



Residential Car Parking Standards

Supplementary Planning Document



October 2014



Ashfield District Council

Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, NG17 8DA

Tel: (01623) 450000 Fax: (01623) 457585 Website: www.ashfield-dc.gov.uk

Contents	Page
1.0 Introduction	2
2.0 Policy Context	3
3.0 Background	6
4.0 Design Principles	8
5.0 Proposed Residential Parking Standards	15
6.0 Implementation	17

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Residential Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) has been prepared by Ashfield District Council to provide guidance and advice for applicants/developers. The SPD sets out the Council's requirement for parking provision to serve new residential developments within the District.
- 1.2 The parking standards contained within the Ashfield Local Plan Review (2002) are now out-of-date and there is an urgent need to update them. As such, the intention of the Residential Car Parking Standards SPD is to provide further clarification and supporting guidance to Policies in the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002.
- 1.3 The supplementary planning document will be a material consideration in determining planning applications for residential development.
- 1.4 Ashfield District Council has worked in partnership with Highway officers at Nottinghamshire County Council to prepare the SPD. The team worked together to produce parking standards for Ashfield based on the most current research and guidance and the local issues affecting the District. Local knowledge regarding parking issues affecting Ashfield has also been utilised to enable the team to formulate locally distinct parking solutions. Design principles/solutions relating to parking have also been identified and form an important aspect of this SPD.
- 1.5 The main objectives of the Supplementary Planning Document are to:
 - provide a clear framework for all to understand how parking provision is to be provided in the district for new development;
 - summarise the national and local policy context relating to the provision of parking for new development;
 - provide architects, engineers and developers involved in the preparation of schemes for new development, clear guidance and advice on the Council's criteria for parking standards.
- 1.6 The key purpose of the document is to ensure new development provides the required level of parking provision to accommodate demand without over providing, which would lead to developments dominated by the car or under providing which would result in a shortfall in parking spaces, leading to potential highway safety problems in the future.

2.0 Policy Context

National Policy

- 2.1 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) was published in March 2012. The NPPF replaces existing national planning policy documents including all planning policy statements (PPSs), all planning policy guidance notes (PPGs) including Planning Policy Guidance note 13: Transport, which previously set out the national parking standards and some planning circulars. Its content reflects the Government's Localism Agenda by placing Local and Neighbourhood Planning at the heart of the development management process. It also reflects the Government's desires to stimulate growth and to address climate change. The NPPF has been supplemented by Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6th March 2014.
- 2.2 The principle of "sustainable development" is at the heart of the NPPF. It is comprised of three key components: economic, environmental and social well being. The NPPF makes it clear that each component should be given equal weight when the concept of sustainability is considered. The achievement of this objective is structured around the requirement of the planning system, that planning applications must be determined in accordance with the development plan unless other material considerations indicate otherwise.
- 2.3 Paragraph 30 of the NPPF requires local planning authorities to 'support a pattern of development which, where reasonable to do so, facilitates the use of sustainable modes of transport'.
- 2.4 Paragraph 37 of the NPPF states that 'planning policies should aim for a balance of land uses within their area so that people can be encouraged to minimise journey lengths for employment, shopping, leisure, education and other activities'.
- 2.5 Paragraph 39 of the NPPF refers specifically to car parking and states that 'if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:
- the accessibility of the development;
 - the type, mix and use of development;
 - the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
 - local car ownership levels; and
 - an overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles

Local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking in town centres so that it is convenient, safe and secure, including appropriate provision for motorcycles'.

Local Policy

- 2.6 Nottinghamshire County Council is the highway authority responsible for the local highway network (excluding trunk roads and motorways) within Ashfield District. Having withdrawn specific parking requirements for new residential development, Nottinghamshire County Council released Residential Car Parking Research for Nottinghamshire – Highway Development Control Guidance in February 2010, which provides guidance on the estimation of demand for car parking space for residential developments within the County. This is based on the DCLG document produced in 2007 called Residential Car Parking Research.
- 2.7 At present local parking standards, as adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council, are set out in the 6Cs Design Guide. The Council are guided by Nottinghamshire County Council, as the Highway Authority for Ashfield, regarding standards for new developments. Once adopted, residential development proposals should meet the local parking standards set out in the Council's Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document.
- 2.8 Historically, Government guidance required local authorities to express residential parking standards as maximum standards. This established a presumption that it was acceptable for more accessible developments, where reasonably justified, to provide fewer parking spaces than the standard.
- 2.9 Parking is often one of the most emotive issues that can cause concern in a local community. Pavement parking, obstruction of driveways and damage to soft landscaping and footways are just examples of what can occur as a result of parking problems. In some cases, emergency or refuse vehicles are unable to pass as a result of obstructive parking.
- 2.10 In January 2011, the Coalition Government decided to remove maximum parking standards with regard to residential parking. The Government concluded that previous policies have directly resulted in an increased level of on-street parking consequently causing congestion and potential hazards for pedestrians. While the emphasis remains on local planning and highway authorities to set parking standards for their areas, it is recognised that due consideration should be given to local circumstances, accessibility and local car ownership levels.
- 2.11 The Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002 includes at Appendix 7 of the document, Parking Standards for New Developments. However, these standards are now considered to be out of date with regards to requirement of maximum parking standards.

- 2.12 Subsequently, the Council has developed minimum parking standards to guide parking provision in new residential development within the District of Ashfield. The inclusion of these minimum standards within this SPD will remove the presumption that a lower provision would be acceptable and instead provide a required standard for new residential development. This will ensure parking provision is adequate in both quantum and form and avoids previous issues associated with under provision.

3.0 Background

- 3.1 It is essential to formulate local parking standards due to the need to tackle congestion, to use land more efficiently; and to promote good design. Due to increasing levels of car ownership there is a need to find intelligent solutions to parking problems. The density of modern residential developments often reduces the amount of space available for parking. This can also create highway safety issues if it is not managed appropriately through the use of parking standards.
- 3.2 With regard to the formulation of parking standards, it is recognised good practice to base car parking standards on an assessment of future levels of car ownership in order to ensure that demand for parking is met. It is important to accurately determine the level of demand for parking in order to ensure that development is not dominated by parking.
- 3.3 The SPD reflects the methodology set out in Nottinghamshire County Council's technical paper 'Residential Car Parking Research for Nottinghamshire – Highway Development Control Guidance, February 2010, which was in turn based on the DCLG document 'Residential Car Parking Research' 2007, which provides guidance on estimating car parking demand for residential developments.
- 3.4 This methodology projects forward existing data on car ownership levels within the district of Ashfield and then derives appropriate parking standards based on this assessment of future levels of car ownership. This approach is based on the assumption that new housing will have similar car ownership characteristics to the existing housing stock in the area.
- 3.5 The data on existing car ownership levels is available to be taken from existing 2001 Census data. It was the Council's intention to use the latest release of data from the 2011 Census data to provide an up-to-date picture of the required parking standards for the district. However to date, not all the relevant 2011 Census data has been released (type, size and location of dwellings).
- 3.6 In the absence of the full release of the 2011 Census data, the Council proposes the use of local residential parking standards used by adjoining neighbouring local authorities (see Table 4).

Census Data

- 3.7 Data for the district of Ashfield is set out in Table 1 and this shows a breakdown of the 2011 Census data of households owning 0, 1, 2, 3 or 4+ cars/vans for the district as a whole. This table also shows a breakdown to allow for comparison between both sets of data between 2001 and 2011.

Total No. House-holds	No. House-holds with no car/van	No. House-holds with 1 car/van	No. House-holds with 2 cars/vans	No. House-holds with 3 cars/vans	No. House-holds with 4 or more cars/vans	All cars/vans in Ashfield
45,626 (2001)	12,306	21,221	9,947	1,684	468	48,039
% of Total Households	27%	46.5%	21.8%	3.7%	1%	
50,931 (2011)	12,072	22,549	12,921	2,571	818	59,790
% of Total Households	23.7%	44.3%	25.3%	5.1%	1.6%	

Table 1 – Ashfield Car Ownership

Ashfield Car Ownership, Census 2001 and 2011

- 3.8 Comparing the above 2011 Census data with the data from 2001, it is noticeable that there is a decrease in the number of households with 1 or no cars. The number of households with 2 cars have increased by 3.5% (9,947 to 12,291), households with 3 cars have increased by 1.4% (1,684 to 2,571) and households with 4 or more cars have increased by 0.65 (468 to 818).
- 3.9 Although the above data is available from the 2011 census data, to date no data has been released to allow a cross-tabulation between dwelling type, size and car ownership. Given the percentage increases highlighted above, it is considered appropriate to utilise the 2011 Census data when released in full, to ascertain the relationship between dwelling type, size and car ownership.

4.0 Design Principles

- 4.1 Garages are flexible spaces that can provide secure parking, although they are often used for domestic storage or sometimes converted to additional living accommodation. Garages should be large enough to accommodate a vehicle plus sufficient space to open the driver door and should also contain a small amount of storage space. Garages will not normally be counted as a parking space for the purpose of calculating parking provision, unless the minimum dimensions for residential garages set out in table 2 below are provided.
- 4.2 As well as achieving the appropriate levels of parking provision within the development, the design, location and layout of the spaces will also be important. Designs will need to provide attractive streets that include adequate parking, but without detracting from the character or visual quality of the place. Well designed places integrate car parking without it becoming over-dominant.
- 4.3 Badly designed residential developments often lead to inappropriate on-street vehicle parking due to:
- Poor layout of the whole scheme;
 - Poor configuration/layout of individual plots (i.e. tandem parking);
 - The density of developments and the width of the public highway;
 - Parking courts which are poorly located and designed; and
 - Garages which are too small to accommodate vehicles.



Parking occupying whole frontages dominates the street scene and creates a lack of visual interest

Building for Life

- 4.4 Building for Life is the industry standard, endorsed by Government, for well designed homes and neighbourhoods that local communities, local authorities and developers are invited to use to stimulate conversations about creating good places to live.
- 4.5 The Building for Life 12 document contains 12 questions which are designed to help structure discussions between local communities, local planning authorities and developers. Criteria 10 – Car Parking is relevant to this technical paper and should be referred to in designing new residential developments within the District. The criteria contains the following:
- Is there enough parking for residents and visitors?
 - Is parking positioned close to people's homes?
 - Are any parking courtyards small in size (generally no more than five properties should use a parking courtyard) and are they well overlooked by neighbouring properties?
 - Are garages well positioned so that they do not dominate the street scene?
- 4.6 Section 10 – Car Parking of the Building for Life 12 document recommends the following should be avoided:
- Relying on a single parking treatment. A combination of car parking treatments nearly always created more capacity, visual interest and a more successful place.
 - Large rear parking courts. When parking courts are less private, they offer greater opportunity for thieves, vandals and those who should not be parking.
 - Parking that is not well overlooked.
 - Using white lining to mark out and number spaces. These are not only costly, but unsightly. It can be cheaper and more aesthetically pleasing to use small metal plates to number spaces, and a few well placed block markers to define spaces.
 - Providing a clear and direct route between front doors and the street by not balancing the amount of parking in front of plots with soft relief.
- 4.7 The Building for Life 12 document contains 12 questions which are designed to help structure discussions between local communities, local planning authorities and developers. Criteria 10 – Car Parking is

relevant to this technical paper and should be referred to in designing new residential developments within the District. The criteria contains the following:

Surface Water Management

4.8 The management of surface water is a key element to the design of residential developments with SuDS being utilised to mimic natural systems for draining surface water. Residential car parking can contribute to sustainable water management through appropriate design//construction so that surfaces are permeable and car parking is incorporated as an element of a wider sustainable drainage scheme on a site. A variety of porous surfacing options are available such as:

- Open-textured soil or granular materials - Gravel or similar surface on a sub-base. where very low volumes of light weight traffic will be present.
- Geosynthetic gravel/grass protection systems - Typically used for light/medium loadings such as car parks.
- Small porous elemental surfacing blocks - This surface carries light loading but of high frequency such as shopping centre car parks.
- Continuous-laid porous material - Typical uses are as shopping centre car parks and service roads.
- Large elemental surfacing blocks - Uses are for occasional usage parking areas where vehicular loading is generally light and where the appearance of a grassed surface is seen as environmentally desirable.
- Precast concrete blocks with a pattern of indentations along their edges intended to be filled with sharp sand/gravel, laid on a recommended sub-base. Typical uses are for office and shopping centre car parks.
- Continuous-laid permeable material - In-situ cast concrete systems are available that provide a surface with large voids for infiltration, whilst offering hard standing for vehicles. Typically used in car parking areas

(See susdrains website www.susdrain.org)

4.9 There are opportunities for all applications to avoid concrete and asphalt surfaces to car parking areas the use of which means that water does not soak into the ground and adds potentially to the risk of flooding. There are three main types of solution to creating a permeable driveway/parking area:

- Using gravel or a mainly green, vegetated area.
- Directing water from an impermeable surface to a border rain garden or soakaway.
- Using permeable block paving, porous asphalt or concrete.

The Department for Communities and Local Government (CLG) has produced guidance on permeable paving which can be found on the following link:

https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/7728/pavingfrontgardens.pdf

Manual for Streets

- 4.10 Manual for Streets is a highway design guidance document produced by the department for Transport. It is aimed at creating well designed residential streets. The document sets out the process which needs to be undertaken in order to ensure that residential streets meet the needs of all users. It advocates a partnership approach between developers and local authorities. The design principles sections set out the concepts for creating well connected streets at the town centre and neighbourhood level. It also addresses design issues relating to crime reduction. Applicants are advised to seek direction from Manual for Streets early in the design stage to ensure that residential schemes accord with national guidance.

Car Parking

- 4.11 Car parking should be overlooked, welcoming and must not dominate the street scene. A mix of parking should help prevent this, and ideally schemes should provide on plot parking and some well configured on street parking zones, provided that this does not detract from the street scene. On plot tandem parking (i.e long driveways) can lead to inappropriate on street parking which has an adverse affect on the visual quality of the streetscene.
- 4.12 Drives and garages should normally be located to the side/rear of houses to minimise their visual impact. Any parking in front of a dwelling should maintain the maximum extent of front boundary possible in order to provide a clearly defined edge to the private space and enclosure to the street.



Example of poor design with vehicles illegally parked, blocking the footpath and dominating the street scene.



Example of good design with drives garages located to the side, minimising their visual impact.

- 4.13 Parking facilities should be well designed in terms of the way they function and the landscaping features and surfacing materials used in the development. Permeable surfacing and soft landscaping should be incorporated into residential development schemes to enable surface water run off to drain more freely. At a national level, Building for Life and Manual for Streets contain more detailed principles relating to residential parking schemes. Proposals should incorporate the design principles set out in both documents.

Garages

- 4.14 Garages are flexible spaces that can provide secure parking, although they are often used for domestic storage or sometimes converted to additional living accommodation. Garages should be large enough to accommodate a vehicle plus sufficient space to open the driver door and should also contain a small amount of storage space. Garages will not normally be counted as a parking space for the purpose of calculating parking provision, unless the minimum dimensions for residential garages set out in Table 2 are provided.

Garage Type	Internal Dimensions (m)	Minimum Door Width (m)	Counts as Parking Space Y/N
Single	6 x 3	2.3	N
Single (inc storage space)	6 x 3.3	2.3	Y
Double (inc storage space)	6 x 6.3	4.2	Y (2 spaces)
Double	6 x 6	4.2	Y (1 space)
Disabled	6 x 3.3	2.8	Y

Table 2 – Minimum internal garage dimensions

Source: Adapted from 6Cs Highway Design Guide (2010)

- 4.15 To prevent illegal parking, where vehicles encroach on the carriageway or footway, minimum garage setback spaces will be required. The required set back spaces are set out in Table 3 below.

Garage Door Type	Minimum set-back (m)
Roller Shutter/sliding/inward opening	5.5
Up and Over	6.1
Hinged outward opening	6.5

Table 3 – Minimum Garage Setback Distances

Source: 6Cs Highway Design Guide (2010)

- 4.16 Where an access is to be gated, the gates should be set back 5m where they open inward and 6m where they open outwards. This is to ensure that the public highway (particularly areas used by pedestrians) is not obstructed if a vehicle is parked on the access in front of the gates.

Pedestrians and Cyclists

- 4.17 In order to encourage sustainable transport methods new developments should incorporate cycle parking facilities where appropriate. The requirement for cycle facilities will be dependent on

the type and nature of the development. Guidance is set out in The 6C Highway Design Guide 2010 - Section DG16: Parking for cycles

Connectivity

- 4.18 The space requirements of emergency vehicles, refuse vehicles and vehicles which deliver and collect goods must be incorporated into development schemes where necessary. Sufficient space will also be required within the site to allow for the parking and manoeuvring of such vehicles. Residential care homes in particular should provide sufficient parking and manoeuvring facilities to accommodate the needs of emergency vehicles.

Safety

- 4.19 Car parking and landscaping should be carefully considered in order to prevent barriers to pedestrian and cyclist movement.

5.0 Proposed Residential Car Parking Standards

- 5.1 In the absence of the full release of the relevant 2011 census data being available. The Council proposes the use of local residential parking standards for all types of residential development.
- 5.2 In order to provide parking standards for residential developments, extensive research has been carried out to identify residential parking standards used by adjoining Councils within Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. It is proposed that minimum parking standards are adopted which are used by similar size and natured Local Authorities. These standards are set out in Table 4 below.

1 bed dwellings and Aged Persons Residence	1 space per unit plus 1 space off plot per 2 units for visitors
2/3 bed dwellings	2 spaces per unit
4+ bed dwellings	3 spaces per unit

Table 4 – Parking Standards for all Types of Residential Development

- 5.3 It is recognised that whilst it is important to combat climate change, recent efforts to restrict parking provision have not resulted in a fall in car ownership. Under-provision of parking places in new development has often led to inappropriate and anti-social parking. As a result, these new standards have been designed to ensure that occupiers of new development have a sufficient minimum level of well-designed parking provision. This should reduce the frequency of inappropriate parking and improve the appearance of new development.
- 5.4 All types of new residential development, including change of use, need to give consideration to the parking standards set out in this SPD. It is the responsibility of the applicant to explicitly demonstrate that the appropriate standards have been met. If the requirements of this guidance cannot be met, the applicant must ensure that the exception is fully justified, being able to demonstrate that other material considerations outweigh the need to adhere to the principles set out in this document. The Council will work proactively with developers to deliver new development that provides the level of parking occupiers will require.
- 5.5 Car parking should be provided within the development site and within the curtilage of the property. Where car parking is located within the development site but beyond the new properties 'residential curtilage, at least one space should be allocated for use by each property. The

allocated car parking space(s) need to be retained in perpetuity and be identified in the deeds of the dwelling.

- 5.6 In exceptional circumstances a more flexible approach may be required and parking standards may be more negotiable. In particular, developments in areas within close proximity to major transport nodes, such as railway and bus stations, may warrant a more flexible approach where there are no implications for amenity or health and safety.
- 5.7 For all non-residential parking requirements, as well as design expectations for a wide range of parking requirements, please refer to the 6Cs Design Guide: Highways, transportation and development (HTD). This is a web based design guide for highways and transportation infrastructure, including parking requirements for new development. It was originally developed by Leicestershire County Council but has subsequently been adopted by Nottinghamshire County Council and other local highway authorities in the East Midlands. The home page for the Design Guide is <http://www.leics.gov.uk/6csdg.htm> This draws heavily on the content of national guidance within Manual for Streets and Manual for Streets 2.

6.0 Implementation

6.1 The Council welcomes the opportunity to have pre-application discussions as it offers an opportunity to guide development positively and highlight areas for improvement.

6.2 For residential developments it is important to discuss your proposal at an early stage. Early intervention can save time and money later on. Pre-application advice incurs a cost for the Council and Section 93 of the Local Government Act 2003 allows Local Planning Authorities to charge for offering a service of pre-application advice. A fee was introduced by the Council in May 2013 and will be required for the processing of pre-application enquiries. This is in line with practice in other parts of Nottinghamshire. The required fee and type of information that will be provided in any response is set out on the Council's website.



Ashfield District Council

Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, NG17 8DA

Tel: (01623) 450000 Fax: (01623) 457585 Website: www.ashfield-dc.gov.uk

Consultation Statement – Residential Car Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012

Introduction

The purpose of this SPD is to set out up to date requirements for parking provision to serve new residential developments within the District. It is consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework and the Saved Policies within the Ashfield Local Plan Review 2002

This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the SPD as required by the Town & Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012.

This Consultation Statement describes the consultation that was undertaken, provides a summary of responses received, and the Council's responses to these comments. The Consultation Statement has been up-dated following completion of the representation period on 8th August 2014.

Consultation Regulations

The SPD is produced in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The relevant regulations relating to the consultation process are explained below.

Regulation 12: Regulation 12(a) requires the Council to produce a consultation statement before adoption of the SPD, this must set out who has been consulted, a summary of the issues raised, and how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD

Regulation 12 (b) requires the Council to publish the documents for a minimum of 4 week consultation, specify the date when responses should be received, and identify the address to which responses should be sent.

This statement is the 'Consultation Statement' for the SPD as required by regulation 12(a). The document also sets out information about the consultation as required by regulation 12(b). As the SPD progresses towards adoption, the 'Consultation Statement' will be expanded to recognise involvement by outside bodies and public participation during the consultation period.

The Council has liaised with Nottinghamshire County Council as the Highway Authority in drafting the SPD.

Regulation 13: Regulation 13 stipulates that any person may make representations about the SPD and that the representations must be made by the end of the

consultation date referred to in regulation 12. This consultation statement sets out this requirement.

Regulation 14: This regulation relates to the adoption of the SPD. When the Council adopt the SPD it must make the SPD and adoption statement available under regulation 35. The Council should also send a copy of the adoption statement to any person who has asked to be notified of the adoption of the SPD.

Regulation 35: Regulation 12 states that when seeking representations on an SPD documents must be made available in accordance with regulation 35. This requires the Council to make documents available by taking the following steps:

- Make the document available at the principal office and other places within the area that the Council considers appropriate;
- Publish the document on the Council's website.

The Statement of Community Involvement

The SCI was originally adopted in 2006 and was then updated in 2010 and July 2013. The procedures for consultation follow the guidelines in the SCI.

Consultation Period

Consultation on the SPD was carried out in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012. The SPD and the Consultation Statement was made available for inspection for a six week period between 24th June and 8th August 2014.

Copies of the SPD and this consultation statement were available (in accordance with Regulation 35) during normal office hours at:

Ashfield District Council offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in- Ashfield, Nottingham, NG17 8DA on Mondays to Fridays 8.30am to 5.00pm (4.30 Fridays).

Copies were also be available for inspection during normal opening hours in the Council offices at Watnall Road, Hucknall, Fox Street, Sutton in Ashfield, and Nottingham Road, Selston.

In addition:

- Notification letters were been sent to bodies identified under the duty to cooperate and as specific consultations bodies under the regulations where the SPD is relevant to those parties.
- To other parties on the Local Plan consultation database where the SPD is considered to be potentially relevant to those parties.
- Notification letters were sent to all Parish Councils within the District
- A press notice was posted in local papers the week commencing 23rd June 2014.

- The documents were available to be viewed on the District Council's website at: <http://www.ashfield-dc.gov.uk/20715.aspx>.

Consultation Responses

The consultation on this document was open until Friday 8th August 2014. It identified that comments could be made in writing to the Forward Planning Team at Ashfield District Council, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham, NG17 8DA or email localplan@ashfield-dc.gov.uk or the online comment form.

It stressed that responses will be made public and a summary of the main issues raised from the consultation and how those issues have been addressed will be made available on the Council's website in accordance with the Regulations.

Parties Consulted

The parties the Council consulted are set out in Appendix One.

Summary of the issues raised / how these issues were incorporated in to the SPD

During the six week consultation period three individuals/organisations responded with representations/comments in relation to the SPD. A summary of the main issues raised and how those issues have been addressed in the SPD are set out in the Table below.

Respondents Name	Section of SPD	Comment/Proposed amendment	Council response
Environment Agency	Section 4	We recommend that the SPD should state that residential car parking can contribute to sustainable surface water management and can be designed /constructed to be permeable and incorporated as an element of a wider sustainable drainage scheme on sites.	Additional text incorporated on surface water management of car parking areas. (Final SPD paragraphs 4.8 & 4.9)
Natural England	General	<p>Natural England did not make specific comments as the topic of the SPD does not relate to their remit to any significant extent. However, a general reference was made to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Biodiversity enhancements - This SPD should encourage the taking of opportunities to incorporate features which are beneficial to wildlife into proposals for development with a reference to an example of best practice. (Exeter Residential Design Guide). • Landscape enhancements - The SPD may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is not considered that the standard advice is specifically relevant to this SPD, therefore no changes have been made. • A SEA screening assessment has been undertaken.

		<p>distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment; use natural resources more sustainably; and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Protected species – Referred to the availability of standing advice. • Strategic Environmental Assessment/Habitats Regulations Assessment - Identified that a SPD may occasionally be found likely to give rise to significant effects which have not been formally assessed in the context of a higher level planning document, for example saved policies. If there is any doubt on the need to carry out a SA or HRA a screening assessment should be carried out. 	
Annesley Community Committed to Ensuring Sustainable Settlements. (ACCESS)	General	ACCESS agree with the comments within Para 2.8 —2.11	Noted.
ACCESS	General	No mention of any allowance for visitors etc., excepting for aged persons residence (Para 5.2) appear to have	No change proposed. Issues over parking typically relate to the occupants of a dwelling. The provision of parking for

		been made.	temporary visitors is not seen as a substantive issue which needs to be addressed in the SPDs.
ACCESS	Para 4.10	Table 2 – Garages should be sufficient the storage of cycles, lawnmowers etc.	No change proposed. The Table reflects guidance from the 6C Highway Design Guide 2010 which considers highways and transportation infrastructure for new developments in areas for which Derby City Council, Derbyshire County Council, Leicester City Council, Leicestershire County Council and Nottinghamshire County Council are the highway authorities
	Para 4.13	<p>Para 4.13 states that <i>“new developments should incorporate cycle parking facilities where appropriate. The requirement for cycle facilities will be dependent on the type and nature of the development”</i>.</p> <p>ACCESS believes that cycling storage facilities should be provided in all new developments.</p>	<p>Additional reference included to the guidance set out in The 6C Highway Design Guide 2010 - Section DG16: Parking for cycles.</p> <p>(Final SPD paragraphs 4.17)</p>
Ashfield District Council	Para 2.1		Final SPD para 2.1 amended to include “The NPPF has been supplemented by Planning Practice Guidance issued on 6th March 2014.”

APPENDIX 1 – LIST OF CONSULTEES

Notification of Residential Design Guide Consultation was issued to the following:

	Ian Baseley	Edwinstowe
	Mr J Beardsmore	Shurdington
	Ms Caron Clare	
	Gloria de Piero	Kirkby in Ashfield
	Mr Terence Fenning	Eastwood
	Mr C Hatcher	Caversham
	Robert Hughs	Edwinstowe
	Mr Richard Kemp	Watnall
	Ms Jacqueline Knowles	Kirkby in Ashfield
	Mr. H. Smith	Hucknall
	Mr Brian Thorpe	Barnby, Newark
	Mr Richard Walters	Nottingham
	F A Webster	Nottingham
	Mr & Mrs Andrew and Jane Wilson	Mansfield
	Mr B Woollard	Sherwood Park
A Division Nottinghamshire Police	Ms Nicky Taylor	Mansfield
ACCESS	Mr P Olko	Kirkby in Ashfield
Adlington Planning Team	Kevin Waters	Congleton
Alfreton Road Tenants and Residents Association	Mr Neil Jones	Sutton in Ashfield
Amber Valley Borough Council		Ripley
Anchor Trust		Bradford
Andrew Martin Associates	Mr Robert Woollard	Kirkby in Ashfield
Annesley & Felley Parish Council	Mr John Barlow	Mansfield
Antony Aspbury Associates	Mike Downes	Basford
Armstrong Burton Planning		Sutton Coldfield
Ashfield CPRE	John Deacon	
Ashfield Homes Ltd		Sutton in Ashfield
Ashfield Links Forum		Sutton in Ashfield
Ashfield Watch	Bill Bailey	
Ault Hucknall Parish Council	Mrs E R Price	North Wingfield
Avant Garde Management Ltd	Mr Jason Savage	Kirkby in Ashfield
BADJER	Mr James Parry	Nottingham
Barton Willmore Planning	Jennifer Walters	Solihull
Ben Hunt Planning Ltd	Ben Hunt	West Bridgford
Bestwood St Albans Parish Council	Mrs P M Hall	Hucknall
Blackwell Parish Council	Mr J Radford	Mansfield
Bloomer Tweedale	R A Gough	Wolverhampton
Bolsover District Council	Mr Ian Collis	Clowne

Bovis Homes Ltd.	Mr B Herrod	Coleshill
Bowden Land Limited	Mr R Bowden	Ockbrook
BPS	Mr Bob Pick	Ripley
BRE	Samantha Borley	Garston
Brinsley Parish Council	Mrs M Frost	Eastwood
Broadway Malyan Planning	Dominick Veasey	Weybridge
Browne Jacobson	Tom Edwards	Nottingham
Broxtowe Borough Council	Mr S J Dance	Beeston
Business Environments Planning	M Millington	Warrington
Carsic Tenants & Residents Association	Christine Whitehead	Sutton in Ashfield
Cerda Planning	Victoria Lane	Birmingham
Chris Thomas Ltd	Chris Thomas	Stoke Bishop
Churngold Land	Mr J Johnson	Hadley
Clowes Developments (Midlands) Limited	R Ofield	Long Eaton
Colin Rae Associates	Mr Colin Rae	Nottingham
Colliers CRE	Adam Pyrke	London
Connell Wilson	S J Marlow	Nottingham
Coxmoor Tenants and Residents Association	Pat Simms	Kirkby in Ashfield
Coxmoor Tenants and Residents Association	Mr George Slack	Kirkby in Ashfield
CPRE (Nottingham)	Mr A Johnson	Linby
Crest Nicholson (Midlands) Ltd	Mr John Pearce	Amington Heights
CWS Property Group	P G Neary	Manchester
Cyden Homes Ltd	Mr Dave Logan	Lacey
D2N2 Local Enterprise Partnership Coordinator	Matthew Wheatley	Nottingham
David Lock & Associates	James Sylvester	Milton Keynes
David Tyldesley and Associates	Mr D Tyldesley	Hucknall
David Wilson Homes BDW	Helen Bareford	Bardon Hill, Coalville
DDP LLP	Peter Hilldrup	Leeds
De Montfort Housing		Leicester
Derbyshire Building Society		Duffield
Derbyshire County Council	Mr David Harvey	Matlock
Derbyshire Police and Crime Commissioner	Mr Alan Charles	Ripley
Derwent Living Association		Derby
Dev Plan		Ilkley
Development Planning Design Services	Graham Smith	Old Town
Development Planning Partnership	Claire Whittaker	Leeds
DPDS	Mr A Plumb	Derby
DPP	Emma Gomersal	Leeds
Dr Malcolm Bell Ltd	Dr Malcolm Bell	Etherley
DTZ Piedad Consulting	Mark Jackson	Birmingham

East Midlands Housing Association		Sutton in Ashfield
Ellis Riley and Son		Warsop
Ellis, Fermor & Negus		Ripley
Elphin Properties	A J Kenney	Kirkby in Ashfield
English Heritage	Claire Searson	Northampton
Environment Agency	Mr Andrew Pitts	West Bridgford
Equal Opportunities Commission		Manchester
Fairhurst	Sophie Gooch	Newcastle upon Tyne
Fisher German LLP	Ian Calverley	Retford
Flint Bishop & Barnett	John B Blackhurst	Ashbourne
FLP	Julie Davies	Congleton
Framptons	Mrs Louisa Cusdin	Banbury
Freeth Cartwright	Mr Paul Brailsford	Nottingham
Friends of Teversal Group	Mr R Goad	Sutton in Ashfield
Fusion on line	Mr S Wildman	Lytham St Annes
Gedling Borough Council	Ms A Gibson	Arnold
George Street Area Tenants & Residents Association	Mr Fred Bramley	Hucknall
George Wimpey Strategic Land	Ms H Guy	Leicester
Gerald Eve Chartered Surveyors	Julian Hood	London
GL Hearn	Catriona Fraser	
Gladedale (Lincoln) Ltd	Mr Twigg	Kingsley Road
Gladman	Baljinder Tiwana	Congleton
Grace Machin Planning & Property	Mr N Grace	Nottingham
Greasley Parish Council	Mr Andrew Marshall	Newthorpe
Guinness Trust Group		High Wycombe
Hallam Land Management	Mr Paul Burton	Sheffield
Hardwick Legal	Mr Geoff Gilbert	Sutton in Ashfield
Harris Lamb Chartered Surveyors	James Hollyman	Edgbaston
Haslam Homes	Mr D Foster	
Healdswood Tenants & Residents Association	Ann Patrick	Sutton in Ashfield
Healey & Baker	Robert Clarke	Hanover Square
Heaton Planning	Jenna Polak	Keyworth
HEB Chartered Surveyors	Mr J Bishop	Nottingham
Henry Boot Homes	Pete Jackson	Sheffield
Henry Mein Partnership	D Bowden	Nottingham
Hucknall Safer Neighbourhoods Committee - North & Central Ward	Mr R N Gow	Hucknall
Ian Baseley Associates	Mr Nick Baseley	Edwinstowe
Indigo Planning Ltd	Kate Girling	Leeds
Januarys	Robert Harrison	Cambridge
JMB Developments	Mr John Booth	Brinsley
John Church Planning Consultancy Ltd		Clay Cross

John D Collins & Associates	John Collins	Matlock
John Willcock Planning	J Willcock	Lowergate
KARA		Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby & District Conservation Society	Mrs Christine Kidger	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby & District Neighbourhood Watch	Mr Colin T Axam	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkby Residents Green Belt Association		Kirkby-in-Ashfield
Kirkby Woodhouse Community Association	Mr J McQuone	Kirkby in Ashfield
Kirkwells	Mr Michael Wellock BSc, Dip TP, DMS, MRTPI	Burnley
Land Planning & Development Consultancy	Mark R Cavell	Beeston
Landmark Information Group Limited	Steven Irving	Eagle Way
Lawnside Tenants & Residents Association	Pauline Coupe	Sutton in Ashfield
Leicester Housing Association Ltd		Nottingham
Level Ltd.		Westbourne
Lewis and Hickey Architects		Nottingham
LHA - ASRA Group Ltd		Leicester
Liam Doherty Architects	Mr Liam Doherty	Bramcote
Linby Parish Council	Kathryn Holmes	Hucknall
Locheil Homes	Mr R. Cameron	Sutton in Ashfield
Longhurst		Nottingham
Lovel		Beverley
Lowland Derbyshire and Nottinghamshire LNP	Ms Heather Stokes	Nottingham
M. B. Property		Southwell
Mansfield and Ashfield NHS Clinical Commissioning Group		Mansfield
Mansfield District Council	Mr R Routledge	Mansfield
Marrons	David Prichard	Meridian Business Park
Martin Bramich Associates	Lisa Finney	Knowle
McDyre & Co.	G R Bridge	Frodsham
Merriman Limited		Cossington
MONO Consultants Ltd	Ms Ginny Hall	Glasgow
Nathaniel Lichfield and Partners	Mr David Gavin	London
Natural England	Ms Roslyn Deeming	Crewe
Neighbourhood Watch	Mr J A Hardy	Hucknall
Network Rail	Mrs M Lake	York
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Matthew Norton	Newark
Newstead Parish Council	Mrs J Johnson	Linby
NHS Nottingham County		Mansfield

NJL Consulting	Justine Entezari BA (Hons) Mplan	Heald Green
North British Housing Association		Sherwood Rise
NorthCountry Homes Group Ltd	Paul Stock	Barlborough
Nottingham City Council	Mr Matt Gregory	Nottingham
Nottingham Community Housing Association		Sherwood Rise
Nottinghamshire County Council	Mrs Lisa Bell	Nottingham
Nottinghamshire Police	Kevin Brown	Hucknall
Nottinghamshire Police and Crime Commissioner	Mr Paddy Tipping	West Bridgford
Nuthall Parish Council	Sue Stack	Nuthall
Office of Rail Regulation		London
OPUN	Julie Tanner	Melton
Oxalis Planning Ltd	J R Holmes	Edwalton
P.J. Lilley Limited	Mr Lilley	Hucknall
Papplewick Parish Council	Mr Laura Poole	Papplewick
Park Portfolio Ltd	A P Watson	East Bridgford
Peacock and Smith	Mark Eagland	Leeds
Pegasus Planning Group	Miss Helen Wallis	Lockington
Persimmon Homes	Mr Nigel Hainsworth	Leicester
Peter Wigglesworth Planning Ltd	Peter Wigglesworth	Matlock
Peveril Homes Ltd		Belper
Phoenix Planning (UK) Ltd	Paula Money	Eastwood
Pinxton Parish Council	Marion Knight	Pinxton
Places for People		Port Way
Planning and Design Group (UK) Limited	Mr David Peck	Nottingham
Planning Potential	Charlotte Boyes	Harrogate
Planning Resources Ltd	Mrs J Padfield	Sherfield - on - Loddon
Planware Ltd	Mr Oliver Mitchell	Sudbury
Redrow Homes (Midlands) Ltd	Edward Irving	Tamworth
RenewableUK	Gemma Grimes	London
Richard Savidge 2010 Ltd	Mr Richard Savidge	Alfreton
RPS Newark	Mr Christopher Dwan	Newark
RPS Planning and Development	Mr Mark Sackett	Birmingham
Rushcliffe Borough Council	Richard Mapletoft	West Bridgford
Safer Neighbourhood Committee - Central & North	Mrs Angela Gregory	Hucknall
Savills	Mr Roger Freeston	Nottingham
Scott Wilson	Mr Simon Betts	Chilwell
SEARCH	Mr Andrew Greaves RIBA	Spalding
Selston Parish Council	Ms S Ball	Nottingham
Severn Trent Water Ltd.	Matt Foster	Anstey

Signet Planning	Mr Paul Stone	Nottingham
Somercotes Parish Council		Somercotes
South Normanton Parish Council	Mr R Shipman	South Normanton
SSR Planning	Mr Simon Smith	Northampton
Stanton Hill Safer Neighbourhood	Chris Hopkinson	Sutton in Ashfield
Stewart Doncaster Associates	Mr J Doncaster	Hilcote
Storey SSP	Ms G Aukland	Leeds
Strutt And Parker	Mr Richard Foxon	Market Harborough
Stuart Knowles Properties	Mr Stuart Knowles	Thorny Wood
Summit Planning Associates	Mrs Amanda Olley	Alderley Edge
Summit Residents Association	Mrs Pugh	Kirkby in Ashfield
Sutton Heritage Society	Mrs S J Peters	Sutton in Ashfield
Sutton Heritage Society	Mrs Marg Thorne	Sutton in Ashfield
Sutton Junction Residents Association	Mr John Mattison	Sutton in Ashfield
Tarmac Topmix Ltd	Andrew Kitchen	Retford
Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd	Mr Keith Oliver	Hook
Tenants Voices: New Cross	Mr Ken Carnell	Sutton in Ashfield
Terence O'Rourke Plc.	Amy Sharpe	Bournemouth
Terrence Hill Group	Philip Leech	London
The Coal Authority	Miss Rachael A Bust	Mansfield
The Co-operative Group	Matthew Stafford	Manchester
The Highways Agency	Mr Kamaljit Khokhar	Birmingham
The Houldsworth Trust	Mr J G H Szejer	Burton Joyce
The Planning Bureau Limited	Mr Matthew Shellum	Bournemouth
The Skegby Appreciation Society	Mr Ian Bunting	Sutton in Ashfield
The Tyler-Parkes Partnership	Mr J R Sammons	Hall Green
Three C's (Marketing Services) Associates	John S Briggs	Crowle
Tibshelf Parish Council	Mr K Bradshaw	Tibshelf
TURLEY ASSOCIATES		Birmingham
Tym And Partners	Mr Adam Bunn	Leicester
Underwood Action Group	Cllr R Sears-Pccavey	Nottingham
URS Infrastructure & Environment UK Ltd		Basingstoke
W A Barnes	Mr N J B Carnall	Sutton in Ashfield
W Westerman Ltd	Mr Robert Westerman	Chilwell
Walton & Co	Vicki Richardson	Leeds
Washdyke Properties	Mr G Cropley	Hucknall
Waterloo Housing Group		Birmingham Business Park
Wealforce Ltd		Underwood
Webster Associates	Mr Peter Webster	Stow Longa
West Hucknall Safer Neighbourhoods	Mr Colin Bailey	Hucknall
Westerman Homes	Mr Robert Westerman	Chilwell
Western Power Distribution		Tipton

White Young Green	Chris Palmer	Bristol
Wilson Bowden Developments	Mr R Henderson	Leicestershire
Wood Frampton	Mr B Weaver	Leamington Spa

Further information:

Further information is available from Forward Planning, Ashfield District Council Offices, Urban Road, Kirkby-in-Ashfield, Nottingham NG17 8DA or by calling the Forward Planning Team on 01623 457381 / 457382 / 457383 or by emailing localplan@ashfield-dc.gov.uk