

## Revised Parking Needs Assessment Working Party Meeting 22/06/21

**Councillors: Bull, Sue Mason, Slatter and Holland,**

**Officers: Julia Stuckey (Town Clerk) and Sharon Sherborne (Assistant Clerk)**

An opening discussion regarding parking problems around the Marina, new developments and existing parking standards took place.

The email circulated the day before 21/06/21 to the working party was redistributed by email providing some response notes from Cllr Slatter and the NSC SPD document.

Each criteria from NSC's document was discussed and the following responses agreed:

\* **Criteria 2,3 & 7** – is the frequency to be measured at peak times or throughout the day? We have seen planning applications recently where the frequency of driving/parking has been measured at completely inappropriate times of the day/week.

\* **Criteria 6** – this should not be considered in Portishead until the railway station is built and in use. Even then, destinations should be considered (similar to the point at the bottom of comments re major employment areas), and the condition of the station, as with bus stops, is not as relevant as where the trains will go.

\* **Criteria 13** – Grocery shop within 1km walking – 1km is a long way for some to walk, especially if carrying shopping. This also does not consider hills (for example you could live within 1km of a shop but have to walk up a steep hill to get there/back). A huge number of Portishead residents live at the top of a hill. Not an inclusive policy for families or anyone disabled.

\* **Criteria 14** – GP or pharmacy – As above, 1km is a long way for some to walk, especially if they require medical attention, and again does not consider hills. If people are going to the GP, it is likely they are struggling with their health in some way. Not an inclusive policy for families or anyone disabled.

\* **Criteria 14** – could points be allocated under this point for a GP and a pharmacy? Whilst pharmacies offer a great service, they do not replace GPs so should not be included separately.

\* **Criteria 15** – over what distance will the quality of footways be assessed? Standard needs to be across all footpaths. Pavements too wide could encourage parking on the pavement.

\* **Criteria 16** – educational centre – Again, does not take into account hills. For example, many parts of Portishead are less than 2.5km from schools but cycling to/from them is impractical due to the topography of the town, particularly for older children carrying large bags and folders etc. Not an inclusive policy for families or anyone disabled. Propose that cycle lanes are considered.

\***Criteria 17** – as criteria 16 – a number of people live at the top of a hill, and it's unlikely many will be able to walk or cycle 2.5 km home with shopping. Not an inclusive policy for families or anyone disabled.

\* **Criteria 18** – Major employment areas – as Criteria 16 and 17 re hills. Also, what will be deemed to be a major employment area? Portishead has few. Propose that cycle lanes are considered.

\* **Criteria 19** – no electric charging points for cycles mentioned. There are no facilities for cyclists (showering/changing).

\* **Final Criteria** – encourage employers via financial support to engage in a green travel 2-3 years scheme. Active/public transport e.g. one year free bus pass – will this just enable developers to add points to their total and move into the next discount category by providing a one year bus pass. We have already lost a major bus service (X5) due it not being financially viable – giving free bus passes will make this situation occur more often.

\* It is noted that any development near a bus stop in a town is going to earn cumulative points from numerous criteria categories e.g. bus proximity, frequency x2, quality of bus stop. Does this mean that no developments in a town in North Somerset will be required to provide the full allocation of parking spaces due to the number and quality of bus stops, regardless of where the buses run to?

\* Criteria 12 & 16 and criteria 13 & 17 - these could be duplicates. For example, a development 1km from a school would earn points from 12 & 16 for the same thing.

\* Are all distances to be measured “as the crow flies” or as actual journeys? This could make a huge difference in Portishead. Again, it is important that the topography of the town is taken into account.

\* The minimum requirement of 1 space per dwelling is inadequate for some proposals and now appears to have been abolished. There is a considerable risk of allowing sizeable discounts to developments that allow far fewer than 1 space per dwelling and creating daily problems for new and existing residents.

\* Should existing car ownership rates and the reasons for these be taken into consideration? Topography of the town and suitable public transport for employment and recreation.

\* The discount bands are considerable in some cases e.g. 25-40%, 40-65% - this seems to go against the intention of creating a "clear, evidenced, and consistent approach for both officers and developers". Each development should be considered on its own merit.

\* Using the various criteria listed, it would be possible for Marina Gardens, for example, to be approved with as few as 81 car parking spaces, for 137 apartments.

\* Being near a bus-stop does not automatically mean you can get to work or a hospital appointment on the bus – the actual bus services available should be considered, not the location of bus stops. People working at Aztec West, Southmead Hospital, the MOD, Avonmouth, Cribbs Causeway etc., all of which are major employment sites for residents of Portishead and its surrounds, have no public transport options to get to work. Basically, anywhere other than the centre of Bristol. Also, many people need a car/van for work e.g. carers, salespeople, construction/maintenance/servicing jobs.

Additional comment on Parking for Non-Residential Development:

\*Criteria 11 – when will surveys of the nearest car park be done? Must be at different times of day, as per parking surveys for residential development proposals. Encourage employers via financial support to engage in a green travel 2-3 years scheme.

Ends 11:30