

## OPTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED DURING CONSULTATION

### **Option A:**

Accept the document in its current form.

### **Response:**

No - see comments below for Options B, C and E.

### **Option B:**

Amend Table 1 (Page 4) to read:

Zone Type	Percentage of Maximum Standard
1	0% to 25%
2	25% to 100%
3	25% to 100%
4	75% to 100%

And also amend Paragraph 3.12 (Page 5) by adding the final sentence:

"The actual percentage of restraint used, within the range indicated in Table 1, will depend upon site circumstances and the standard of public transport services, either existing or proposed at the time of application."

### **Response:**

Yes - support amendments as they would make the zonal approach more flexible, giving more discretion in the application of the parking standards.

### **Option C:**

Add a Paragraph 1.4 to the Introduction (Page 1), which reads:

"1.4 Developers will be able to make a case for maximum car parking standards to be exceeded if particular exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated in any particular case."

**Response:**

Yes - support amendment as it would allow parking standards to be raised to reflect specific site or development constraints. However suggest Councils may also be given the opportunity to provide justified reasons for exceeding maximum car parking standards in exceptional circumstances.

**Option D:**

Amend the table for C3 Residential Development (Appendix H) to combine Small Housing and Affordable Housing with Large Dwelling Houses, to create a single category of 'Dwelling Houses' having a maximum car parking standard of:

"2 spaces per dwelling plus 1 space per 3 dwellings for visitors (dwellings with 4+ bedrooms may be expected to provide double garages, depending on local circumstances"

Also, delete Paragraphs 4.4 (Page 5) and 4.5 (Page 6).

**Response:**

Do not support these amendments, as they would remove the distinction between small and affordable housing and large dwelling houses in the application of the parking standards and therefore result in reduced flexibility. It is considered that a distinction between small and large dwellings needs to remain in order to reflect the realistic differences in parking demand.

**Option E:**

Amend the first sentence of Paragraph 1.3 (Page 3) to read:

"Parking standards are specified for each class of development, along with zonal maps with which to modify car parking standards in East Sussex towns."

Amend the last sentence of Paragraph 4.1 (Page 5) to read:

"The zonal approach for non-residential development also applies to residential standards, using the range of restraint indicated in Table 1, in combination with the zonal maps in Appendices B to F."

Also, amend the penultimate sentence of Paragraph 4.4 (Page 5) to read:

"In addition, Planning Authorities will continue to exercise discretion in conservation areas, and parking standards will be reduced from the maximum in areas with greater travel choices and close to jobs and services, as indicated by the zonal approach."

Also, amend the last sentence of Paragraph 7.1 (Page 6) to read:

"A zonal approach is applied to car parking standards."

**Response:**

Do not support amendments as do not believe residential development should be unreasonably restricted. It is likely that the provision of parking spaces will not influence ownership or otherwise of a motor vehicle and could, therefore, lead to increased on street congestion.

**Option F:**

Any other amendment deemed appropriate by the consultee.

**Response:**

None.

**Option G:**

Reject the document in its current or amended form.

**Response:**

No - subject to acceptable amendments.

**NB:** As support is being given for Options B and E any concerns regarding the 25% maximum parking standard in Zone 1 is covered by supporting Option C.