

To: Minister for the Environment

03 October 2023  
Head of Place and Spatial Planning  
Place and Spatial Planning, Cabinet Office

## Supplementary planning guidance **RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS**

### **Purpose**

1. To consider the outcome from consultation about draft residential parking standards supplementary planning guidance with a view to publication of a response to it; and the amendment and adoption of revised guidance.

### **Timing**

2. Draft guidance was issued for consultation between March and April 2023. Key themes arising from consultation were tabled for discussion in August.
3. The preparation and issue of other draft guidance for consultation (including Density standards; Housing development outside the built-up area; Residential space standards; Short-term holiday lets; and Development briefs for affordable housing sites and the former St Saviour's Hospital) has reduced the capacity of the team to review the outcome from consultation on this guidance and revise the draft guidance. This has now been undertaken.
4. Revised guidance should be issued as soon as possible in order to replace existing out-dated guidance but also to inform the preparation of development briefs for rezoned affordable housing sites.

### **Recommendations**

5. That you:
  - a. note the consultation feedback and endorse the analysis and proposed response to it, as set out at appendix 1;
  - b. note the key issues raised and endorse the proposed changes to draft guidance;
  - c. endorse the revised guidance for residential parking standards, as set out at appendix 2; and authorise its publication in order that it might become material to the planning process.

## Background

6. Supplementary planning guidance was issued as a draft for consultation in accord with Proposal 33 of the bridging Island Plan which states that the Minister for the Environment will develop supplementary planning guidance for sustainable transport zones (STZ) to:
  - establish standards for the provision of motorised and non-motorised vehicle parking:
    - for various forms of development, including residential to meet all users' needs, including those of visitors; and / or
    - for the zone, or any part of the zone.
  - set out any planning policy considerations and associated standards:
    - for the provision of associated facilities to support sustainable travel;
    - for the provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure or services;
    - or other low emission technologies, and / or
    - to advance other policies set out in the Sustainable Transport Policy or a related policy plan.

## Consultation

7. Consultation was undertaken between 06 March and 17 April 2023 for six weeks, with the consultation extended informally for a further two weeks for receipt of late comments.
  - the draft guidance was published online.
  - direct approaches for comment was also made to a range of stakeholders, with the offer of a specific meeting, if requested.
  - a public webinar was held on 28 March. Attendance was free, and admission secured through Eventbrite.
  - an evening meeting was held with the Association of Jersey Architects.
  - a webinar was held for States Members covering the same material.
  - consultation feedback was invited via an online survey or in writing, by email or letter.

## Consultation feedback: extent

8. 26 online surveys were completed. Of these, eight have requested that comments are not published.
9. 15 written submissions were received.
10. There were no 'late' comments.
11. Consultation feedback was received from a range of stakeholders including:
  - Jersey Electricity and JEVCo (EVie)
  - developers (Andium Homes, and States of Jersey Development Company);
  - planning consultants and architects (MS Planning, BDK, Waddington, Axis Mason and Godel Architects)
  - environmental groups (National Trust for Jersey; Grouville Community, Environment & Change)
  - interested members of the public

### Consultation feedback: detail and analysis

12. All comments have been collated, reviewed and analysed against the 14 questions posed in the online survey.
13. Where written submissions have been made, they have been disaggregated and assigned to the relevant part of the survey response.
14. In some cases, survey responses have been re-allocated against other questions, where the answers have more relevance.
15. Eight of the online survey participants have not given permission for their comments to be published. These are highlighted in grey: they will be removed before publication.
16. Appendix 1 provides the anonymised survey responses, together with a draft response to the issues raised.
17. The response includes an outline of the potential for changes to be made to the draft guidance, before adoption and publication. These are denoted as ‘changes’ in the response.
18. The key issues and themes, of which there are considered to be nine, have been identified and summarised below together with a considered response to the issues raised and proposed changes to the draft guidance, as follows:

Issue/theme	Substance	Proposed changes
1. Give greater emphasis to alternative sustainable transport provision, particularly shared transport options	i. There has been feedback from a number of agencies, but particularly JEVCo (EVie) about the potential use of POAs to deliver shared mobility options instead of on-site parking provision. ii. There has also been feedback that guidance should explicitly reference (and support) those circumstances where the provision of car parking space is very difficult (i.e. office conversions where there is no existing on-site parking provision).	3.1.1 Provide greater emphasis to potential for shared transport solutions in guidance, including delivery of off-site provision where it is accessible and in close proximity to residents of a development. 5.5.1 Provide explicit reference to the potential for some forms of development – such as office conversions -to be car free, and for contributions to other forms of off-site sustainable transport measures (such as shared transport solutions) to be supported.
2. There should be more of a transition between parts of the BUA and the countryside in ‘other areas STZ’.	There is clearly a difference in the level of services and accessibility between places such as Longueville, Five Oaks, St Brelade’s Bay and many of the parish centres; and other, more remote parts of the island’s countryside, in terms of access to local services and bus services, yet in the draft guidance, they are required to have the same level of parking provision.	Section 4 Define – as STZ5 - an additional sustainable transport zone to embrace those parts of the built-up area where (a) there are some local services; and/or (b) where there is a bus service frequency of between 2-6 buses/hour. STZ5 embraces those built-up areas, as defined in the bridging Island Plan as local centres including Bagot-Longueville; Five Oaks; Grands Vaux, Trinity Hill; Maufant; Sion; St Brelade’s Bay; and the parish centres of St Peter’s village; St Ouen’s village; St Mary’s village; St John’s

Issue/theme	Substance	Proposed changes
		<p>village; St Lawrence Church; and St Martin's village.</p> <p>This provides greater granularity between parts of the BUA and the countryside.</p> <p>Establish parking standards that provide a more graduated transition between STZs 5 and 6.</p> <p>STZ4 levels of provision reduced for 1- and 2- bed homes (to 0.5 and 0.75).</p> <p>STZ5 levels of provision at 0.75 per 1-b/ 1 per 2- and 3-b/ and 2 per 4+b)</p> <p>Retitle all sustainable transport zones: number them 1-6.</p>
<p>3. Clarify requirement for parking for people with disabilities.</p>	<p>The draft guidance states that car parking spaces adjacent to a home should be capable of being widened to allow disabled access.</p> <p>It also states that 10% of car parking should be required should be accessible to people with disabilities. It is not explicit whether this provision just relates to development of ten or more homes.</p>	<p>5.2 In accord with the STP mobility hierarchy, it is considered appropriate that the guidance is changed to clarify that a minimum of one car parking space should be provided that is accessible to people with disabilities in all development where at least one space is required.</p> <p>This means that all homes with just one space will need to meet the specification for a disabled car parking space (which is 1.2 m wider and longer).</p> <p>Larger development will need to provide at least 10% of car parking for people with disabilities.</p>
<p>4. EV charging infrastructure</p>	<p>i. The guidance should allow for the most efficient form of EVCP provision: the proposed form of provision of 20% active provision and 80% passive provision may not match supply/demand; and may result in the provision of unused kit. It also does not enable installation of most up-to-date kit, when required.</p> <p>ii. where EVCPs are installed, they should have smart functionality to reduce the requirement for enhancement of the electricity network.</p> <p>iii. Concern about fire risk and its severity from batteries used in EVs and e-bikes, particularly in covered parking spaces.</p>	<p>5.4 Remove the requirement for 20% active provision; and require all spaces to have passive provision (except where a home has more than one car parking space).</p> <p>5.4. Require EVCPs to have smart functionality.</p> <p>5.4. Change guidance to state that cycle parking should be provided with a chargepoint, to avoid the risk of batteries being charged in the home.</p> <p>Chargepoints should be provided in the ratio of one per home; and one per ten homes in larger developments.</p> <p>5.4 Where electric vehicle charging infrastructure is provided in covered parking spaces (for bikes or cars), encourage the provision of mitigation (in consultation with JFRS)</p>
<p>5. Specification of cycle parking</p>	<p>A number of representations sought greater flexibility in the type of cycle parking that might be permitted under the guidance, particularly those forms</p>	<p>Appendix 2A: Specification – cycle parking space.</p> <p>Add explicit reference that solutions requiring cycles to be lifted are not</p>

Issue/theme	Substance	Proposed changes
	that employ double-stacked racked parking solutions. These are obviously more space efficient.	supported as these are harder to use for many people and not always appropriate for e-bikes (which are heavier and bulkier).
6. Specification of motorcycle parking	A number of representations sought greater provision of motorcycle provision; and for this to grouped (rather than marked out as individual spaces): this is obviously more space efficient.	Appendix 2B: Specification – motorcycle parking space.  This has been amended to require at least one marked out space for people with disabilities, with the remainder being able to be provided as grouped space.
7. Cycle parking standards	A significant volume of comment was received to state that:  the cycle standards were excessive relative to other places; and the development of other cycling infrastructure in the island;  the standards were very ‘space-hungry’, particularly on the ground floor plane of buildings (this being compounded by the lack of supportive for ‘innovative’ forms of cycle parking provision, such as double-stacked racks)	Appendix 3A: Cycle parking standards  The standards sought in the draft guidance are, when compared with other jurisdictions where cycling as mode of travel and the provision of infrastructure is better developed than in Jersey (e.g. London), aspirational.  The standards have been revised (i.e. reduced from those in the draft guidance) to better reflect where Jersey is currently at in terms of a transition from where no cycle parking is required (under current guidance) to the introduction of new standards; and also recognising that the provision of dedicated infrastructure to support cycle use is still nascent.
8. Car parking standards	Concern that level of car parking for smaller units of accommodation, which might accommodate families, was not sufficient.	Appendix 3C: Car parking standards  Relative level of provision for 2-bed family homes increased in STZ2 (ToSH); and 3-bed family homes in STZ2 and 3 (ToSH and LQ).
9. Ease of use	Comment has been received that all elements of guidance should be clearly represented in the tables, for ease of reference e.g. reference to the need for all car parking requirements which result in part of one space being provided will be rounded down to the next whole number (except where the level of provision would result in less than one space).	Appendix 3C: Car parking standards  Add explicit reference to rounding-down; and minimum space provision.  Further consideration to be given to clearer and more explicit presentation of key elements of guidance.

19. These proposed changes have been made to the consultation draft of the guidance and an amended version of the guidance is provided at appendix 2.

### Relevant considerations

24. The Minister for the Environment is empowered to publish guidelines and policies under the auspices of Article 6 of the Planning and Building (Jersey) Law, where it accords with the island plan. The proposed guidance for revised residential parking standards accords with proposal 33 of the BIP.

25. The adoption and publication of guidance will ensure that it becomes material to the planning process. This is not considered to have any adverse resource implications and will provide applicants, developers, planners and decision-makers with revised tools to deliver development that better accords with policy objectives of the island plan and the Sustainable transport policy.

#### Communications

26. The adoption and publication of new supplementary planning guidance might be the subject of a news release.

27. Publication of the revised guidance, and the response to consultation, should be notified to those taking part in the consultation. Adoption of the revised guidance should be communicated directly to the development industry using established channels.

28. Internally, liaison is required with I&E (Regulation) and I&E (Transport and operations) to ensure that the requirements of the revised guidance are embedded within practice and procedures.

#### Appendices

1. Anonymised feedback and draft response
2. Revised guidance for residential parking standards

#### Copy list

1. Assistant Minister for the Environment
2. Tom Walker
3. Tim Pryor (Head of communications)
4. Mark Richardson (Private secretary)
5. Kelly Whitehead (Group director: Regulation)
6. Andrew Marx (Head of development and land)
7. Chris Jones (Principal planner: Development control)
8. Rob Hayward (Principal transportation planner)