

CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTREVISED COUNTY PARKING STANDARDS AND A  
TRANSPORT CONTRIBUTIONS METHODOLOGYKey Decision:  
YES

PART I

Electoral  
Division(s):

All

REPORT BY DIRECTOR FOR ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT AND HEAD OF  
HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTRECOMMENDATION

That the Supplementary Planning Guidance attached as Appendix 1 be approved.

1. Background

- 1.1 The Cabinet Member for Strategic Environmental Services approved, in July 2003, a consultation process relating to revising County Parking Standards and developing a county-wide Contributions Methodology (Members' Information Service 24<sup>th</sup> June 2003).
- 1.2 The consultation process has now been completed, comments have been considered and the draft Supplementary Planning Guidance has been amended as necessary.
- 1.3 The adoption of the revised Parking Standards and Contributions Methodology as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) will ensure that they are material considerations of substantial weight in the determination of planning applications.

2. Discussion

- 2.1 The SPG document attached as [Appendix 1](#) is consistent with planning policy and guidance. The approach has been the subject of extensive consultation, including public consultation via the County Council website and a press notice.
- 2.2 The approach has received support generally. Limited comments have been made with regard to the parking standards and though some reservations have been raised in relation to the Contributions Methodology the majority of comments were constructive and have improved the clarity of the SPG. Comments received, a response to these comments and the action taken are highlighted in [Appendix 2](#).
- 2.3 The Government Office for the South East (GOSE) has confirmed that our approach is consistent with national and regional planning policies.

### 3. Proposals

3.1 That the document attached as Appendix 1 be adopted as SPG.

### 4. Consultation

The approach has been the subject of extensive consultation, the results of which are reported in Appendix 2.

Overall the approach has been welcomed although a number of comments and concerns have been raised. These relate in particular to the justification for the levels of contribution and the relationship with existing planning guidance. A paper has now been added to the SPG to address these concerns. A number of notes have been added to address concerns raised through the consultation exercise.

Appendix 2 includes a response to each of the issues raised and an explanation of how these have been addressed.

### 5. Resource Implications

The Contributions Methodology provides a consistent basis for securing developer contributions. Assuming that development within the Structure Plan progresses as anticipated and that no thresholds are applied to the Contributions Methodology our approach should secure £4 – 5M per annum towards transport improvements identified in the document 'Proposed Schemes to be Progressed if Developer Funding is Secured' (published for the first time earlier this year and to be updated as part of the annual Highways and Transport works programmes). Funding will only be available for schemes that are related, in terms of corridors of movement generated, to the development proposals.

### 6. Risk Management Implications

There is a risk that the new SPG could be challenged at appeal or may not be applied by District / Borough Councils, particularly if it results in delays in the planning process.

GOSE has confirmed that the approach taken is consistent with current national and regional planning guidance. The SPG is consistent with the approved and Deposit Draft Structure Plans for West Sussex. Consultation has been carried out with interested parties during the development of the SPG. This has included consultation with the general public by means of the County Council website and a County-wide press notice. Careful consideration has been given to all representations received as a result of the consultation exercise. District and Borough Councils have been involved throughout and have generally supported the approach set out in the SPG. Continued liaison with District / Borough Councils will ensure that any practical concerns are addressed and delays are not experienced. The risk is considered to be minimal.

7. Crime and Disorder Act Implications

There are no identifiable Crime and Disorder Act implications.

8. Human Rights Act Implications

There are no identifiable human rights implications.

MARK HAMMOND  
Director for Environment & Development

COLIN McKENNA  
Head of Highways and Transport

No background papers

Contact: Duncan Barratt, Ext. 77559