

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: 29 December 2022 14:00
To: Strategic Transport
Subject: Public consultation - Draft parking standards for new developments

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Categories: Green Category

You don't often get email from [REDACTED]. [Learn why this is important](#)

CAUTION: This email originated outside the Central Bedfordshire Council network. Do NOT click on links, open attachments or respond unless you are sure that the email is legitimate. If you believe this to be a spam email, report it to the Service Desk at https://centralbedfordshire.samanage.com/catalog_items/1053685-report-received-email/service_requests/new

Hello - please can I submit the following comments/feedback on the above.
This morning the online consultation portal was not resetting my password so I couldn't do it online - I hope this email is sufficient.
Thank you very much for the opportunity to input and participate in this consultation.
Kind regards,
[REDACTED].

Feedback / comments:

The thoroughness and care that has gone into the policy is greatly appreciated.

Cycling

p10 (3.0) - no reference is made to cycle security and theft prevention in the *overall* standards and summary listed in the opening paragraph; please can the frequent reference to the 'Sheffield Stand' in later parts of the document re. cycle spaces be summarised in this opening section and ideally stated as a requirement not a preference.

Number of cycle spaces provided: Overall, the policy should reflect a vision for the level of sustainable transport choices that CBC aims to achieve in the coming decade and beyond. Therefore easy, convenient, secure cycle parking should be highly visible in residential and non-residential developments and should be attractive and copiously provisioned. Please can this premise / policy goal be clearly set out at the start of section 3.0. The brief reference to the Sustainability Plan 2020 (Section 1.0, p7) is insufficient - there needs to be a deep description of what that 2020 policy means for cycle space provision (see comments below re. Table 7). In terms of goals, could CBC consider a 10-year goal for the whole CBC area, benchmarking the total number of cycle spaces against the number of car park spaces in the region, at a measurable level that reflects the intended uptake of cycling in the region as part of the Sustainability Plan? The absence of such measures and goals greatly weakens what will truly be achieved by CBC in the coming decade.

Section 3.3 - cycle parking for house residents: this section is very much supported but how can this high quality standard be enforced among developers who are typically suspected of frequently overlooking requirements for the quality and amenity of new build developments?

Section 6.1: the only reference to security (theft prevention) aspects of cycle storage is the 'preference' for a Sheffield stand for bike-locking etc; this should be a requirement, not a preference.

Table 7 - p41 - cycle parking allocations for non-residential: the allocations here seem especially low / inadequate. CBC intends this to be an era of transition to more sustainable modes of transport (cf. Sustainability Plan, 2020). Empty cycle spaces at non-residential locations are a crucial 'advert' to the non-cycling public of the ease and convenience of adopting cycling as a mode of transport (recent evidence: <https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/143013/1/Bicycle%20parking%20paper%20revision3%20final.pdf>). Cycle spaces are relatively cheap to provide and have a disproportionate impact on uptake of cycling - the provision of spaces must reflect the intended future level of cycling, not the current demand. It is disappointing that there is no mention in this section of the ongoing CBC consultation on cycle route provision across the area.

Cars

Section 4.4.7 - p.22: considering the ecology, amenity and enjoyment of areas around new construction, the exclusion of soft landscaping adjacent to parking bays feels disproportionate - we would prefer this sentence to be removed completely, but if it remains it should be a 'preference' and not a requirement/prohibition. Surrounding parking bays only with walls or paving makes developments ugly, less enjoyable and greatly reduces biodiversity.

Section 4.6 - Parking allocations in town centres and near public transport: No evidence is offered regarding the reduced need for cars in such locations - the journeys made by householders are unlikely to be significantly met by local public transport and residents are just as likely to work outside their immediate neighbourhood or even outside the CBC area as evidenced by the typical 'sprawl' of cars on pavements blanketing town centre residential areas. The draft policy itself states that it is a characteristic of the CBC area that it is "difficult to provide public transport to meet residents' needs for commuting trips when there are multiple destinations and origins" (p.18). This appears to be equally true of urban and rural locations in the CBC area. The solution in this regard is that the 'Draft parking standards for new developments' should be explicitly linked to the parallel policy goals and requirements in areas such as sustainable transport (cycling and walking etc) and public transport. Without this joined-up thinking and clear strategic linkage across the various areas of CBC responsibility, urban parking provision will be too low (being based on idealism rather than pragmatic policy action) and in the absence of good alternatives to the car, vehicles will remain strewn around new developments and car usage will remain higher than it might otherwise be.

Section 4.7 - visitor parking for HMOs: no justification is provided for the decision to exclude any visitor parking spaces for HMOs from the policy. On the face of it, HMO residents seem to be as entitled to visitor parking as anyone else and some allowance should be made for this.

Thanks again! Kind regards,

██████████