area	Considered on merits of proposal	a) 1 space per 20 sqm for covered sales areas and 1 space per 30 sqm for uncovered areas	Following consultation standard adjusted to comply with advice from the industry and to comply with other local authorities. Revised
(b) Attached to non-food retail warehouses	(b) 1 SPACE PER 18 SQUARE METRES	1,000 SQUARE METRES OR UNDER – 2 SPACES OVER 1,000 SQUARE METRES – 3 SPACES	b) as above Lorry parking as existing	

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>MARKETS</u>	To be individually assessed	To be assessed individually	As per existing	Given the varied nature of market uses and limited number of applications within the County, it was felt that no specific standard should be set and each should be assessed on its own merits. No change
<u>WHOLESALE CASH AND CARRY</u> (excluding factory outlets/factory retail outlets etc)	1 SPACE PER 50 SQUARE METRES	1 SPACE PER 200 METRES	As per existing (car and lorry)	In reviewing this standard it was felt that the existing standard remained appropriate maximum standards given the nature of the use. No change
<u>CAR SALES ESTABLISHMENTS</u>	1 SPACE PER 30 SQUARE METRES of internal and outside gross car display area	Considered on merits of proposal but provision for off-loading car transporters	As per existing but with additional criterion of 'staff parking to be clearly designated' Lorry parking as per existing	A key concern from Development Control and throughout the County group related to the provision of staff parking. The existing standard is calculated to include staff parking provision but it is felt that this is sometimes used for car display pushing staff parking onto surrounding roads. By adding the criterion for the staff parking to be adequately defined it would facilitate investigations as to the use of such spaces and enable enforcement to ensure that some are retained solely for

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
				staff use. Revised criterion
<u>MOTOR REPAIR GARAGES</u> (NB: This is an industrial use not retail, but as it often accompanies car sales it was felt appropriate to group these two uses)	To be assessed individually	To be assessed individually	1 space per 45 sqm for staff and 3 spaces per service bay (or 25sqm) Staff parking to be clearly defined.	It is considered important to set a standard for such uses. The TIG group looked at other County standards (e.g. Hampshire) and canvassed views of DC officers. The proposed standard reflects the finding of this review and it considered to provide an adequate level of parking for this car borne activity. New standard

ii) Other Non Residential Uses (Business and Industrial Uses)

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
DEVELOPMENT / USE	CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS	LORRY PARKING REQUIREMENT	ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003	COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD
<u>FINANCIAL / PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (A2)</u>	1 SPACE PER 25 SQUARE METRES	Considered on merits of proposals	1 space per 30 sqm	It is proposed that the A2 standard should be amended to 1 space per 30 sqm to bring it in line with B1 office use (previously revised in line with PPG13). In reviewing this standard it was found that other Counties were taking this approach.
FINANCIAL / PROFESSIONAL SERVICES (outside defined town centre)	1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES	Considered on merits of proposal		

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
				As the standards are maximum standards it is no longer considered appropriate to have a different standard for the town centre. The accessibility of a site may provide justification for accepting a lower standard in appropriate circumstances. Analysis of applications found that A2 proposals were change of use in existing retail areas. In considering such applications account was taken of the requirements and provision of
<u>GENERAL INDUSTRY (USE CLASS B2)</u> 240 square metres gross or under Over 240 square metres	1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES 12 SPACES PLUS 1 FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 25 SQUARE METRES OVER 240 SQUARE METRES	1 SPACE 1 MINIMUM AND 1 SPACE PER 500 SQUARE METRES	1 space per 40 sqm Lorry parking as existing	The County TIG group looked at TRICS (Trip Rate Information Computer System) information in reviewing this standard. It was found that the trip rate generated by B2 users was approximately 55% of the B1 trip rate. Given the change of B1 standard to 1 space per 30 sqm, the TRICS data provided a basis for reviewing this standard. Analysis of other Counties' standards found variation between 1 per 35 sqm – 50 sqm Given that B2 uses are less trip

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
				<p>intensive than B1 uses it was considered that a standard of 1 per 40 sqm would be a suitable compromise based on the analysis. By undertaking consultation on these standards, other organisations may be able to provide further evidence to support this standard or suggest an alternative.</p> <p>Revised standard</p>
<p><u>STORAGE AND DISTRIBUTION (USE CLASS B8)</u></p> <p>240 square metres gross or under</p> <p>Over 240 square metres</p>	<p>1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES</p> <p>12 SPACES PLUS 1 SPACE FOR EACH ADDITIONAL 100 SQUARE METRES OVER 240 SQUARE METRES</p>	<p>1 MINIMUM</p> <p>1 MINIMUM AND 1 SPACE PER 500 SQUARE METRES</p>	<p>1 space per 100 sqm</p> <p>Lorry parking as existing</p>	<p>The County TIG group looked at TRICS in reviewing this standard. It was found that the trip rate generated by B8 uses was approximately 30% of the B1 trip rate. Given the change of B1 standard to 1 space per 30 sqm, the TRICS data provided a basis for reviewing this standard.</p> <p>Analysis of other Counties' standards found variation between 1 space per 70 sqm – 150 sqm.</p> <p>Given that B8 uses are less trip intensive than B1 and B2 uses it was considered that a standard of 1 per 100 sqm would be appropriate based on the</p>

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
				analysis. Revised standard
<u>OPEN STORAGE</u>	To be assessed individually	To be assessed individually	1 space per 100 sqm Lorry parking to be assessed individually	Given the nature of open storage areas it is considered that they are akin to B8 uses and thus the B8 standard should also apply here. New standard

ii) Other Non Residential Uses (Leisure Uses)

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>DEVELOPMENT / USE</u>	<u>CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS</u>	<u>LORRY PARKING REQUIREMENT</u>	<u>ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003</u>	<u>COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD</u>
<u>TENNIS / BADMINTON COURTS</u>	4 SPACES PER COURT	-	2 spaces per court	TIG group felt that logically this standard should be reduced as the existing standard assumed that every player would be driving. It is felt that this would often not be the case. No recent applications in the County in this category. Revised standard
<u>SQUASH COURTS</u>	4 SPACES PER COURT	-	2 spaces per court	Comment as per tennis / badminton. Revised standard

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>SWIMMING POOLS</u>	<p>1 SPACE PER 5 SQUARE METRES for other than town centre locations</p> <p>1 SPACE PER 8 SQUARE METRES AREA within Worthing's defined town centre</p>	-	1 space per 10 sqm of pool area	<p>There have been no recent applications for solely swimming pools in West Sussex (usually multi-leisure). Analysis of other County standards found 1 space per 10 sqm of pool area. Considered appropriate standard to apply in West Sussex.</p> <p>As the standards are maximum standards it is no longer considered appropriate to have a different standard for the town centre. The accessibility of a site may provide justification for accepting a lower standard in appropriate circumstances.</p> <p>Revised standard</p>
<u>GOLF COURSES</u>	4 SPACES PER HOLE	-	As per existing	<p>Review of other County standards also found 4 spaces per hole.</p> <p>No change</p>
<u>RIDING STABLES / STABLES</u>	2 SPACES PER LOOSE BOX	-	As per existing	<p>No evidence to support changing this standard.</p> <p>No change</p>
<u>INDOOR EQUESTRIAN CENTRES</u>	1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES OF ARENA	1 SPACE PER 150 SQUARE METRES OF ARENA FOR HORSE BOXES	As per existing	<p>No evidence to support changing this standard.</p> <p>No change</p>

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
		/ TRADERS		
<u>BOWLING</u> (including 10-pin, outdoor and indoor)	6 SPACES PER RINK / LANE	-	As this is a D2 use, those standards to be applied (Part A) 1 space per 22 sqm	As this is a D2 leisure use, the TIG group felt that the D2 standard should apply and there was not a need for a separate standard for bowling. Refer to D2 standards (already consulted upon a Part A standards)
<u>PLAYING FIELDS</u> (including soccer, rugby, hockey, cricket etc)	1 SPACE PER 2 PLAYERS	-	12 spaces per hectare of pitch	Given that many pitches are used for a range of different sporting activities throughout the year it was considered by the TIG group that it can be difficult to assess parking requirements. The proposed revised standard is comparable to the existing standard with regard to sporting team games such as football, hockey. Revised standard
<u>INDOOR MULTI-PURPOSE FACILITIES</u>	1 SPACE PER 15 SQUARE METRES OF FLOOR AREA for locations outside the town centre 1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES OF FLOOR AREA within Worthing's town	- -	As this is a D2 use, those standards should be applied (Part A) 1 space per 22 sqm	As this is a D2 leisure use, the D2 standard would be applicable. Refer to D2 standards (revised recently in line with PPG13).

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
	<p>centre</p> <p>In addition, if regular social functions, conferences, meetings etc take place in the main hall 1 SPACE PER 8 SEATS OR 1 SPACE PER 4.5 SQUARE METRES</p>	-		
<u>OTHER INDOOR LEISURE USES</u>	Considered on merits of particular proposal	-	<p>As this is a D2 use, those standards should be applied (Part A)</p> <p>1 space per 22sqm</p>	<p>As this is a D2 leisure use, the D2 standard would be applicable.</p> <p>Refer to D2 standards (revised recently in line with PPG13).</p>
<u>OTHER OUTDOOR LEISURE ACTIVITIES</u> (e.g. windsurfing, angling, shooting)	Considered on merits of particular proposal	-	As per existing – consider on merits	<p>No recent relevant applications or other evidence to support changing this standard.</p> <p>No change</p>

ii) Other Non Residential Uses (A3 Uses)

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>DEVELOPMENT / USE</u>	<u>CAR PARKING REQUIREMENT</u>	<u>LORRY PARKING REQUIREMENT</u>	<u>ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003</u>	<u>COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD</u>
<p><u>USE CLASS A3 – FOOD AND DRINK (PUBLIC HOUSES, RESTAURANTS, CAFES AND PRIVATE CLUBS)</u></p> <p>(outside the defined town centre)</p>	<p>1 SPACE PER 3 SEATS and/or 1 SPACE PER 4.5 SQUARE METRES OF PUBLIC AREA, IN ADDITION, 2 SPACES PER BAR FOR STAFF ARE REQUIRED WHERE BAR(S) ARE PROPOSED.</p>	-	<p>1 space per 5 sqm of public area and 2 spaces per bar (or 5m length of bar for large bars) for staff</p> <p>Staff parking to be clearly designated.</p>	<p>In reviewing A3 uses it was considered that it would be more appropriate to base the parking requirement on floor and bar space rather than number of seats. This is in line with other Counties' approaches. Analysis of a recent application for a new A3 was found to equate to 1 space per 5 sqm.</p> <p>As the standards are maximum standards, it is no longer considered appropriate to have a different standard for the town centre. The accessibility of a site may provide justification for accepting a lower standard in appropriate circumstances. Analysis of applications found that most A3 proposals were change of use in existing retail areas. In considering such applications account was taken</p>
<p><u>USE CLASS A3 – FOOD AND DRINK (PUBLIC HOUSES, RESTAURANTS, CAFES AND PRIVATE CLUBS)</u></p> <p>(within the defined town centre)</p>	<p>1 SPACE PER 25 SQUARE METRES</p>			

ii) Other Non Residential Uses (Places of Assembly, Hotels)

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
DEVELOPMENT / USE	CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS	LORRY PARKING REQUIREMNT	ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003	COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD
<u>PLACES OF ASSEMBLY</u> (places of worship, cinemas, theatres, concert halls, night clubs)	1 SPACE PER 8 SEATS and/or 1 SPACE PER 4.5 SQM OF PUBLIC AREA AS APPROPRIATE PLUS STAFF PROVISION	-	As these are D2 uses, those standards should be applied (Part A). 1 space per 22 sqm For large scale places of assembly serving more than a local catchment 1 space per 15 sqm	As these are D2 leisure use, the D2 standard would be applicable. Refer to D2 standards (revised recently in line with PPG13).
<u>HOTELS, MOTELS AND GUEST HOUSES</u>	1 SPACE PER BEDROOM (including staff bedrooms) except within the Central Accommodation Area defined within the Local Plan Review: Deposit Document where a lower standard of 1 SPACE PER 2 BEDROOMS applies	-	As per existing	No recent relevant applications or other evidence to support changing this standard. No change

ii) Other Non Residential Uses (Hospital, Doctors, Vets)

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
<u>DEVELOPMENT / USE</u>	<u>CAR PARKING REQUIRMENT</u>	<u>LORRY PARKING REQUIREMENT</u>	<u>ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003</u>	<u>COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD</u>
<u>HOSPITALS</u>	1 SPACE PER BED Plus adequate staff parking	-	Applications should be assessed individually and be based upon a Travel Plan	In reviewing this standard it was felt that it can be difficult to ascertain bed or staff numbers and they can be subject to change. No recent applications to provide evidence of suitable standard. Hampshire County standards based on individual assessment and Travel Plan requirement. Development of Travel Plans is a central government target for all hospitals, thus requirement for this is in relation to new proposals is considered appropriate.
<u>DOCTORS, DENTISTS, VETS AND MEDICAL CENTRES</u>	1 SPACE PER PRACTITIONER PLUS 4 SPACES PER CONSULTING / EXAMINATION ROOM FOR VISITORS AND STAFF, PLUS 1 SPACE PER 20 SQUARE METRES OF OFFICE SPACE FOR ADMINISTRATIVE AND SUPPPORT STAFF	-	As per existing	No evidence to support changing this standard. No change

ii) Other Non Residential Uses

	<u>1995 STANDARD</u>		<u>STANDARD ADOPTED IN 2003</u>	
DEVELOPMENT / USE	CAR PARKING REQUIREMENTS	LORRY PARKING REQUIREMENTS	ADOPTED MAXIMUM STANDARD 2003	COMMENTS ON 2003 STANDARD
<u>SCHOOLS, COLLEGES AND LIBRARIES</u> (see Separate Revised Standards for Further and Higher Education)	To be assessed individually	-	As per existing But as a general guide: 1 space per 2 daytime teaching staff. Parking levels to be established within a Travel Plan	No recent relevant applications or other evidence to support changing this standard. No change but guidelines provided.
<u>CHILDREN'S NURSERIES</u>	No standard at present, assessed individually	-	To be assessed individually, particular regard should be given to adequate provision for dropping off children without causing highway problems. As a guide 1 space per 2 staff	Many nurseries are within residential areas with limited on-site parking. It is acknowledged that such uses can be problematic with regard to parking provision and especially dropping off. In undertaking an individual assessment of such proposals particular regard should be given to the provision of staff parking and dropping off areas.
<u>CEMETERIES AND CREMATORIA</u>	To be assessed individually	-	As per existing	No evidence to support changing this standard. No change

Other Categories of Parking Requirement

<p><u>CYCLE PARKING</u></p>	<p>1 cycle space per 8 car parking spaces provided. Subject to a minimum of 2 cycle spaces, apart from at large out of town retail outlets where the standard is 1 cycle space per 16 car parking spaces</p>	<p><u>A1</u> – 1 space per 100sqm for staff and 1 space per 100sqm for customers. <u>A2</u> – 1 space per 100sqm for staff and 1 space per 200sqm for customers <u>A3</u> – 1 space per 4 staff and 1 space per 25sqm for customers <u>B1</u> – 1 space per 150sqm for staff and 1 space per 500sqm for visitors <u>B2</u> – 1 space per 200sqm for staff and 1 space per 500sqm for visitors <u>B8</u> – 1 space per 500sqm for staff and 1 space per 1000sqm for visitors <u>D2 uses</u> <u>Leisure and Recreation</u> 1 space per 4 staff plus visitor / customer cycle parking <u>Residential Uses</u> – none if a garage is provided and the garage is of sufficient size. 2 cycle spaces per dwelling (2 beds or more) plus 1 space per 8 dwellings for visitors. 1 space per dwelling (1</p>	<p>Current standards calculate cycle and motorcycle spaces based on a proportion of car parking. In reviewing the car parking standards it was apparent that the setting of maximum standards and the scope for developers to provide lower parking provision would thus mean a lowering for these other types of parking provision.</p> <p>Given that lower parking may be considered in association with promoting more sustainable modes of transport. It is considered illogical to then reduce the number of these spaces required.</p> <p>It is thus considered more equitable that these standards are also generally calculated based upon floor space.</p> <p>The proposed cycle standards are a minimum and represent an increase in provision.</p> <p>All cycle parking must be sheltered and secure and in accordance with local guidance or best practice design. However, flexibility and innovation will be encouraged. It is essential that cycle parking is considered carefully within the design of new development.</p>
-----------------------------	--	---	---

		bed) and 1 space per dwelling plus 1 space per 8 dwellings for visitors.	
<u>MOTORCYCLE PARKING</u>	1 motorcycle space per 30 car parking spaces, subject to a minimum of 1 space.	1 space plus 1 space per 10 parking spaces. For retail uses primarily involving bulky purchases (e.g. food superstores and hypermarkets) the provision may be reduced to 1 space per 25 car parking spaces.	See comments above.
<u>DISABLED PARKING</u>	1 parking space for people with disabilities per 20 parking spaces or part thereof.	Employment premises: Individual bays for disabled employees. At least 1 space or 5% of total car parking provision, whichever is greater. Car parks associated with shopping areas, leisure, recreation and places open to the general public. A minimum of 1 space for each employee who is a disabled motorist, plus 6% of the total capacity for visiting disabled motorists.	The Department of Transport has recently published guidance entitled 'Inclusive Mobility: A Guide to Best Practice on Access to Pedestrian and Transport Infrastructure' (December 2002). This document includes technical advice on a range of mobility / access related issues, including recommended standards for parking provision. Given this is a recent Central government publication, it is considered appropriate to revise the existing disabled parking standards to bring them in line with this guidance.

APPENDIX B

ACCESSIBILITY CRITERIA

Accessibility Criteria

Location	Criteria
Zone 1 – for example Town Centres	Attractive, safe and convenient accessibility by various modes from a variety of directions; local shortfalls in the quality of alternatives and limited access to the wider catchment area; opportunities for improvements available in the foreseeable future.
Zone 2 – for example edge of town	Attractive, safe and convenient accessibility by various modes but limited variety of direction; local shortfalls in the quality of alternatives and limited access to the wider catchment area; opportunities for improvements in the foreseeable future.
Zone 3 – for example other built up areas	Attractive, safe and convenient accessibility by limited modes and limited variety of direction; local shortfalls in the quality of alternatives and limited access to the wider catchment area; opportunities for improvements in the foreseeable future.
Zone 4 – for example rural areas with limited or poor accessibility	Limited or poor accessibility by non car modes for which the maximum parking standard will be required. The level of accessibility will be a key consideration for the Highway Authority when making a recommendation to the Local Planning Authority.

District / Borough Councils will define zones in consultation with the Head of Transport Planning Services and Head of Planning Services.

When defining zones the facilities available and the catchment population who may benefit from those facilities will be considered – for example pedestrian routes within a mile of a commercial site will be considered alongside the population within a mile of the site. Pedestrian routes within a mile of a residential site will be considered alongside the number of employment opportunities and location of schools, shops and other essential facilities.

SECTION 3 – THE TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY

- 3.1 In the past significant contributions have been secured to mitigate the impact of development in the form of a commuted sum – a contribution based on the shortfall between parking spaces required and parking spaces provided. PPG13 now makes it clear that it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted payments based around the lack of parking provided on a site. However it is still appropriate to seek contributions to secure transport improvements to mitigate the impact of development and improve accessibility by all modes, in particular public transport, walking and cycling. The joint officer group considering parking standards has considered how the need for access to a development (and hence, in part, the relationship with the provision of car parking spaces) should relate to developer contributions towards local transport improvements.
- 3.2 A methodology has been developed which relates contributions to 'Total Access Demand' (TAD). This methodology, following a consultation exercise, was adopted as SPG in Crawley for business development in January 2003. The approach has the support of GOSE and is set out in Appendix C.
- 3.3 The concept of Total Access Demand (TAD) as a means of calculating transport contributions has now been applied successfully to a number of developments in Crawley.
- 3.4 This SPG extends the approach across the county to cover B1 and other commercial uses and residential development as set out in Appendix D.
- 3.5 The proposed methodology compliments SPG adopted in July 1999 – 'The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1' - which requires that developers:
- 'provide or contribute towards the costs of infrastructure and other measure which are necessary to ensure that new development is accessible by sustainable transport'.
 - fund necessary new or improved off site infrastructures where the capacity of the existing network is unable to accommodate additional traffic or where additional traffic would prejudice safety.
- 3.6 Contributions secured through the contributions methodology will be allocated to schemes:
- identified in the document titled 'Highways and Transport Proposed Schemes to be Progressed if Developer Funding is Secured', developed through a consultation exercise and approved by West Sussex County Council, or

- any other scheme which will improve access between the development and local amenities (to include housing, jobs, shops, schools, leisure and other services).
- 3.7 For residential development it is appropriate that the Methodology be used in relation to small to medium scale development of up to around 100 units. For larger developments the Methodology may provide a guide but improvements to mitigate the impact of development should form part of a full Transport Assessment. It would not be anticipated that contributions secured from larger developments would be any less than the level of contribution calculated using the Contributions Methodology.
- 3.8 The Methodology will provide a firm basis for negotiation; however, in some circumstances, flexibility will be required. It may, for example, not be appropriate to apply the methodology to affordable or keyworker housing schemes. All developers will have the opportunity to provide a Transport Assessment as an alternative approach to identifying the impact and necessary mitigation measures associated with their development.
- 3.9 A number of notes have been added to Appendix D to provide clarity in relation to the approach and the calculation with respect to commercial and residential development.
- 3.10 It is considered that the approach complies with national policy, local policy and Circular 1/97. A note setting out the compliance is included as Appendix E.
- 3.11 A justification of the figures used within the Methodology is included as Appendix F.

APPENDIX C

**CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY APPROVED AND ADOPTED IN
CRAWLEY**

TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – B1 USES

Financial Contributions

Parking standards and contributions are based on the concept of meeting Total Access Demand (TAD) or the total access needs generated by the development. TAD can be represented by the total number of employees accessing the site. This is calculated on the basis of 1 employee per 21 sqm which is taken to represent the average number of employees to be found in office development.

Financial contributions will be sought to address the impact of a development on the transport network, in accordance with planning guidance. As parking standards will not meet the total access demand generated by a development, contributions will be sought towards transport improvements based around securing improved accessibility to the site by all modes, in particular public transport, walking and cycling. The total contribution calculated using the TAD methodology will be required in addition to off site works required to meet safety and capacity requirements.

Based on the concept of meeting total access demand, the contribution is made up of two elements - a sustainable transport contribution and an infrastructure contribution. These two elements will be combined into a single payment.

Sustainable Access Contribution

This is a financial contribution towards the cost of improvements to alternative modes of access to the development and is based on the number of employees who will use modes of transport other than the car to access the site. It is calculated by subtracting the number of employees who will be provided with a car parking space from the Total Access Demand for the site. A contribution of £300 will then be sought for each remaining employee.

Example

10,000m ² B1 development		
Calculate total access demand	- 10,000m / 21m ²	= 476
Employees with a car parking space	- 10,000/31m ²	= 323
Employees without a car parking space	- 476 - 323	= 153
Sustainable Transport Contribution	-153 x £300	= £45,900

Note – Crawley has developed an accessibility map which allows reductions to the PPG13 maximum standard of 1 space per 30sqm for B1 development. 1 space per 31sqm is the maximum standard for the Manor Royal area based on accessibility criteria.

Infrastructure Contribution

This is a financial contribution towards the costs of mitigating the effects of those driving to the site thereby creating additional traffic on the road network.

The increase in vehicle traffic could also make it less desirable to walk or cycle. The contribution is calculated on the basis of the number of car parking spaces provided.

Example

10,000m² B1 development

Employees with a car parking spaces - 10,000/31m² = 323

Infrastructure contribution - 323 x £600 = £193,800

Total contribution

The total contribution is therefore the sustainable transport contribution plus the infrastructure contribution

Example

10,000 m² B1 development

£45,900 + £193,800 = £239,700

Notes

Where B1 development is permitted in less accessible locations the PPG13 standard of 1 space per 30m² will be sought. In more accessible area, such as Crawley Town Centre a maximum of 1 space per 41sqm will be permitted.

The approach will be applied to development of all sizes.

The level of contributions for sustainable transport and infrastructure are based upon the cost of providing a bus service. The differential between the two costs has been set so as to encourage the provision of a reduced number of car parking spaces.

Total Access Demand and parking standards will be based on gross floorspace.

All contributions will be secured via a S106 agreement. Agreements may require money which is not spent within a certain period of time to be repaid to the developer.

Money paid over as the financial contribution described above will be kept in a ring fenced account and will only be allocated to sustainable transport schemes. All allocations of the money will be approved by the Executive of the Borough Council. The allocation of money to schemes will be undertaken in liaison with West Sussex County Council.

An annual report summarising the total of financial contributions received and where they have been spent will be produced and made publicly available.

APPENDIX D

CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY

TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – COMMERCIAL & RESIDENTIAL USES

Total Access Demand - commercial development

The principle of Total Access Demand (TAD) has been established through the adoption, following widespread consultation, of SPG in Crawley. TAD is based on the principle of securing improved accessibility by all modes and mitigating the impact of those accessing development by car. The methodology considers the total number of people accessing a site and the number of those accessing a site who are provided with a parking space. A sustainable access contribution and an infrastructure contribution are required. The differential between the two elements of the contribution has been set to encourage the development of accessible sites and the provision of a reduced number of car parking spaces. Hence, the more accessible the site, the lower the level of parking requirement and the lower the level of contribution required.

The adopted approach for B1 development calculates TAD based on 1 employee per 21 sqm of office development. This figure is established from the SERPLAN report 'The Use of Business Space – Employment Densities and Working Practices in South East England – March 1997'. The same report provides guidance in relation to warehousing, industrial and manufacturing uses. Assuming that gross floor area is 17.5% greater than net floor area (established in SERPLAN report) the following employment densities are derived from the SERPLAN report:

	Floorspace to Labour (Net)	Sqm per worker (Gross)
Offices	17.9	21.0
Industrial	31.8	37.0
Manufacturing	29.7	35.0
Warehousing	40.1	47.0

Hence, the same methodology established for B1 development can be used to establish contributions associated with other commercial uses.

For example – a 10,000 sqm development

Use Class	TAD	Parking Provision	Sustainable Access Contribution	Infrastructure Contribution
B1 office	476	1:30 sqm – 333 spaces	$(476 - 333) \times \text{£}300 = \text{£}42,900$	$333 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}199,800$
B2 Industrial	270	1:40 sqm – 250 spaces	$(270 - 250) \times \text{£}300 = \text{£}6,000$	$250 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}150,000$
B8 Warehousing	213	1:100 sqm – 100 spaces	$(213 - 100) \times \text{£}300 = \text{£}33,900$	$100 \times 600 = \text{£}60,000$

It is apparent that development that will generate a lower level of traffic and hence have a lower level of impact will be required to make a lower level of contribution.

If, due to the accessible nature of a site, parking provision below the maximum can be permitted the sustainable access contribution would increase and the infrastructure contribution would reduce. Overall a lower level of contribution would be required.

Total Access Demand – Residential

The principle of Total Access Demand can equally be applied to residential development. County records highlight the following average occupancies for residential development:

1 bed 1.3 occupancy
 2 bed 1.5 occupancy
 3 bed 2.2 occupancy
 4 bed 3.0 occupancy

Note – this refers to total occupancy as all occupants will generate movement and hence impact on the transport network.

Applying the infrastructure contribution for those with access to a parking space and the sustainable access contribution for those who have not –

Development	Occupancy	Parking Provision	Sustainable Access Contribution	Infrastructure Contribution
10 x 1 bed units	13	1 space per unit = 10 spaces	$(13 - 10) \times \text{£}300$ = $\text{£}900$	$10 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}6,000$
10 x 1 bed units	13	0.5 spaces per unit = 5 spaces	$(13 - 5) \times \text{£}300 =$ $\text{£}2,400$	$5 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}3,000$
10 x 2 bed units	15	1 space per unit = 10 spaces	$(15 - 10) \times \text{£}300$ = $\text{£}1,500$	$10 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}6,000$
10 x 2 bed units	15	1.5 spaces per unit = 15 spaces	0	$15 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}9,000$
10 x 3 bed units	22	2 spaces per unit = 20 spaces	$(22 - 20) \times \text{£}300$ = $\text{£}600$	$20 \times \text{£}600 = \text{£}12,000$
10 x 4 bed units	30	3 spaces per unit = 30 spaces	0	$30 \times 600 = \text{£}18,000$

The development of smaller units will generate less demand for movement and will hence be required to make a lower level of contribution – contributions from 1 bed units with one car parking space per unit will average £600 per unit whilst contributions related to four bed development with three car parking spaces per unit will average £1,800 per unit.

Notes

1. The sustainable access contribution and infrastructure contribution will be required in addition to contributions or improvements required to ensure that the development provides sustainable and safe access within the capacity of the transport network provide.
2. The sustainable access contribution and the infrastructure contribution will be required in addition to the costs of managing on street parking required as a result of proposed development.
3. With respect to commercial development the sustainable access contribution and infrastructure contribution will be required in addition to measures incorporated within a travel plan.
4. With respect to commercial development TAD will be based on gross floor area.
5. With respect to residential development concessions may be made in respect of affordable or keyworker housing to reflect the potential for lower levels of movement generated by these types of development.
6. No thresholds are proposed below which the methodology will not apply, however for practical reasons, thresholds may be agreed with individual District and Borough Councils. If thresholds are applied then the level of contribution may need to be reconsidered in accordance with Appendix F.
7. For residential development the methodology will be used for developments up to 100 units. Above this a full Transport Assessment will be required.
8. The methodology relates to the impact of new development – allowances will be made for movement generated by existing uses on a development site or existing parking provision provided on a site. Hence for the purposes of the contributions methodology development includes all proposals likely to result in a net increase in movement.
9. The TAD methodology provides a guide to aid transparency, consistency and equity when considering developer contributions. Exceptional circumstances will be considered on their merits. All developers have the option of providing a Transport Assessment as an alternative approach to assessing the impact of development and hence appropriate mitigation measures.
10. An assessment of wider planning objectives could result in the level of contribution being reviewed in exceptional circumstances.
11. The methodology should be considered in relation to the approved list of schemes to be funded if developer contributions become available – contributions will be ringfenced and allocated to these schemes or others identified by the Highway Authority in partnership with the District and Borough Planning Authorities.
12. Contributions could secure improvements to facilities for the disabled, pedestrians, cyclists, public transport services or facilities, traffic management or safety enhancements.
13. Contributions will only be secured towards proposals which will influence travel patterns to / from development either on their own or as part of a package. Contributions will not be sought from development if no improvement can be identified that relates directly to movement generated by the development.

14. Contributions will be secured via a S106 agreement.
15. An annual report summarising the total of financial contributions received and where they have been spent will be produced and made publicly available.
16. Similar principles may be applied with respect to other use classes – however adjustments would need to be made with respect to retail development, for example, to reflect access by those other than employees or residents.
17. TAD relates directly to occupancy levels. Where local information suggests that alternative occupancy levels are more appropriate these will be considered.
18. Separate provisions apply in relation to development impacting on the trunk road network. These provisions are set out in DTLR Circular 04/2001 (Control of Development Affecting Trunk Roads and Agreements under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980).
19. The approach will not be applied retrospectively to sites with unimplemented planning permissions.
20. The level of contributions will be reviewed annually, to include an inflation increase in accordance with relevant construction Indices.

APPENDIX E

TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGY – COMPLIANCE WITH NATIONAL POLICY, LOCAL POLICY AND CIRCULAR 1/97

Transport Contributions Methodology – Compliance with National Policy, Local Policy and Circular 1/97

1. Introduction

Following consultation on the draft SPG a number of questions were raised in relation to how the methodology relates to Circular 1/97.

Circular 1/97 sets out the Government’s policy for the use of planning obligations.

This paper highlights how the methodology complies Government and Local planning guidance and with the key tests set out in Circular 1/97.

2. Relationship with national policy, local policy and Circular 1/97

Views of GOSE	WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology
GOSE have been consulted on this proposal. They are satisfied that the proposal is generally consistent with national and regional planning guidance.	Methodology consistent with national and regional planning guidance.
National Planning Policy Guidance - PPG 13 :Transport	WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology
PPG13 indicates that planning obligations may be used to achieve improvements to public transport, walking and cycling, where such measures would be likely to influence travel patterns to the site involved, either on their own or as part of a package of measures. In preparing their development plans and determining planning applications, local authorities, in conjunction with work on the local transport plan, should negotiate for improvements to public transport; create more direct, safe and secure walking routes; seek the provision of cycle routes and cycle priority measures.	Methodology secures contributions to public transport, walking and cycling improvements identified by County and District / Borough Councils. Note added to the SPG document to make it clear that ‘Contributions will only be sought towards proposals which will influence travel patterns to / from the site involved either on their own or as part of a package of measures’.
While the individual circumstances of each site and the nature of the proposal will affect the details of the planning obligations in relation to transport, developers will be expected to contribute more to improving	Methodology requires a lower level of contribution for development of more central sites. The method reflects PPG13 guidance.

<p>access by public transport, walking and cycling for development in locations away from town centres and major transport interchanges, than development on more central sites.</p>	
<p>Given that there should be no minimum parking requirements for development it is inappropriate for a local authority to seek commuted sums based purely around the lack of parking on the site.</p>	<p>Methodology secures contribution based on Total Access Demand. The contribution is not based on the lack of parking on site. The method reflects PPG13 guidance</p>

Local Policy – Structure Plan	WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology
<p>The West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 Deposit Draft highlights the following policies:</p> <p>DEV3 – New development should not be permitted unless the infrastructure needs it creates (including facilities and services) are met, it does not impose costs on the existing residents or businesses of West Sussex, and, where possible, it accommodates existing needs.</p> <p>The explanatory memorandum highlights (para 395) ‘Even one dwelling contributes to demand to use facilities or services, such as open space or school places, as well as needing to be directly served by physical infrastructure such as roads and utilities. It is fair and reasonable that contributions are sought from developers towards the provision of infrastructure to serve needs arising from their development’.</p> <p>‘New development will not be expected to meet the needs of current residents and businesses of West Sussex, that is to meet existing shortfalls or deficiencies in the provision of infrastructure. However, inadequate infrastructure may need to be improved if new development is not to exacerbate existing deficiencies. In such cases, new development should contribute towards any improvement which is required to avoid worsening an already unsatisfactory situation.’</p> <p>DEV4 – Development should not be permitted unless: the travel needs it generates are met; where possible, it reduces the need to travel; it achieves</p>	<p>The methodology is prepared to be supplemental to policies DEV3, DEV4 and DEV5 of the Deposit Draft Structure Plan 2001 – 2016.</p> <p>The methodology recognises the cumulative impact of small development on the transport network.</p> <p>The methodology is linked to the document ‘Proposed Schemes to be Progressed if Developer Funding is Secured’. This document provides a link between the LTP and the policies set out in PPG13 relating to new development.</p> <p>A note has been added to the SPG clarifying the link between the SPG and the document highlighting schemes.</p> <p>A note has been added to the SPG to stress that if a developer produces an effective alternative approach to mitigating the impact</p>

<p>safe and convenient access by a choice of means of travel; and the number of motorised journeys is minimised.</p> <p>DEV5 – Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport, where this is, or can be, a realistic alternative.</p>	<p>of their development then this could be considered as an alternative to the contributions methodology.</p>
<p>West Sussex Structure Plan 1993 – adopted July 1993 highlights the following policies :</p> <p>Policy T14 – Development (including the use of land) will be required to be located, designed and carried out so that it would :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) have safe and adequate access to the main road network; 2) cater safely and adequately for any vehicular traffic it would generate; 3) not reduce safety or worsen traffic conditions materially for existing highway users (or would incorporate satisfactory remedial measures); 4) be accessible by public transport and where relevant, not reduce (and if possible improve) its operating efficiency; 5) have safe and adequate access for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled; and 6) include provision for parking and, if appropriate, loading space (except in some town centres and conservation areas where special policies apply). <p>The explanatory memorandum indicates that 'All development has implications for movement: it is important that they are taken into account before permission is given. Development must make provision for dealing with traffic problems related to</p>	<p>The methodology is prepared to be supplemental to policies T14 and G4 of the adopted West Sussex Structure Plan 1993.</p> <p>The methodology recognises the impact of all development on the transport network.</p> <p>The methodology is linked to the document 'Proposed Schemes to be Progressed if Developer Funding is</p>

<p>it, for connection to existing transport systems and for parking and loading. The County Council has had to adopt a less flexible attitude as the effects of financial restraint have become more evident: with the other demands it has to meet it cannot afford to spend money correcting problems which may be caused by development, and must ensure that they are not (as policy G4 requires). Where a developer is unable or unwilling to do this permission will have to be refused: however, experience shows that it is often possible for developers and the Planning and Highway Authorities in partnership to \achieve worthwhile results, and the County Council will continue to work in this way.'</p>	<p>Secured'. This document provides a link between the LTP and the policies set out in PPG13 relating to new development.</p> <p>A note has been added to the SPG clarifying the link between the SPG and the document highlighting schemes.</p> <p>A note has been added to the SPG to stress that if a developer produces an effective alternative approach to mitigating the impact of their development then this could be considered as an alternative to the contributions methodology.</p>
<p>Local Guidance - SPG Adopted July 1999 – The Provision of Service Infrastructure Related to New Development in West Sussex – Part 1</p>	<p>WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology</p>
<p>Sets out how the infrastructure requirements arising from new development will be assessed and sought when local plans are prepared or planning applications submitted. States that 'the whole approach is intended to be fair, reasonable and transparent and in accordance with the guidance given in Department of the Environment and the Regions Circular 1/97 – Planning Obligations.</p>	<p>The approach highlighted in the SPG complements the County SPG adopted in July 1999 following consultations with the District Councils, Government Departments, the Environment Agency, the building industry and other interested groups and individuals.</p>
<p>The document highlights that:</p> <p>'Service needs are often calculated on the basis of the population increase that development would generate. This applies to all housing development' (para 2.7.6)</p> <p>It is not considered appropriate to set an overall threshold below which infrastructure contributions will not be sought' (para 2.7.3)</p> <p>'in relation to new development, all</p>	<p>The methodology is related to movement generation based on housing occupancy.</p> <p>The methodology applies to all residential and commercial development without thresholds.</p> <p>All new development will potentially</p>

<p>the infrastructure and other appropriate measures needed to facilitate the additional movements of people and goods in ways which are safe, sustainable and otherwise satisfactory will be sought from the developer' (para 3.3.1).</p> <p>'Provision for modes of travel which are more sustainable than the car, such as walking, cycling and public transport, is important in relation to all development. Therefore, developers will be required to provide or contribute towards the costs of infrastructure and other measures which are necessary to ensure that new development is accessible by sustainable transport modes' (para 3.3.4).</p>	<p>generate movement which must be facilitated – the proposed methodology requires all development that generates additional movement to contribute in order to mitigate the impact of the development.</p> <p>The methodology requires all development generating additional movement to contribute. Overall the methodology complements the adopted SPG.</p>
<p>Law - Section 106(2)</p>	<p>WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology</p>
<p>Provides that a planning obligation may : (iii) provide for payments of money to be made, either of a specific amount or by reference to a formula ...</p>	<p>Methodology consistent with S106</p>
<p>Governments Policy for the use of planning obligations – Circular 1/97</p>	<p>WSCC Transport Contributions Methodology</p>
<p>Negotiations should be fair, open and reasonable.</p>	<p>A key objective of the methodology is to make the process more equitable and transparent</p>
<p>Contributions should be necessary and relevant to planning –</p> <p>Where a proposed development would, if implemented, create a need for particular facilities or would have a damaging impact on the environment or local amenity or would adversely affect national or local policies it will usually be reasonable for planning obligations to be sought.</p> <p>In some circumstances, on sites proposed for major development</p>	<p>All development that generates movement which impacts on the local environment creates a need for improvements to the transport network. Cumulatively the impact of a range of small developments is significant. The methodology requires a contribution from all development towards proposals which will meet LTP (and PPG13) objectives and will improve facilities or mitigate environmental impact.</p> <p>The methodology will secure</p>

<p>inadequately served by modes other than the private car, to improve accessibility the provision of contributions may be appropriate towards, e.g new / improved bus / rail stations or facilities, park and ride schemes, improved bus services / shelters and other capital items, widened access, turning spaces and improved measures for cyclists / pedestrians (in line with PPG13 aims)</p> <p>Development plan policies which are likely to be unacceptable include those which are a blanket formulation. This may not take proper account of whether the contribution is fairly and reasonably related to the development proposed. For example, it would be unacceptable to seek to ensure that all housing developments of more than thirty dwellings provides children's play areas since some of them may not be suitable for family homes.</p>	<p>contributions for proposals of this nature.</p> <p>The methodology is not a blanket formulation. It is only applicable to development that will generate a transport impact and hence the need for improvements.</p> <p>A note has been added to the SPG to stress that if a developer produces an effective alternative approach to mitigating the impact of their development then this could be considered as an alternative to the contributions methodology.</p> <p>The proposed methodology will secure contributions that are necessary and relevant to planning in accordance with Circular 1/97.</p>
<p>Directly related to the proposed development</p>	<p>The methodology is linked to the document 'Proposed Schemes to be Progressed if Developer Funding is Secured'. This document provides a link between the LTP and the policies set out in PPG13 relating to new development. This document highlights priorities but is not exhaustive – it may be that further improvements will be identified in relation to specific development proposals. The document will be updated annually.</p> <p>If improvements can not be identified that relate directly to movement generated by the development then a contribution will not be sought.</p>

	<p>A note has been added to the SPG confirming that contributions will not be sought if improvements that relate directly to movement generated by the development can not be identified and that contributions will only be allocated to improvements that relate directly to movement generated by the development.</p> <p>The methodology will secure contributions to improvements that are directly related to the proposed development.</p>
<p>Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development</p>	<p>Justification for the level of contribution required will be added to the SPG – included as a separate paper.</p> <p>The levels of contributions have been assessed in line with national assumptions, LTP objectives and targets and historic approaches to contributions.</p> <p>The methodology will secure contributions that are reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development.</p>
<p>Reasonable in all other respects – ‘... situations may arise where an infrastructure problem exists prior to the submission of an application for planning permission. Although the need to improve, upgrade or replace such infrastructure does not arise directly from proposed development, it would clearly be inappropriate to grant planning permission for a development that would exacerbate a situation which is already unsatisfactory. However, developers may reach agreement with a local planning authority or an infrastructure undertaker to bring forward in time a project which is already programmed but is some years from</p>	<p>Schemes identified in ‘Proposed Schemes to be Funded if Developer Funding is Secured’ will address identified infrastructure problems. The methodology will seek a contribution only if the identified improvements relate to movement generated by the development.</p> <p>Overall the methodology conforms with the key tests set out in Circular 1/97.</p>

implementation'.	
------------------	--

3. Conclusion

Overall the methodology conforms with national policy, local policy and Circular 1/97. Notes will be added to the SPG to address issues raised and add clarity where appropriate.

APPENDIX F

TOTAL ACCESS DEMAND – JUSTIFICATION FOR THE LEVELS OF CONTRIBUTION

Total Access Demand – justification for the levels of contribution

1. Background

The Total Access Demand contributions methodology identifies an infrastructure contribution of £600 and a sustainable transport contribution of £300. The differential has been set to provide a clear incentive to develop in accessible locations – the more accessible the site the lower the level of car parking provided and hence the lower the level of contribution.

The level of the contributions has been based on a range of assessments that are explained below. It is acknowledged that when the methodology is operating in practice these levels will need to be reviewed, particularly if exemptions from the methodology are defined.

The level of contributions will be reviewed annually, to include an inflation increase in accordance with relevant construction indices.

It must also be stressed that the TAD methodology provides a contribution to offset the impact of development on the wider transport network. Direct requirements associated with ensuring that the development provides safe access within the capacity of the transport network and in a sustainable location will be required in addition.

2. Annual Progress Report – Priorities and Targets

The Local Transport Plan for West Sussex Annual Progress Report 2002/2003 indicates transport priorities and targets. The document is endorsed by GOSE. The document acknowledges that in order to meet targets enhanced levels of expenditure will be required with respect to choice, safety, integration, accessibility, economic and environmental objectives (figure 4.5).

Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 : Transport (PPG13) requires authorities to demonstrate a linkage between land use planning and transport policies.

New development will generate a significant proportion of new trips on the transport network over the coming years.

The APR highlights that it is necessary to secure development funding in order to achieve LTP objectives and targets for the environment, integration and accessibility (para 4.1 and 4.4). Allocations need to increase from £0.5M in 2003/04 to £4.5M in future years with respect to these objectives.

Developer contributions will also contribute to achieving choice, safety and economic objectives (around 10% of the allocation to economic objectives relates to town centre enhancements for which developer contributions should be secured).

Developer contributions also provide a significant element of funding for major schemes highlighted in the APR, Fastway for example.

The LTP relies on a level of developer contribution in excess of £4.5M per annum if targets and objectives are to be achieved.

3. 10 Year Transport Plan – Funding Requirements

The 10 Year Transport Plan highlights that it is anticipated that the LTP will provide 68% of funding to meet local transport objectives (table 2, chapter 5). The remaining 32% to be raised from private investment.

Developer funding provides the primary opportunity to secure the 32% of funding to be secured from private investment.

The West Sussex Annual Progress report 2002/2003 identifies the need for an LTP allocation, to local transport initiatives, of in the region of £10 - 11M in future years. Assuming that this represents 68% of funding required if local transport objectives are to be achieved then the overall funding requirement is £14.7 – 16.2M.

Hence the element to be secured from developer contributions equates to £4.7 – 5.2M.

4. Forecast Contribution from TAD approach

Based on the TAD approach for residential and commercial development and the following assumptions –

- Employment at one employee per 21sqm and 1 parking space per 30sqm provides an average contribution of £510 per employee.
- Structure Plan (Deposit draft, November 2001) proposes 1,350,000sqm of employment space (B1, B2 & B8) over 15 years. Assumptions in background paper to 1996 Structure Plan highlight average space per employee (across all B1, B2 & B8) as 34.9sqm per job in central towns and 31.5sqm per job in coastal towns.
- Policy NE1 highlights :
 - Adur – 7333 sqm p.a
 - Arun – 16000 sqm pa
 - Worthing – 7333 sqm pa
 - Chichester – 14000 sqm pa

Total = 44666 sqm pa @ 1 employee per 31.5sqm = 1,418 employees @ £510 per employee
= £723180

Crawley – 18700 sqm pa
Horsham – 12700 sqm pa
Mid Sussex – 14000 sqm pa

Total = 45400 sqm pa @ 1 employee per 34.9 sqm = 1300 employees @ £510 per employee
= £663000

- **Total Contribution from Commercial = £1.386M**
- Average household occupancy = 2.3
- Policy NE1 – 3100 new dwellings pa
- Average 1.5 parking space per unit
- £600 per parking space = $3100 \times 1.5 \times £600 = £2.79M$
- £300 per resident without parking = $3100 \times 2.3 - (3100 \times 1.5) \times £300 = £0.744M$
- **Total Contribution from residential = £3.534M**
- **TOTAL CONTRIBUTION FROM TAD = £4.920M pa**

5. Funding a Bus Service

The method has been assessed against a historic approach to contributions. In the past B1 development of approximately 10,000, sqm has been required to fund new bus services for a minimum of three years – although this approach is now seen as simplistic in terms of improving accessibility and the sustainability of a site, and a service would be now required to run over a significantly longer period, it does provide a useful audit.

Contributions from the development using this historic approach have been based on the cost of providing a new bus over 3 years hence $£90,000 \times 3 = £270k$.

Using the proposed methodology –

10,000 generates 476 employees

Based on 1 car parking space per 30sqm - 333 employees would be provided with a parking space.

Hence a contribution using the proposed methodology of $(333 \times £600) + (143 \times £300) = £242,700$.

6. Conclusion

The current levels of contribution through the TAD method have been assessed in line with current national assumptions; LTP objectives and targets; and historic approaches to contributions.

Approaches suggest that a funding level between £4.5M and £5.2M per annum should be secured through developer contributions if targets and objectives are to be achieved.

TAD should provide an income of £4.920M per annum.

The levels of contribution set within TAD are consistent with that assumed to be raised through development opportunities in national and local guidance.

It is proposed that income is monitored and the levels adjusted if necessary.

7. Impact of Exempting Smaller Development

It has been suggested to West Sussex County Council that TAD should not be applied to residential development of under 5 units.

Evidence from Worthing Borough Council suggests that 40% of smaller scale development is less than 5 units.

40% of residential development highlighted in the Structure plan is associated with Strategic Locations and will therefore make a contribution – $3,100 \times 0.4 = 1,240$.

Of the remaining 1,860, only 60% would contribute if development of less than 5 units were exempt. Hence, 1,116 units would contribute.

Hence the total number of units contributing reduces from 3,100 to 2,356.
Hence the contribution from residential development would fall to:

$$(2,356 \times 1.5 \times \text{£}600) + ((2,356 \times 2.3 - (2,356 \times 1.5)) \times \text{£}300) = \text{£}2.686\text{M}$$

Hence the total contribution from TAD would fall to $\text{£}2.686 + \text{£}1.386 = \text{£}4.072\text{M}$.

This reduces the contribution available to support the LTP allocation by £850k.

In order to achieve the level of contribution provided by the current proposal (£600 & £300 contributions from all development), contributions would need to be increased for residential development to £800 for the infrastructure contribution and £400 for the sustainable transport contribution.

$$(2356 \times 1.5 \times \text{£}800) + ((2356 \times 2.3) - (2356 \times 1.5)) \times \text{£}400 = \text{£}3.581\text{M}$$

On this basis 1 bed units with 1 car space would contribute an average of £920 per unit and a four bed unit with 3 car parking spaces would contribute an average of £2,400 per unit.

APPENDIX G

THE STATUS OF THIS DOCUMENT AS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING GUIDANCE

Introduction

This appendix sets out the status of this document as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) and considers the weight to be given to it as a material consideration in deciding planning applications.

The Government's planning policy guidance (PPG12) indicates that SPG must be consistent with national and regional planning guidance as well as the development plan, that it should be clearly cross referenced to the relevant plan policy or proposal, that its status should be made clear and that it may be taken into account, as a material consideration, in deciding planning applications.

The guidance suggests that the weight accorded to SPG in deciding planning applications will increase if it has been prepared in consultation with the general public, businesses and other interested parties and has been the subject of a resolution to adopt as supplementary guidance. Comments should also be invited from the Government Office for the region when SPG is subject to formal consultation.

This appendix demonstrates that this document has been developed following extensive consultation and that all comments have been considered carefully and addressed as appropriate.

Background

PPG13, published in March 2001, required local authorities to review parking standards. PPG13 also made it clear that it was no longer appropriate to secure commuted sums, based on parking spaces not provided, from development.

A Transport Issues Group, consisting of representatives of the County Council and each Borough / District Council, was established in October 2001 to progress a range of PPG13 issues including parking standards and developer contributions.

Both the parking standards and contributions methodologies have been progressed in two stages:

Parking Standards

- PPG13 and residential standards approved by Cabinet Member for consultation in September 2002. Results of consultation reported and standards adopted in July 2003.
- Other parking standards approved by Cabinet Member for consultation in July 2003. Results of consultation reported and standards adopted in November 2003.

Contributions Methodology

- Total Access Demand methodology for B1 use class in Crawley Borough approved by Crawley Borough Council for consultation in June 2002. Results

of consultation reported and approach adopted by Crawley Borough Council in January 2003.

- Total Access Demand methodology for commercial and residential uses approved by Cabinet Member for consultation in July 2003. Results of consultation reported and method adopted in November 2003.

Consistency with Policy and Guidance

The Government Office for the South East (GOSE) have been consulted at each stage of the process and have confirmed, in each case, that the approach taken is consistent with national and regional planning guidance.

Appendix E demonstrates how the approach complies with national and local policy and the Planning Obligations Circular 1/97.

This SPG is supplemental to policies DEV3, DEV4 and DE5 of the Deposit Draft Structure Plan 2001 – 2016. It is also supplemental to policies T14 and G4 of the approved West Sussex Structure Plan 1993.

Consultations Undertaken and Representations Received

Each stage of the development of this document has been the subject of extensive consultation.

The PPG13 and residential parking standards were widely circulated to the industry, GOSE, other Government Departments as well as other interested parties and individuals.

The Total Access Demand methodology for B1 use was subject to an extensive consultation undertaken by Crawley Borough Council.

The parking standards for classes other than for PPG13 / Residential, and the Total Access Demand approach county wide for commercial and residential uses, was circulated to the industry, GOSE, other Government Departments as well as other interested parties and individuals. In addition this element was subject to public consultation via the County Council website and a public press notice.

Overall the approach has been welcomed however a number of reservations and comments have been raised. The document has been amended to reflect these comments where appropriate.

The approach has the support of District and Borough Councils (some with reservations) and GOSE.

A summary of consultation responses has been reported to the Cabinet Member, with comments and proposed actions, prior to adoption of this document. A separate document containing summaries of consultation responses is available on request.

Conclusion

This SPG document is consistent with planning policy and guidance. It has been prepared in consultation with the general public, businesses and other interested parties. It has the support of GOSE. It has been formally adopted by West Sussex County Council as SPG. It is recommended to the seven District / Borough Councils for adoption as SPG.

Therefore, in accordance with the advice in PPG12, this SPG shall be regarded as a material consideration of substantial weight in the determination of planning applications.

APPENDIX H

STRUCTURE PLAN POLICIES

Approved West Sussex Structure plan 1993

Policy G4 – The Relationship between Development and the Provision of Infrastructure

Development will not normally be permitted unless the infrastructure directly required to service it can be made available at the appropriate time. Where it cannot, but it is planned, permission may be granted in anticipation of this: in such circumstances a Planning Authority may attach a condition requiring the infrastructure to be in position before use of the development commences, or may require large developments to be phased in step with infrastructure provision.

Infrastructure in this context includes transport networks, utility services (including fire hydrants and an adequate water supply for fire-fighting), land drainage, sewage disposal, public open space and land for any community facilities, and appropriate services such as education and health facilities, for which the need is generated primarily by the development.

Policy T14 – Access Requirements for Development

Development (including the use of land) will be required to be located, designed and carried out so that it would

- (1) have safe and adequate access to the main road network;
- (2) cater safely and adequately for any vehicular traffic it would generate;
- (3) not reduce safety or worsen traffic conditions materially for existing highway users (or would incorporate satisfactory remedial measures);
- (4) be accessible by public transport and, where relevant, not reduce (and if possible improve) its operating efficiency;
- (5) have safe and adequate access for pedestrians, cyclists and the disabled and
- (6) include provision for parking and, if appropriate, loading space (except in some town centres and conservation areas where special policies apply).

Where the Highway Authority is not satisfied on these matters, or where the requirements of policy G4 are not met, the authority will recommend the refusal of planning permission.

There is a presumption against

- (1) the formation of any means of access to a highway forming part of the Strategic or Supporting Network; or

(2) the intensification of the use of an existing access on this Network where the traffic capacity of the existing highway is being, or is near to being, exceeded.

The provision of parking space will be required in relation to standards adopted from time to time by the Highway and Planning Authorities and stated in local plans. Where development is permitted and there is uncertainty about which of two or more possible uses will occur, parking space will be provided according to the standard applicable to the use which generates the highest requirement.

West Sussex Structure Plan 2001 – 2016 Deposit Draft

Policy DEV3 – Infrastructure requirements

(a) New development should not be permitted unless the infrastructure needs it creates (including facilities and services) are met, it does not impose costs on the existing residents or businesses of West Sussex, and, where possible, it accommodates existing needs.

Policy DEV4 – Travel Needs and Choices

(a) Development should not be permitted unless: the travel needs it generates are met; where possible, it reduces the need to travel; it achieves safe and convenient access by a choice of means of travel; and the number and impact of motorised journeys is minimised.

Policy DEV5 – Parking Provision

(a) Development should not be permitted unless the level of parking is compatible with the need to avoid environmental or safety problems and the need to encourage walking, cycling and the use of passenger transport, where this is, or can be, a realistic alternative.