Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Report - Adoption Consultation Statement

The Parking Standards (SPD) and SA Report was adopted on 26 June 2007. As you may recall, the Council consulted on these documents between 15th March and 26th April, 2007. The Council has prepared this Consultation Statement setting out a summary of the main issues raised and in these representations how they have been addressed in the SPD or SA Report.

The SPD will be made available as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Opening times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Council Offices</td>
<td>Thorpe Lodge, 1 Yarmouth Road, Norwich</td>
<td>8.30am – 5.00pm Mon-Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Councils website</td>
<td><a href="http://www.broadland.gov.uk/housing_and_planning/1747.asp">http://www.broadland.gov.uk/housing_and_planning/1747.asp</a></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aylsham Library</td>
<td>Hungate Street, Aylsham, Norfolk</td>
<td>9.30am – 5.00pm Mon-Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wroxham Library</td>
<td>Norwich Road, Wroxham</td>
<td>10.00am – 5.30pm Mon–Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Millennium Library</td>
<td>Forum, Norwich</td>
<td>9.00am – 5.00pm Mon &amp; Wed-Fri</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobile Information Centre</td>
<td>Spixworth Village Hall Car Park</td>
<td>Mon 9.30am – 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cawston Post Office</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mon 1.30pm – 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brundall Public Car Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tues 9.30am – 11.30am</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lingwood First School</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tues 12.00pm – 1.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old Catton, Somerfield</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tues 2.15pm – 3.45pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reepham, Station Rd Car Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weds 10.00am – 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foulsham, Market Hill</td>
<td></td>
<td>Weds 1.30pm – 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acle Recreation Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs 10.00 am - 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reedham, Viking Sports &amp; Social Club</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thurs 1.30pm – 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hellesdon Community Centre</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 9.30am – 12.30pm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drayton, Budgens Car Park</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fri 1.30pm – 3.30pm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In addition, the Council used an online consultation system as follows: http://consultation.limehouse.co.uk/index.do?identifier=broadland

We sent a letter and representation form (which included details of where the documents were available for inspection) to the specific and general consultees in line with Regulation 17(2)(b), and those contacted in the preproduction consultation including those bodies who had expressed an interest in the SPD through public consultation on the Statement of Community Involvement. The specific consultees potentially affected by the SPD (namely all specific consultees) see Appendix III were also sent copies of:

- the SPD,
- its Sustainability Appraisal Report,
- Consultation Statement, and
- Statement of SPD Matters.

We received representations from 17 organisations and individuals to the draft SPD. A summary of the issues raised and how they were addressed in the adopted SPD and SA Report is provided at Appendices I & II
Consultation Representations on Parking Standards SPD and Sustainability Appraisals Report – Appendix I

General Comments
The following list includes a summary of all the issues raised in the representations to the above mentioned documents and how they have been addressed.

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Ray Walpole (Norfolk Ramblers Association)
The facilities for walking and cycling along the Bure Valley Way, Horsford Woods, and Sprowston Plantation need to be reviewed to ensure signage is adequate in order to encourage new residents and tourists to use them. Similar review needs to be made of view points where cars may stop to appreciate the panoramas of river valleys in the Broads area without impending traffic flow e.g. Buckenham Woods.

Officer Recommendation
Parking SPD is applicable for new developments and includes parking standards for tourist facilities such as hotels, shops, cafes, etc. Although there may be other ways of attracting visitors to tourist facilities any reference made to signage for car parking related to tourist facilities would only be encouraged where parking is not obvious. The specific comments on Sprowston Plantation etc. have been forwarded to the Conservation Manager for consideration.

In terms of including reference to view points on roads, this would be a matter for the Highway Authority and is outside the remit of the SPD.

1. Response – Chapter 3 Design
Amend Chapter 3 Design - paragraph 3.9 insert a new sentence stating “consideration should be given to providing adequate signage for parking where necessary”.

Amend Chapter 3 Design – new paragraph 3.12 and new sub heading Consider Views - ‘In areas where a particular view may be of some importance informal parking should be provide where it is safe to stop’.

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Ray Walpole - (Anglican Church - Plumstead)
Para 4.12 - Cycle Parking - If a garage is adjoining the dwelling and does not give access to a back door or if there is no adjoining garage, there must be a back entrance outside to the rear of the curtilage. Then cycles may be stored in a shed without having to be carried through the dwelling from the front door. This back entrance will also facilitate walking in boots from the countryside and gardening with boots on allotments.

Officer Recommendation
Paragraph 4.12 states that cycle parking for individual dwellings can be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling (e.g. in a garage or garden shed etc).

2. Response – Chapter 4 Cycle Parking
Amend Chapter 4 – Cycle Parking - add a sentence in paragraph 4.12 “The cycle parking should be easily accessible from the dwelling”.

--------------------------------------------
Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Colin Bambury / (Highways Agency)
The Highways Agency has no comments on either of the documents

Officer Recommendation
Comments noted

3. Response – Chapter 4 – Cycle Parking
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Nigel Brigham - (Sustrans)
Support Section 4 on cycle parking

Officer Response
Comments noted

4. Responses – Chapter 4 – Cycle Parking
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Richard Smith / (Showmens Guild)
The organisation has no interest in this particular consultation

Officer Response
Comments noted

5. Responses
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Ms Rose Freeman / (The Theatres Trust)
Due to the specific nature of the Trust’s remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and as this consultation is not directly relevant to the Trust’s work, we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents especially the Core Strategy Preferred Options stage and any associated relevant SPDs (e.g. Developer Contributions), Development Control policies and Area Action Plans.

Officer Response
Comments noted

6. Responses – General Comments
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation, the contact details have been added to our on-line consultation system to keep them informed on the progress of the LDF.

Consultee Name / Organisation
Ms Susan Heinrich / (EEDA)
EEDA receives a number of requests of this kind as a statutory consultee and on this occasion, EEDA has no comments to make on the document.

**Officer Response**
Comments noted

7. **Responses – General Comments**
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-----------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
Govt Pipeline and Storage System - Mr Andrew Bridge - Fishergerman
Fishergerman is acting as land agents that manage the Government Pipeline and Storage System, unsure as to whether the information regarding clients apparatus has been taken into consideration. The high pressure oil pipeline network is protected by wayleave and landowners should be aware of its existence, however it is beneficial if its existence is raised as early as possible in the planning process in order that third parties can plan around it.

**Officer Response – General Comments**
This issue is unrelated to the Parking Standards SPD or Policies TRA8 (Parking Standards) or TRA5 (Cycle movement) which the Parking Standards apply.

8. **Responses**
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-----------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
(Morrisons Supermarkets Plc) - Peacock & Smith (Agents)
Quotes paragraph 56 (PPG13: Transport) 'Where retail and leisure dev are located in a town centre, or on an 'edge of centre' defined by PPS6 ' LPA should consider allowing parking addition to the relevant max standards providing LA is satisfied that the parking facilities will genuinely serve the town centre as a whole and that agreement to this has been secured before planning permission is granted'. Reference should be made in SPD to the benefits that an in-centre or edge-of centre retail facility with associated parking will have on town centre by ways of linked trips and shared parking. The parking standards should therefore have greater flexibility to allow those facilities that may offer such linked benefits.

**Officer Response**
The Standards relate to the parking provision for a development. Parking provision for separate public use such to serve a town centre would need to be considered in its own right.

9. **Responses – Appendix 2 Parking Standards**
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-----------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
Mr Paul Woolnough / (CPRE Norfolk)
Introduction - policy must seek to reduce the need for car travel. Policy must meet government sustainability objectives.
PPS3 and PPS 13 must be applied.
Broadland must plan monitor and manage parking issues as a priority.

**Officer Response**
The Parking Standards SPD aims to provide detail guidelines to Local Plan policies TRA5 -Cycle movement and TRA8 -Parking Guidance. The Parking provision for new developments which the Parking Standards is based on takes into account Government policies PPS3: Housing and PPG13: Transport.

The Local Plan policies seek to reduce the need for car travel through various policies based on sustainable development; these policies are in line with the Local Transport Plan, East of England Plan and higher order documents. The Annual Monitor Report monitors local plan policies including Parking, reference to this effect has been made in the Sustainability Appraisal Report for the Parking Standards SPD paragraph 5.6

10. Responses – General Comments

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Paul Woolnough - (CPRE Norfolk)
Broadland must resist pressures to allow parking spaces above guidelines because of the Kyoto Protocol, relevant planning policy statements, the Regional and Local Plans and the Parking Standards SPD Sustainability Appraisal.
Policy TRA8 must be applied - support Broadland’s position regarding TRA8. Housing provision in the Regional and Local Plans would not be met if parking provision above guidelines were the norm.

Officer Response
The Parking Standards SPD for policies TRA5 and TRA8 takes into account recent guidance in PPS3: Housing requiring parking standards to take into account the expected levels of car ownership. In addition, the SPD provides for safe and sure parking at origin of destination to encourage people to leave their car parked at home and travel by other modes of transport. The Sustainability Appraisal and Scoping Reports the Parking SPD takes into account the Kyoto Protocol amongst other environmental policy documents as part of this process.

11. Responses – General Comments

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation -
Mr Paul Woolnough
(CPRE Norfolk)
Major developments should be made where there is adequate public transport.

Officer Response
The Parking Standards SPD does not deal with the location of development, this is a policy consideration dealt with through the local plan / Local Development Framework.

12. Responses – General Comments

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Paul Woolnough / (CPRE Norfolk)
We support best practice, as outlined in the Consultation Documents for cycle and powered two wheeler parking provision. Including Lighting designed to ensure safe parking for all modes of transport without the night sky and local amenity being affected.

**Officer Response –**
Comments noted. Reference made to lighting is included in Chapter 2 – Security section paragraph 2.2.

13. **Response – Chapter 2 Security**
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
Mr Paul Woolnough / (CPRE Norfolk)
Any parking provision must be made in the most appropriate place. There is a limit to how much car parking provision is possible for example in Aylsham.

**Officer Response**
Parking Standards SPD relate to parking provision in new developments. It is a specific document aimed at providing detailed guidance to Local Plan policies TRA5: Cycle Movement and TRA8: Parking Guidelines.

14. **Response – General Comments**
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
Mr Paul Cronk / (Homes Builders Federation) -
Paragraph 4.4 the provision of CCTV /high-level security should also only be applicable to non-residential development. In respect of residential development, such provision would be likely to be both prohibitively expensive to install and operate, and also unacceptable to occupiers on invasion of privacy grounds.

**Officer Response**
The Inclusion of CCTV cameras / high-level security is aimed at commercial developments not residential.

15. **Response – Chapter 4 Cycle Parking**
Amend subheading paragraph 4.4 – Chapter 4 Cycle Parking to refer to 'General Requirements for Commercial Facilities'

**Consultee Name / Organisation**
Mr Paul Cronk / (Homes Builders Federation)
Para 6.14 & Appendix 2: Class C Latest government policy shifts away from the application of blanket restrictive parking standards, towards a more flexible approach taking greater account of local characteristics. The HBF also advocates a more flexible approach given that every site and locality is different. Whilst some can operate with very little parking provision, others cannot. If a lack of sufficient parking provision arises, the end result is often nearby approach roads being clogged up with parked vehicles. Which apart from being unsightly and inconvenient can also pose access problems.

It is stated that the levels of car parking set out in these standards for residential development
will be regarded as operational, and will therefore not be regarded as a maximum, but as an indicative level. The HBF endorses this common sense approach, and would suggest that this text is emboldened in order that this approach is abundantly clear to all readers of the final version of the document.

**Officer Response**

The purpose of the SPD is to set out clear guidance for parking provision, having regard to national guidance and local circumstances. The HBF’s support for the approach taken for residential development is noted. It is not necessary appropriate to single out this one item of the standards for particular emphasis.

**16. Response – Chapter 6 – Car Parking / Appendix 2 Parking Standards**

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

--------------------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**

Morrisons Supermarkets Plc / Peacock & Smith

Cycle parking for new food retail developments over 1,000 sq m are high, which results in inefficient use of land, instead they should be: 1 short-term space per 500 sq. m GFA ; plus 1 long-term space per 20 maximum staff on site at any one time.

**Officer Response**

Agree the cycle parking requirement for food retail developments over 1,000 sq m are for visitors (1 space / 100m2) are higher then those for shops (1 space for 200m2) and this could be changed to match the requirement for shops. In relation to cycle parking for staff will be local to the development offering cycling as a credible option for travel to work.

**17. Response – Appendix 2 Car Parking Standards**

It is recommended that Cycle Parking for Food Retail could be changed to meet the same requirements for Shop which is: visitors 1 space per 200m sq. However, in terms of the staff cycle parking no change is recommended.

--------------------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**

Trevor Nelson / (Norfolk constabulary)

Para 2.1 However, the scheme is now called "Safer Parking"

It would be good to work towards this standard on all public car parks to reduce the chances of crime and fear of crime thereby creating a non-threatening environment for users."

**Officer Response**

Agree with comments received, in all parking areas, security is regarded as essential by the council, therefore as the scheme name has changed reference to this effect should be made to reflect this.

**18. Response – Chapter 2 –Security**

Amend paragraph 2.1. Security Chapter to reflect change from ‘Secure Parking Status’ to new name of ‘Safer Parking Scheme’ per comments received.

--------------------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**

Mr Trevor Nelson / (Norfolk constabulary)
Para 3.7 No reference to Para 87 of D &A statements”, Para 87 (Circular 01/2006) refers to applicants should demonstrate ways that crime and the reduction thereof has been considered and addressed in design access statements.

Officer Response
Agree with comments received, Chapter 3 – Design includes key points which need to be addressed in design access statements, as no reference is made to safety this should be included in revised SPD.

19. Response – Chapter 3 - Design
Amend paragraph 3.7 – Design Chapter by adding a extra bullet point under ‘The statement should address the following
• “Safety and demonstrate how crime prevention measures have been considered”

------------------------
Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Stuart Rickards / (Environment Agency)
Para 3.12 The benefit of underground parking is that it allows the street frontage of buildings to be maintain. We recommend that the risk of flooding and tidal sources be included within the SPD. Where spaces are to be provided in the form of underground, undercroft or basement car parking their location within a floodplain would increase the risk of life. We recommend that the SPD states that such forms of car parking are not suitable if located in Flood Zones 2 or 3 of our Flood Maps and your Strategic Flood Risk Assessment (SFRA) once it is completed later this year. As surface water drainage and flood risk affect all forms of parking we recommend this issues be given a separate chapter.

Officer Response
Agree that the risk of flooding in relation to underground parking has not been included nor the reference to Flood Zones 2 or 3 of the Environment Agency and the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment for Broadland. Recommended changed noted below.

Reference to Sustainable Drainage Systems is included in paragraph 6.9 – Car Parking however, this is under Non-Residential developments and to clarify and emphasise SUDS applicable to all development could be addressed in the Design Chapter.

20. Response – Chapter 3 Design
Amend SPD paragraph 3.12 – Design Chapter by stating that underground parking would not be suitable if located in Flood Zones 2 or 3 after the second sentence.

Relocate paragraph 6.9 on SUDS Chapter 3 - Design retaining cross reference at 6.9

----------------------
Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Paul Cronk - (Homes Builders Federation)
Para 4.2 and 4.3 - It is stated that developers will be expected to provide for the additional needs of cyclists such as lockers, changing and shower facilities as appropriate to the development. Specific mention should be made to state that such provision would only be applicable to non-residential development. In respect of residential development, cyclists will be able to use the facilities of those that they are visiting if they require a shower or change of clothing.

Officer Response
Agree with comments received that paragraphs 4.2 and 4.3 – Cycle Parking requirements are in relation to Commercial Developments.
21. Response – Chapter 4 – Cycle Parking

See Response to no.16

-----------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Paul Woolnough - (CPRE Norfolk)
Safe Cycle Routes - for Broadland Business Park there is scope for more cycle paths in advance of further development. Continuous cycle routes without gaps also provide safe routes into the country side.

Officer Response
The parking Standards SPD relates to the parking provision in new development and not cycle route provision.

22. Response – Chapter 4 – Cycle Parking

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-----------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mrs Mo Anderson-Dungar / (Aylsham Town Council)

lack of provision for mobility scooter or powered "buggy" parking.”

“safe parking is needed for these types of vehicle, usually driven by the elderly or infirm. The Council feels that parking should be provided near to facilities, with consideration to using part of wider pavements where available.”

Officer Response
Car Parking – Chapter 6 paragraphs 6.1- 6.3 refers to Provision for People with Disabilities which includes guidance and diagrams. Paragraph 6.3 states that designated parking clearly signed should not be more than 50 m from the entrance. It also makes reference to further advice in Leaflet 5/95 Parking for Disabled People.

23. Response – Chapter 6 – Car Parking

Include a statement that “consideration should also be given to the provision for mobility scooter or powered buggy parking” in the section for Provision for people with Disabilities – Chapter 6.

-----------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Stuart Rickards / (Environment Agency)

Para 6.9 states that “SUDS should be used wherever feasible to provide necessary drainage” We support these statements but feel that draft could give greater emphasis. PPS25 and Building regulations part H now require that infiltration SUDS be considered as the first option for surface water drainage from development. This could be stated within the SPD and has direct link to objective 3 for promoting good design.

Officer Response
Comments noted, this is in line with Local Plan Policy CS2 – Sustainable Drainage Systems. But the SPD is already clear on this. There is no need for further emphasis.

24. Response – Chapter 6 – Car Parking

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

-----------------------------------

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Paul Woolnough / (CPRE Norfolk)

Drainage - Sustainable Drainage Systems (SUDS) should be provided when car parks are built. Flooding is made worse because many developed areas, including parking areas, is made up of hard surfaces. Water drains away too quickly for rivers and drains to cope.

Officer Response
See Response above.

25. Response - Chapter 3 - Design
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mrs Sandra Parkinson / (Taverham Parish Council)

Para 6.11 - The inclusion of garages within the calculations of parking space for residential dwellings does not take into account the increasing tendency for householders to apply for consent to convert garages to into living accommodation, some are used entirely for storage purposes, rather than for vehicles. Add text to SPD to prevent application to convert garages into living accommodation should not be permitted if they would result in parking being displaced onto the street.

Officer Response
The inclusion of garages in residential developments as car parking spaces should remain. It is possible that a garage could be converted to another use but this would not conflict with the Standards as the do not set a minimum parking to be provided.

26. Response Chapter 6 – Car Parking
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mrs Mo Anderson-Dungar / (Aylsham Town Council)

The Council would like to be notified once the Draft Parking SPD has been adopted.

Officer Response
Agree, comments noted. Contact details have been entered into the on-line consultation system, once the SPD is adopted these consultees will be notified.

27. Response
No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

Consultee Name / Organisation
Mr Stewart Patience / (EERA)

Appendix 2 of the Draft SPD sets out the required standard for both cycle and car parking for different land uses. Response: In general the detailed matters related to the provision of parking addressed as part of the Draft SPD are considered to be matters for local consideration.

However, Appendix 2 of the Draft SPD treats the car parking standards set out in PPG13 as
maximums. This is consistent with policy T14 of the Secretary of State’s Proposed Changes to the Draft East of England Plan.

**Officer Response**

Comments noted.

28. **Response – Appendix 2 Parking Standards**

No change to the SPD in respect of this representation

--------------------------

**Consultee Name / Organisation**

Mr Richard Doleman / (Norfolk County Council)

The County Council are undertaking a review of the existing countywide parking standards which will not be complete within your consultation period.

The County Council raises an objection in principle to the SPD on the basis that it should have regard to the County Council’s review of Parking Standards and so be delayed pending the completion of this review

**Officer Response**

Refer to Cabinet Report 11 June, 2007 – Council 26 June, 2007

As well as, pg. 15 of this appendix.

29. **Response**

Refer to Cabinet Report for 11 June, 2007 and minutes – Council 26 June, 2007

As well as, pg. 15 of this appendix.

**Comments Received on Sustainability Appraisal**

**Consultee Name / Organisation**

Mr Stuart Rickards, Environment Agency

“We recommend that in the view of our comments regarding the draft SPD, the SA includes clear reference to drainage and flood risk. Para 4.8 and 5.3 discuss the need for SUDS and the benefits that good drainage design can yield in reducing flood risk. We would suggest that these paragraphs include reference to PPS25, our flood maps and your draft SFRA.”

**Officer Response**

Paragraph 4.8 discuss the need for SUDS, reference is already made to PPS25 in the Scoping Report.

**Response –**

Amend Paragraph 4.8 – Chapter 4 Predicting the Effects of the SPD by including reference to PPS25 and flood maps.
Other proposed modifications to the Draft Parking Standards SPD – Appendix II

The following officer Responses relate to the Draft SPD for the purpose of clarification and correction:

**Item 1 - Chapter 1 – Introduction**

paragraph 1.4 Policy Guidance Section  page 3 after the statement:

‘In the case of commercial development falling within the classes described in PPG 13, these standards will apply only below the thresholds set out in the PPG 13, though they are generally similar to the standards in the PPG. Above these Standards the PPG 13 will apply’

Add:

‘The standards for cycle parking will apply for all sizes of development including those above the PPG13 thresholds.’

**Item 2 – Appendix 2 – The Parking Standards Class A1 Shops**

Amend the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING</th>
<th>MAXIMUM CAR PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class A1 – Shops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPS</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 200m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 100m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 20m² gfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD RETAIL SUPERSTORES</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free standing food superstore,</td>
<td>1 space / 100m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>with gfa above 1,000m²</td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 100m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 14m² gfa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING</th>
<th>MAXIMUM CAR PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Class A1 – Shops</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FOOD RETAIL</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free standing supermarkets with</td>
<td>1 space / 200m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gfa below 1,000m²</td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 100m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 14m² gfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOPS</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 200m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 100m²</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 20m² gfa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Item 3 – Appendix 2 – The Parking Standards – Class D2
To clarify the PPG13 Standards

Change the Table currently illustrated as in page 36: (draft)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING</th>
<th>MAXIMUM CAR PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Assembly and Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINEMAS, CONCERT, THEATRE, HALLS, BINGO HALLS, CASINOS,</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td>1 space / 5 seats or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONFERENCE CENTRES, DANCE HALLS, DISCOTHEQUE</td>
<td>1 space / 20 seats</td>
<td>1 space / 22m² gfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 1 space / 100m² gfa</td>
<td>plus bus/coach drop-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td>off/pick-up point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 4 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To add an extra line and separate Cinemas and Conference facilities per PPG13 as outlined below: (proposed change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LAND USE</th>
<th>MINIMUM CYCLE PARKING</th>
<th>MAXIMUM CAR PARKING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>D2 – Assembly and Leisure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CINEMAS, CONFERENCE CENTRES</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td>1 space / 5 seats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 20 seats</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 1 space / 100m² gfa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 4 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONCERT, THEATRE, HALLS, BINGO HALLS, CASINOS, DANCE HALLS, DISCOTHEQUE</td>
<td>Visitors:</td>
<td>1 space / 22m² gfa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 20 seats</td>
<td>plus bus/coach drop-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>or 1 space / 100m² gfa</td>
<td>off/pick-up point</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Staff:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 space / 4 staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Item 4 – Residential Car Parking
Paragraph 6.13 Add at the end of the paragraph ‘In addition, regard has been had to the information about the number of people per house size and car ownership levels in new developments as well as, recent Residential Car Parking Research by DCLG’.

Item 5 – Schools see below
**Item 5 – Schools Continued**
Amend the Table for parking spaces per schools in page 35 noted below (draft copy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS (PRIMARY &amp; SECONDARY)</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>1 space / 6 children (secondary only) Staff: 1 space / 5 staff</th>
<th>1 space / 2 daytime teachers plus provision for public / schools transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

To the following (proposed change)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SCHOOLS (PRIMARY &amp; SECONDARY)</th>
<th>Children</th>
<th>1 space / 6 children (secondary only) Staff: 1 space / 5 staff</th>
<th>1 space / Full Time staff plus 1 space / classroom provision for public / schools transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
**Consultees – Appendix III**

Below is the list of people/organisation we consulted with.

**Statutory - Broadland Parish Councils**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No</th>
<th>Organisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acle Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Attlebridge Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Aylsham Town Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Beeston St Andrew Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Beighton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>BeLaugh Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Blickling Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Blofield Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Booton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Brampton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Brandiston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Brundall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Burgh &amp; Tuttington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Buxton with Lamas Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Cantley Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Cawston Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Coltishall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Crostwick Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Drayton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Felthorpe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Foulsham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Freethorpe Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Frettenham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Great &amp; Little Plumstead Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Great Witchingham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Guestwick Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Hainford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Halvergate Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Haveringland Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hellesdon Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Hemlington Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Hevingham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Heydon Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Honingham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Horsford Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Horsham &amp; Newton St Faiths Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Horstead and Stanninghall Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Lingwood and Burlingham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Marsham Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Morton-on-the-Hill Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Old Catton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Oulton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Postwick with Witton Parish Council</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
44. Rackheath Parish Council
45. Reedham Parish Council
46. Reepham Town Council
47. Ringland Parish Council
48. Salhouse Parish Council
49. Salle Parish Council
50. South Walsham Parish Council
51. Spixworth Parish Council
52. Sprowston Parish Council
53. Stratton Strawless Parish Council
54. Strumpshaw Parish Council
55. Swannington with Alderford & Little Witchingham Parish Council
56. Taverham Parish Council
57. Thetford Parish Council
58. Thorpe St Andrew Town Council
59. Upton with Fishley Parish Council
60. Weston Longville Parish Council
61. Wood Dalling Parish Council
62. Woodbastwick Parish Council
63. Wroxham Parish Council

Other Local Authorities
64. Breckland District Council
65. Broads Authority
66. Great Yarmouth Borough Council
67. Norfolk County Council - Planning & Transportation
68. North Norfolk District Council
69. Norwich City Council
70. South Norfolk District Council

Government Agencies
71. English Heritage
72. Environment Agency
73. Go East
74. Highways Agency
75. Natural England

Other
76. Anglian Water Services Ltd.
77. Norfolk Constabulary - Central Area
78. Norfolk Constabulary - Rural Area

Non – Statutory Consultees
79. Allied Earth Developments Limited
80. Balmforth Homes
81. Beazer Homes
82. Bovis Homes Ltd
83. Broadland Business Forum
84. Broadland Community Safety Officer
85. Broadland Disabled Peoples' Forum
86. Broadland Housing Association
87. Broadland Older Peoples' Partnership
88. Calderwood Property Investments Ltd
89. Carlink
90. Circle Anglia Housing Group
91. Cofton Ltd
92. Cotman Housing Association
93. Council for the Protection of Rural England (Norfolk Society)
94. Country Landowners Association
95. DES Developments
96. DN Grady & Sons
97. East Anglian Property Ltd.
98. East of England Tourist Board
99. Fairclough Homes Ltd
100. Fairstead Homes Ltd.
101. First Eastern Counties Bus Ltd
102. Flagship Housing Group
103. Freight Transport Association
104. Harnser Homes
105. Hopkins and Moore (Developments Ltd)
106. House Builders Federation
107. Housing Corporation
108. Lovell
109. McCarthy & Stone Ltd
110. National Federation of Builders
111. Norfolk Association for the Disabled
112. Norfolk Association for Village Halls
113. Norfolk Coalition of Disabled People
114. Norfolk County Football Association Ltd
115. Norfolk Cricket Board
116. Norfolk English Bowling Association
117. Norfolk Homes
118. Norfolk Lawn Tennis Association
119. Norfolk Rural Community Council
120. Norfolk Sports Alliance
121. Norfolk Tourism
122. Norfolk Wildlife Trust
123. Norwich and Norfolk Transport Action Group.
124. Norwich Door to Door
125. Norwich International Airport Ltd.
126. one Anglian Railways
127. Orbit Housing Association
128. Orchard Developments (East Anglia) Ltd
129. Peacock & Smith
130. Persimmon Homes Ltd
131. R. G. Carter
132. Sanders Coach Services
133. Sport England (Eastern Region)
134. Sustrans
135. Tarmac Ltd
136. Wimpey Homes East London Ltd.