

Policy 54

Id No	Respondent	Policy 54
141	Brethren's Gospel Trusts	<p>Objection to policy as currently drafted. In our submission it is essential to ensure that adequate parking provision is made for community uses and places of worship, which characteristically meet at times of poor public transport provision, for example evenings and weekends.</p> <p>We believe that a dedicated place of worship is necessary for their form of worship with a safe and adequate controlled facility for parking of coaches, minibuses, cars, and cycles.</p> <p>It should be recognised in local transport plans and other strategies that the voluntary and not-for-profit sector are often unable to make financial contributions to the improvement of transport infrastructure and services as part of their development.</p>
200	Environment Agency	<p>3.216</p> <p>Agree that its important that development of 'prestige employment sites' doesn't lead to high levels of parking supply.</p>
163	Friends of the Earth North East	<p>Friends of the Earth broadly supports this policy, with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Point a), remove the words 'seek to';• Point b), replace 'seeking to reduce' with 'reducing';• Point f), amend the second sentence to read, 'At the Prestige Employment Sites and Regional Brownfield Mixed-Use Developments, a coordinated approach for the whole site should be developed, including overall levels of parking provision. <p>• Amend second outcome to read: '100% of LDFs/LTPs including policies to achieve a progressive increase in the proportion of total trips to work and school in the Region made by walking, cycling and public transport, and a corresponding reduction in the proportion made by car</p>
329	Friends of the Earth South Tyneside	<p>South Tyneside Friends of the Earth broadly supports this policy, with the following amendments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Point a), remove the words 'seek to';• Point b), replace 'seeking to reduce' with 'reducing';• Point f), amend the second sentence to read, 'At the Prestige Employment Sites and Regional Brownfield Mixed-Use Developments, a coordinated approach for the whole site should be developed, including minimising overall levels of parking provision.
4	Friends of the Earth Tyne Bridge	<p>Further to Policy 53 this is very worthwhile, we strongly support it.</p>
8	Gateshead Council	<p>The approach towards parking and travel plans is inadequate and needs to be strengthened. Clear guidance is needed on the appropriate levels of parking in new development and how existing car parking can be managed.</p>
215	Government Office For The North	<p>The policy needs indicative thresholds for relevant applications.</p>
160	Highways Agency	<p>Publicity to promote sustainable travel. LDD's should be clearer as to how development should contribute to improve the transport infrastructure. Imaginative way to reduce parking need at new development should also be employed.</p>

Id No	Respondent	Policy 54
453	Member of Public	support with amendments: point a) remove "seek to" point b) replace "seeking to reduce" with "reducing" point f) second sentence to read "At prestige employment sites and regional brownfield mixed use developments, a coordinated approach for the whole site should be developed, including overall levels of parking provision"
273	Member of Public	Whilst I support the reduction in parking it is a fact of life. What is high time though is that parking solutions are a bit more elaborate and where we say we are seeking densification of housing for example why do we still have seas of tarmac around industrial/office and retail units? Why is the RSS not seeking to use multi storey and below ground parking to redress the balance of urbanization and emulate some of our EU towns and cities more?
185	Middlesbrough Council	Policy 54 seeks to reduce non residential parking standards in locations with good public transport access, particularly at strategic public transport hubs, including Middlesborough. This policy, under current circumstances is likely to prove counter productive, by encouraging town centre businesses to locate to out of centre locations where parking for staff and customers is less restricted. This also appears to go against national planning guidance, with PPG 13 advising local authorities to 'be cautious in prescribing different levels of parking between town centres and peripheral locations, unless they are confident that the town centre will remain the favoured location.'
Requested Changes The reference in policy 54 to reduced parking provision in strategic public transport hubs should be deleted.		
272	Middlesbrough Town Centre	Policy as written does not sufficiently constrain car parking provision in locations outside of established urban areas and could lead to a situation where the policy has a reverse impact to that anticipated by being more forceful in its application in those locations where there is actually an alternative public transport infrastructure e.g. the strategic public transport hubs- while allowing more discretion in areas such as prestige employment sites and regional Brownfield mixed use development, recognizing that where public transport is not currently provided in the short term parking provision is imperative to give commercial viability. This will merely perpetuate the current flight of town centre businesses to out of town locations for extra and apparently "free" parking.
90	Mr M.L Cunliffe	Pleased to read 54d) but adding "reflecting local circumstances" makes this section a contradiction in terms and makes policy too flexible
94	Nectar	Policy 54 is inadequate and is opposed by NECTAR. However, the principles of controlling car parking and developing travel plans are supported by NECTAR. It is understood that a major revision of Policy 54 is in preparation; comment will therefore be reserved until that revision has been published for public scrutiny.
66	Railfuture	Policy 54 is inadequate and is opposed. However, the principles of controlling car parking and developing travel plans are supported. It is understood that a major revision of Policy 54 is in preparation; comment will therefore be reserved until that revision has been published for public scrutiny.
207	Tees Valley Joint Strategy Unit	This policy advises that Local Transport Plans and other strategies should seek to reduce non-residential parking standards in locations with good public transport accessibility, such as strategic public transport hubs. There is a danger that this aspect of the policy may further encourage town centre businesses to locate to out of centre sites where parking is less restricted. RSS should not be prescriptive on this issue, particularly as it refers to imposing standards in the region that may be stricter than national guidance (PPG13 which advises local authorities

Id No Respondent

Policy 54

to be cautious in prescribing different levels of parking between town centres and peripheral locations, unless they are confident that the town centre will remain the favoured location).

This part of the policy should therefore be deleted.

61 Tesco Stores Ltd

Concerns that consideration should be given to a reduction in parking standards as certain activities e.g family bulk food shop are often near impossible to undertake via public transport. If restrictions such as the above were applied within and on the edge of the main centres, they believe that shoppers would simply continue to drive to stores further out of town.

105 Tynedale Council

This policy seeks reduced parking standards, below national maxima, in certain locations, including in local public transport hubs. It should be noted that in rural locations, hubs rarely cater for good accessibility from all parts of the catchments of the centres concerned. A certain proportion of those using these town centres, especially those who work there but live in remoter rural locations, will always be reliant on cars. For this reason, it may therefore not be possible to seek below national maximum parking standards in rural local transport hubs. **02**