
Appendices



APPENDIX A

Extract from PPG 13 Transport Annex D: MAXIMUM PARKING STANDARDS

USE	NATIONAL MAXIMUM PARKING STANDARD	THRESHOLD FROM AND ABOVE WHICH STANDARD APPLIES
	1 space per square metre (m ²) of gross floorspace unless otherwise stated	(gross floorspace)
Food retail	1 space per 14m ²	1000m ²
Non food retail	1 space per 20m ²	1000m ²
Cinemas and Conference facilities	1 space per 5 seats	1000m ²
D2 (other than cinemas, conference facilities and stadia)	1 space per 22m ²	1000m ²
B1 including offices	1 space per 30m ²	2500m ²
Higher and further education	1 space per 2 staff + 1 space per 15 students (see note1)	2500m ²
Stadia	1 space per 15 seats (see note 2)	1500 seats

NOTES to PPG 13 Annex D:

1. The standard for students relates to the total number of students attending an educational establishment, rather than full-time equivalent figures.
2. For stadia, sufficient coach parking should be provided to the satisfaction of the local authority and treated separately from car parking. Coach parking should be designed and managed so that it will not be used for car parking.
3. Parking for disabled people should be additional to the maximum parking standards. Development proposals should provide adequate parking for disabled motorists, in terms of numbers and design (see Traffic Advice Leaflet 5/95, Parking for Disabled People).
4. For mixed use development, the gross floorspace given over to each use should be used to calculate the overall total maximum parking figure. For land uses not covered in these standards, the most stringent regional or local standards should apply.

APPENDIX B

Policy GD.3 - Context - Options Considered

'Windfall Plus' - 'New Settlements' - 'Conurbation Edge' - 'Urban Expansion'

We first considered a **'Windfall Plus'** option which would seek to accommodate all new housing within existing towns and the larger villages in the form of additional windfalls. It follows that under this option, the relationships between housing, industry and transport can only be influenced by a general direction to settlements without reference to scale or location. In theory, this would be consistent with RPG 11 but in practice it would be extremely difficult to deliver the scale and type of housing needed in the right places at the right time relying entirely on windfall. The potential of public transport corridors would be difficult to realise and the support of developer contributions to affordable housing and modal shift schemes would be very 'hit and miss'. This option would particularly favour the higher-priced small-scale 'executive housing' schemes in the larger villages undermining provision for local needs. In terms of environmental impacts the results would be patchy, for whilst brownfield development could be given priority, dependence on windfall alone to deliver housing provision would run a very serious risk of 'town-cramming' which could precipitate a reaction in favour of ad hoc greenfield development.

We concluded that it was far too late, to expect the 'Windfall Plus' option to deliver the new agenda in terms of meeting housing needs, transport sustainability and brownfield urban potential. This apparently easy way out of difficult strategic decisions would leave district councils with little direction and even less control, forced to approve schemes they would rather refuse just 'to make the numbers up'. This option responds badly to pressures for commitment to meeting housing needs where they arise and support transport modal shift initiatives because, being 'site' rather than 'need' based, windfall is a fragmented and highly unpredictable phenomenon. There is no evidence that a 'Windfall Plus' option could deliver the required development. Even in advance of local district plan urban capacity studies, it is evident that urban expansion could meet housing needs. In Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough housing windfall completions are transpiring to be much higher than expected at the outset of WASP's preparation, so substantially reducing the need for new dwelling allocations and, by implication, peripheral expansion. Similarly, any need for further urban expansion in Warwick District appears to be quite modest in comparison with total need throughout the Plan period, because of a large housing supply pipeline.

A **'New Settlements'** option would direct additional housing and industrial development, together with the supporting transport and other community infrastructure to two locations: one to serve the north of the

County and the other to serve the south. These locations are likely to be based on existing large villages, within or accessible to public transport corridors, centrally located to the areas of local housing need they would be serving, probably in the Green Belt. The scale of development would be to effectively produce new settlements. This option would be the logical alternative if it were to be concluded that the 'Urban Expansion' option put too much pressure on those main urban areas which do not have much brownfield development potential and already congested road systems and town centres. It would seek to continue Warwickshire's legacy of separate and distinct towns by creating new settlements. They would place transport corridor and accessibility to the Conurbation above Green Belt considerations and probably have to rely largely on greenfield land. They would absorb most developer contribution towards infrastructure to secure local modal shift and they may very well make significant contributions towards immediate local housing needs. However, new settlements will not be consistent with RPG11 and will not meet local housing needs arising elsewhere. If they were confined to a scale equivalent to migrant housing needs, their scale would very probably be insufficient to be sustainable in terms of community facilities and public transport. Were the overall scale of additional housing growth required to be several times larger, then new settlements could be a sustainable option.

The scale of need and the potential remaining

of the existing main towns does not justify the 'New Settlement' option in this plan period - though the time may come in future Structure Plan reviews. Adoption of this option would commit growth and infrastructure provision over the long term to ensure that it remains sustainable, unnecessarily tying the hands of future Structure Plan reviews. For example, whilst a 'New Settlements' option could be appropriate as a means of providing for growth driven by demographic changes producing migration, nationally these factors may well have worked through by 2020, possibly to be replaced by the need for large scale, in situ, redevelopment of inter-war suburbs in the big cities.

A '**Conurbation Edge**' option would direct additional housing development to two or possibly more locations on the edge of Birmingham. The basic premise of this option is that these locations would only attract migrants from Birmingham who would then commute back into the Conurbation for work and services, avoiding the need for balance with additional industrial development. These locations would be in public transport corridors, in the Green Belt and almost certainly on greenfield land. This option would represent the continued realisation of the Conurbation's propensity to expand at its edges, unless constrained by a strongly supported Green Belt policy. Because migrant moves out of the Conurbation tend to be short, it is inevitable that housing in such locations would cater almost exclusively for migrant needs, including their affordable

housing needs. It is also clear from the transport corridor studies that a significant use of rail services can be developed in these fringe locations, albeit a modal shift from bus to rail as well as from car to rail. However, like the 'new settlements' option, to achieve a sustainable scale of development they would have to include housing to meet local needs arising across the whole of Warwickshire. The alternative of accommodating just the equivalent of Birmingham migrant needs would mean scales of development which would be unsustainable in relation to the ability to contribute to and support public transport infrastructure and services and community facilities. This would not be consistent with RPG11 (para. 9.16) and would clearly undermine its principles because there is no way the existing housing pipeline (which is more closely related to where local needs arise) can be reserved for just, or even mainly, local needs. Consequently, therefore, in addition to having negative environmental impacts, this option would be likely to accelerate out-migration of local housing need by reducing the overall supply of housing in the Crescent Towns. This risk is likely to be increased by the direction of developer funded transport and other contributions to modal shift away from those towns, blunting any urban focus in their direction.

We concluded that the 'Conurbation Edge' option is an historical model drawn from the suburbanisation of the metropolitan areas that

was stimulated by the railways over the first half of the 20th Century. There is little doubt that this option could deliver housing to meet conurbation migrant needs given a sufficient scale to secure and support public transport infrastructure and services. However, there can be equally little doubt that it would not be sustainable in terms of meeting overall housing needs or delivering the RPG11 agenda on urban focus on the Crescent towns and brownfield land potential. Once the principle of large scale extension of the Conurbation edge is re-established it will inevitably become the long term solution to the Conurbation's housing needs. To go in the direction of this option would be to take a giant leap backwards in time to before the days of Town & Country Planning Acts and Green Belts. Any strategy involving the conurbation edge would be bound to affect the Green Belt, as there is no evidence that significant development sites could be found on the edge of the metropolitan area within Warwickshire that were outside the Green Belt. Whilst the Corridors Study concluded that Type A locations (i.e. those on the edge of the conurbation) are likely to perform well with regard to travel demand where housing is intended to meet needs arising from the metropolitan area, there is no evidence that development at such locations would actually reduce the need to travel. Therefore, so long as development needs can be met outside the Green Belt, it follows that Green Belt releases are not warranted to allow for the Conurbation Edge option to be pursued.

An '**Urban Expansion**' option would direct most new housing and industrial development towards the nine main towns, making best use of the existing building stock (through reduction in vacancies, conversions and increased densities) and brownfield land within the built-up area before committing to urban extensions. It is worth noting that urban expansions differ from urban extensions in that the latter refers only to extending the built-up area by building on the edge of the settlement. However, an urban expansion can be achieved by intensifying development and increasing densities within the existing built-up area without necessarily extending the urban boundaries. This option would be the closest interpretation of RPG 11 and the distribution of housing across the districts. However, it places proximity to new industrial development in the north of the County to counter out-commuting and out-migration of the predominant local housing needs higher than access to transport corridors. The priorities are reversed towards the south, with

greater emphasis on transport corridors reflecting the greater propensity of migrants to commute back to the Conurbation, and the opportunities for modal shift. On environmental impacts, there is a greater balance struck in favour of urban focus aiding transport sustainability and meeting local housing needs over brownfield development potential per se (i.e. in rural areas), with some greenfield development likely in Nuneaton/Bedworth, Warwick/Leamington and Stratford-upon-Avon, pushing at the limits of road systems and town centres to accommodate the additional traffic pressures. However, this option falls short of the need for housing development in the Green Belt at one extreme or 'town-cramming' at the other. The main risk with this option is that the heavy focus on urban areas will starve the larger rural villages of developer contributions from new housing sufficient to support affordable housing and modal shift schemes. This may result in a widening of the gap between urban and rural provision in these areas.



Further copies of the Warwickshire Structure Plan are available from:

Planning Strategy Unit
Department of Planning, Transport & Economic Strategy
PO BOX 43
Shire Hall
WARWICK
CV34 4SX

Telephone: 01926 412061

E-mail: planningstrategy@warwickshire.gov.uk

Web: www.warwickshire.gov.uk

Acknowledgements

The Warwickshire Structure Plan 1996 - 2011 was produced by the Planning Strategy Unit PTES, Warwickshire County Council.

Designed by Marketing & Graphics PTES, Warwickshire County Council.

'Guest Editors', the Tyler-Parkes Partnership, who edited the Explanatory Memorandum to improve clarity, accuracy and consistency.

This publication can be made available in alternative forms on request. For information on this service only please contact the Departments library and information service on 01926 418633 fax 01926 418631 e-mail: PT-MS library@warwickshire.gov.uk