

## **11. Development in Plymouth**

- 11.1 There is potential for significant development aimed at urbanisation, intensification, and regeneration of Plymouth and the surrounding area. It is hoped that this regeneration will attract inward investment, inward migration, and tourists to the City and to improve the standard of living for residents.
- 11.2 Transport will play a key part in facilitating and managing this growth. Investment and forward planning will be important. In addition the new developments provide a significant opportunity to deliver transport improvements. The Mackay Vision identifies transport improvements that will support the viability of a high quality public transport system.

### **Mackay Vision**

- 11.3 The Mackay Vision was commissioned by the Plymouth 2020 Partnership to provide a master plan to achieve the City's aspiration for growth in the Plymouth area and for the City to become an international City that fulfils its role as the Principal Urban Area for Devon and Cornwall. The impact of the Mackay Vision upon parking in the City was described in paragraphs 2.43 to 2.49.
- 11.4 The Mackay Vision aims to provide a strategy that will regenerate Plymouth City Centre and distribute the benefits throughout the City and wider area. The study identified the opportunity to use the City's waterfront status as a driver for development that, if properly planned, would lead the wider regeneration of the City region.
- 11.5 The master plan focuses upon regeneration and intensification that will see an increase in the number of dwellings within the City centre core and subsequent increase in population density. It recommends that increased density of development combined with taller buildings within the City centre will contribute to a more urban feel to the City's heart.
- 11.6 Most proposals are for mixed-use developments of which the lower levels would be designated for leisure purposes such as bars or restaurants residential dwellings above. Developments closer to the City centre would also incorporate offices.

### **Local Development Framework**

- 11.7 It is planned that the Local Development Framework (mentioned in paragraph 2.34) will be adopted in 2007. The LDF is a statutory plan developed by the City Council that will enable the Mackay Vision to become a reality. The LDF provides policies and strategies that aim to turn elements of the Mackay Vision into firm proposals that can be taken forward.

### **Residential Development**

- 11.8 Demographic assessment undertaken as part of the Plymouth Sub-Regional Study determined that there is demand for an additional 19,000 dwellings within the

Plymouth travel to work area (TTWA) between now and 2016. The assessment established that the additional demand is primarily associated with demographic, social and economical changes in the current population rather than with migration into the Plymouth TTWA. Inward migration is expected to account for less than 30% of additional demand compared with 70% of the additional demand across Devon and Cornwall.

- 11.9 Structure and local plans already provide for 15,500 dwellings to 2011 within the Plymouth TTWA. This represents 80% of the demand to 2016. Table 11.1 lists the planned provision of dwellings within the TTWA for each planning area over the period 2001 to 2011. The table also shows the number of additional dwellings (column three) that the urban capacity studies estimated could be provided in the period 2011 to 2016.

**Table 11.1 – Estimated Provision of Dwellings 2001 – 2016**

Planning Area	Planned No. Dwellings (2001 – 2011)	Urban Capacity Estimate (2011 – 2016)	Additional Provision (2011 – 2016) [Total]
Plymouth	6 100	2 400	8 500
South Hams part of TTWA	4 230	30	4 260
West Devon part of TTWA	870	0	870
Dartmoor National Park part of TTWA	300	30	330
Caradon part of TTWA	4000	105	4 105
<b>Plymouth TTWA</b>	<b>15 500</b>	<b>2 565</b>	<b>18 065</b>

- 11.10 If the urban capacity studies are considered to have provided a rational assessment of sustainable residential development, then 93% of the sub-regions housing demand will be provided by 2016. It is planned that almost 70% of this development will be provided within the Plymouth principal urban area at the following locations:
- ◆ 8500 dwellings within Plymouth;
    - Plymstock Quarry
    - Seaton Barracks
  - ◆ 4000 dwellings at the Sherford new community in South Hams.
  - ◆ 360 dwellings in Saltash;
  - ◆ 100 dwellings in Torpoint;
- 11.11 In order that new housing developments are sustainable, they must either be located close to existing employment areas or include new employment areas within them (i.e. mixed-use developments). The provision of local employment opportunities is an important means to reduce the length of journeys and make sustainable travel more viable.

## Retail Development

11.12 As part of the continuing regeneration of Plymouth, a number of developments that include retail units are planned. The most significant of these is the development of a major indoor shopping centre at Drake Circus on the eastern edge of the city centre core. The development is due to open in autumn 2006 and will provide a net gain in gross retail floor area of 26 000 m<sup>2</sup>. The shopping centre will also incorporate 1270 additional privately operated car parking spaces. Other development proposals that contain a significant amount of retail floor area include:

- ◆ Millbay;
- ◆ Colin Campbell Court;
- ◆ Bretonside; and
- ◆ City Centre Core

11.13 Planning Policy Guidance 13 states that the maximum number of parking spaces that should be provided at new retail developments can be estimated on the basis of the gross retail floor area. Table 11.2 presents the existing city centre gross retail floor area as calculated by Plymouth City Council and by Government.

11.14 Although the study area used by Government when calculating the gross retail floor area was fairly extensive and included the city centre core, the Barbican, parts of North Hill and parts of Union Street; the value calculated (225 750m<sup>2</sup>) was less than that resulting from the City Council's calculations for the City Centre core (238 500m<sup>2</sup>). It is thought that this discrepancy is due to incorrect assumptions made by the Government regarding the number of storeys that are used for retail purposes.

**Table 11.2 – Current City Centre Gross Retail Floor Area and Number Parking Spaces**

	[ A ] Gross Retail Floor Area (m <sup>2</sup> )	[ B ] Total No. of Off-street parking Spaces <sup>48</sup>	[ = A / B ] One Parking Space per
City Centre Core Retail Floor Area - PCC Strategic Planning Department	238500m <sup>2</sup>	5195	46m <sup>2</sup>
City Centre Retail Floor Area - Government	225750m <sup>2</sup>	5195	43m <sup>2</sup>

11.15 Table 11.2 shows that currently in the central area of Plymouth one parking space is provided for every 43m<sup>2</sup> to 46m<sup>2</sup> of gross retail floor area. The absolute maximum provision for non-food retail developments as set down in Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 (see paragraphs 2.12 to 2.17) and adopted by Plymouth City Council is one space for every 20m<sup>2</sup> of gross retail floor area. The provision in the city centre of one space for every 46m<sup>2</sup> therefore means only 44% of the maximum allowed is provided, representing a reduction from the maximum of 56%. This reflects the high levels of accessibility in the City centre.

<sup>48</sup> Includes private publicly available car parks (including Staples / Gala bingo car park at Charles Cross).

- 11.16 Table 11.3 shows two planned developments with figures for additional gross retail floor areas taken from the planning applications. Table 11.3 also includes columns to indicate the number of parking spaces that could be provided to service these developments.
- 11.17 The number of parking spaces is calculated twice. The number provided is first calculated on the basis that one space would be provided for every 46m<sup>2</sup> and then again to the maximum levels recommended in PPG13.

**Table 11.3 – Forecast Growth in Central Area Retail Floor Area and Demand for Additional Short Stay Parking Spaces**

Development	Additional Gross Retail Floor Area	No. Parking Spaces (PCC)	Maximum No. Parking Spaces (PPG13)
Drake Circus	26000m <sup>2</sup>	565	1300
Colin Campbell Court <sup>49</sup>	12000m <sup>2</sup>	261	600
<b>Total</b>	<b>38000</b>	<b>826</b>	<b>1900</b>

- 11.18 If the number of city centre parking spaces continues to be based upon a 56% reduction from PPG13 maximum standards, then the developments above would theoretically require 826 extra spaces to maintain this level. The Colin Campbell development does however, require the removal of the Council owned car park at this location, which contains 247 spaces, thus 1073 extra spaces would be needed in order to maintain the level. Since the Drake Circus development will incorporate 1270 spaces, 197 more spaces than needed will be provided city-wide if the Colin Campbell development proceeds (and 705 more if it does not). However, it should be taken into account that proposals for extra retail floor area as part of the Millbay / Stonehouse Area Action Plan would necessitate extra parking provision.

## Parking Standards

- 11.19 Parking standards form part of the Local Plan (referred to in paragraph 2.33). They are a tool that local authorities use to manage the number of parking spaces provided at new developments. They are one of the criteria that help local authorities to determine new planning applications and are also applied to applications for redevelopment of existing sites.

### Maximum Parking Standards

- 11.20 Studies have shown that the availability of car parking is a major influence on the means of transport that people choose for their journeys. In 2001 the Government published Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13: "Transport" (see paragraphs 2.12 to 2.17). In the guidance the Government defined the maximum levels of parking that should be provided at various classes of development. These national maximum parking standards are shown in Appendix A.

<sup>49</sup> An outline planning consent was granted in 2002 and the latest planning application proposes retail development with a floor area of 12000m<sup>2</sup>. Minimal parking provision (maximum 50 spaces) is proposed since the 1142 space Western Approach car park is adjacent.

- 11.21 The guidance also encourages local authorities to set more rigorous standards where they see this as appropriate: for instance at developments in highly accessible locations that can be easily reached on foot, by bicycle or by public transport. Parking standards provide a vital link between transportation and spatial planning policies. They can be used to achieve high levels of sustainability throughout an area. In order to do this they must take into account the expected demand from a development, the capacity of the local road network and the level of public transport accessibility.
- 11.22 Despite the focus upon accessibility and sustainability, PPG13 emphasises the need for a degree of consistency between neighbouring authorities if competition, based upon the supply of parking spaces, is to be avoided. To this end RPG 10 defines maximum parking standards that should be adopted by local authorities in the South West. RPG10 replicates the standards contained in PPG13 but with the addition of standards for hospitals and additional standards for some employment developments. RPG10 states very strongly that local authorities should not exceed the regional standards.
- 11.23 Like most other planning authorities in the region, Plymouth City Council has adopted the parking standards defined in RPG10. Very few authorities have adopted standards that would result in a greater number of parking spaces than would be provided with RPG10 standards.

### **Application of Parking Standards**

- 11.24 In order to establish a greater link between spatial planning, transport and accessibility, many authorities in the South West and throughout the UK apply more rigorous standards at accessible locations. In Plymouth, reductions in the number of parking spaces provided from the maximums contained in the Local Plan (1995 – 2011) are applied to some types of development in the “Central Area”. The “Central Area”, in the context of this study, is the part of the City protected by controlled parking zones with the “central area core” bounded by Royal Parade, Western Approach and Coburg Street (shaded green in Figure 3.2) and the “central area fringe” outside this (shaded orange in Figure 3.2). The following types of development are subject to more stringent standards:
- ◆ All shops, financial and professional services, food and drink outlets, assembly and leisure uses in the central “Core” and “Fringe” areas (Use Classes A1-3 / D2); and
  - ◆ Progressively more restrictive standards are applied at office developments within the central “Fringe” and central “Core” areas respectively (Use Class B1).
- 11.25 Plymouth does not apply more stringent standards to residential developments in the central area. Occupiers of new dwellings constructed within the controlled parking zones are, however, ineligible for resident permits.

## Problems

11.26 Consultation with the Development Consents Section within the City Council identified any problems or issues associated with the way in which parking standards are currently applied. Ultimately it was anticipated that by addressing the issues identified, a methodology for applying parking standards and obtaining developer contributions could be developed. The issues identified are outlined below:

- ◆ Policy contained within the Plymouth Local Plan uses a commuted payments system to obtain developer contributions<sup>50</sup>. The policy states that the value of the commuted payment is based upon the number of parking spaces that are not provided at a development. Discussions with officers has revealed that this is now rarely enforced, however the policy itself is no longer in keeping with sustainable development despite the fact that they strive to link the application of parking standards and developer contributions with accessibility and demand management.
- ◆ Although the principle of negotiating for reduced parking standards in the central area is sound, there are other parts of the City that are equally as accessible (i.e. Derriford, The A386, The George Junction etc) which also attract large numbers of trips.
- ◆ The lack of a clear policy defining how reductions from the maximum standards are calculated leads to inconsistent planning decisions, can prolong negotiations with developers and may in some cases lead to planning decisions that do not accord with the City Council's wider policies for sustainable development.

11.27 It is expected that a firm policy setting out a methodology for the application of reduced maximum parking standards and defining how developer contributions are calculated would:

- ◆ help to ensure that all planning decisions support the City Council's transportation and sustainable development policies;
- ◆ make planning decisions more consistent;
- ◆ simplify negotiations with developers; and
- ◆ improve the City Council's relationship with developers.

11.28 The following paragraphs describe the policies that have been adopted by other local authorities in the region and throughout the UK and which could be tailored to suit Plymouth.

### *Area Based Zonal Systems*

11.29 The most straightforward method for achieving reductions from maximum parking standards is to define zones within an authority area. This approach has been adopted in Plymouth and which Bristol, Poole and Worcester Councils also use.

11.30 Like Plymouth, Bristol City Council<sup>51</sup> has defined an 'Outer' zone and an 'Inner' zone in which more rigorous parking standards applied to certain types of development<sup>52</sup>.

---

<sup>50</sup> Legal agreements made under Section 106 of the Town and Country Act

<sup>51</sup> Ref: First Deposit Draft of the revised Local Plan (February 2003)

<sup>52</sup> B1 Offices, C1 Hotels, D1 Museums / Art Galleries, D2 Theatres / Cinemas

The outer zone characteristically has lower levels of public transport accessibility, which may mean that a higher number of parking spaces may be required in order that a site can be accessed. Higher accessibility contributions are usually sought for developments in the outer zone. However no formal methodology is defined.

- 11.31 Worcester City and Poole Borough Councils use similar systems in which three zones are defined<sup>53</sup>: Zone 1 being the City or town centre core. In Worcester, no additional parking is permitted at new development sites in the City Centre core and in Poole 36% of the maximum provision is allowed.
- 11.32 Less than a third of the maximum parking provision is permitted on the edge of Worcester City Centre (Zone 2) and between half and 9/10 of the full provision is permitted in other areas. Like Plymouth, Worcester City Council continues to use a system for obtaining developer contributions, which is based on a commuted payment mechanism in lieu of parking spaces. It does, however, accept that this method is out-dated and expects that the situation will be reviewed imminently.
- 11.33 Wycombe District Council uses a zonal system to determine how many parking spaces may be provided at a development but rather than commuted payments, uses a methodology based upon the number of trips generated by a site to calculate developer contributions. The District Council levies £210 for each trip. This figure was calculated by dividing the shortfall in LTP funding (2000 – 2005) for the district (£4 million) by the total number of trips that are forecast to be generated by sites allocated in the Local Plan (19,000 trips).
- 11.34 Although it provides a clear justification for seeking developer contributions this methodology would be difficult to use in practice. LTP allocations from Government vary each year depending on how successful an authority is in achieving targets and the levy would therefore need to be re-calculated each year. In addition, the methodology does not take into consideration development consents, which do not comply with the local plan.
- 11.35 The main benefit associated with area based zonal systems is their simplicity. There are, of course, several other benefits and dis-benefits associated with this method. These are presented in Table 11.4.

**Table 11.4 – Benefits and Dis-benefits of Parking Standards Based upon Area Based Zonal Systems**

Benefits	Dis-benefits
Simple to understand	Difficult to apply in authority areas with more than one focal point (hub)
Simple to work	Weak link to the accessibility of a development site
Zone boundaries will require only infrequent revision	Difficult to develop a complementary method for determining developer contributions

<sup>53</sup> Ref. Worcester City Council Parking Standards (October 1998)

Benefits	Dis-benefits
	Relatively course method of determining reductions from maximum standards

### *Site Accessibility Based Systems*

- 11.36 Other authorities in the UK have established methods directly linked to the accessibility of a site in order to achieve reductions from maximum standards. Each method requires that some assessment be made of a site's accessibility. The accessibility 'score' is then used to calculate the reduction from maximum values. The strong link to accessibility enables Council officers to present a very robust case for seeking reduced numbers of spaces.
- 11.37 North Somerset Council uses a relatively basic methodology for determining reductions from its maximum standards. Unlike Plymouth, North Somerset contains both urban and rural areas. Its accessibility methodology is designed to achieve reductions in the number of parking spaces provided in the urban areas. 30% reductions are sought in the parts of Weston-Super-Mare, which are within 400m of the railway station. In other parts of the town centre 20% reductions are sought and 10% everywhere else. Clevedon, Nailsea and Portishead are smaller, less accessible settlements in which the Council looks to achieve a 10% reduction from the maximum.
- 11.38 Hampshire also contains both urban and rural areas and seeks reductions from maximum values in accessible areas. The County Council bases its calculations upon a detailed public transport accessibility model<sup>54</sup>. The parameters that the model uses to determine public transport accessibility levels are as follows:
- ◆ bus stops within a 10 minute walk
  - ◆ railway stations within 15 minute walk
  - ◆ frequency of bus and train services at each stops or stations
  - ◆ average waiting times at the stop or station
  - ◆ average walking time based on 80 metres per minute
- 11.39 The model also uses an elasticity value, which represents the level of attractiveness of each of the services. This value takes into consideration the reliability of services and their relative attractiveness based upon documented research. The method for calculating developer contributions is currently under review. It is, however, expected that contributions will be based upon a set levy for every parking space and each forecast car trip rate. The value of the levies may be linked to any shortfall in LTP funding.
- 11.40 The London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham is an affluent urban district of London served well by buses, underground and railway services. The Council uses an innovative method of applying parking standards to large employment developments. In common with Hampshire, the methodology is based upon levels of public transport accessibility which are calculated on the distances from stations /

<sup>54</sup> Similar to Accession software.

stops, number of services (i.e. choice), frequency of services and reliability. Six levels of public transport accessibility are used.

11.41 Rather than reducing the number of parking spaces permitted at accessible developments, the Borough adopted a single parking standard for use throughout the borough and imposed limits upon the floor area that could be provided at inaccessible sites. Table 11.5 shows the plot ratios for each level of public transport accessibility. An example of the application of these standards is given in paragraph 11.42, below.

**Table 11.5 – Plot Ratio Standards: London Borough of Hammersmith and Fulham**

	Low		High			
<b>Public Transport Accessibility Level</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Maximum Permitted Plot Ratio</b>	0.5 : 1	0.8 : 1	1.1 : 1	1.4 : 1	1.7 : 1	2.0 : 1

11.42 Consider two sites, both with a plot (site) area of 10000m<sup>2</sup>. One site is relatively inaccessible and has a public transport accessibility score of one. The other site is highly accessible and has a public transport accessibility score of six. 17 parking spaces would be permitted at each site however at the first, inaccessible site, a gross floor area of 5000m<sup>2</sup> (=10000m<sup>2</sup> x 0.5) would be permitted and at the second a gross floor area of 20000m<sup>2</sup> (=10000m<sup>2</sup> x 2.0) would be permitted.

11.43 The effect of such a system is to allow more intensive use of sites that are more accessible by public transport. Developers are therefore encouraged to acquire accessible land rather than to develop areas that are less accessible by public transport. A further benefit of such a system is that developers are encouraged to contribute financially in order to improve public transport accessibility thereby allowing them to make more intensive use of land.

11.44 The main benefit associated with site accessibility based systems is that they provide an extremely robust link between planning and transport. There are, of course several other benefits and dis-benefits associated with this method. These are presented in Table 11.6.

**Table 11.6 – Benefits and Dis-benefits of Parking Standards Based upon Site Accessibility Based Systems**

<b>Benefits</b>	<b>Dis-benefits</b>
Strong link to land use planning	Can require specialist software
More easy to develop methods for obtaining developer contributions	Public transport accessibility levels constantly change
Doesn't require an authority area to be divided into zones	

Benefits	Dis-benefits
Level of detail used in the methodology to determine public transport accessibility can be varied to suit each authority	
Suitable for authority areas with more than one focal point (hub)	

### *Matrix Approach*

11.45 The benefit of using a matrix approach when calculating appropriate reductions from maximum parking standards is that they can be developed to be uniformly applicable to the whole of an authority area. Matrices can be developed that make account of:

- ◆ floor area;
- ◆ type of development;
- ◆ site accessibility; and
- ◆ capacity of local road network to accommodate additional traffic.

11.46 As well as requiring a methodology to assess site accessibility, typical applications of the matrix approach require authority areas to be zoned. Both Somerset County Council and Swindon Borough Council have adopted this approach. This is the method that is recommended for use in Plymouth. Table 11.7 sets out the proposed reductions to be applied to the council's maximum parking standards.

**Table 11.7 - Proposed Reductions from Maximum Parking Standards**

	ZONE				
	City Centre Core	Edge of Centre	Controlled Parking Zone	Derriford Area	Elsewhere
High Accessibility	>60%	40 - 50%	30 - 40%	30 - 40%	10 -20%
Medium accessibility	n/a	30 - 40%	20 - 30%	20 - 30%	10 - 20%
Low Accessibility	n/a	20 - 30%	10 - 20%	0 - 10%	0 - 10%

11.47 It is proposed that the City Council's accessibility model be used to determine how accessible a particular site is by public transport, and subsequently which band (high medium or low) the site should be classed as. Then, depending upon which zone the site was in the reduction from maximum standard could be calculated. A banded system would give developers a degree of flexibility whilst giving City Council officers clear guidance on which to base their negotiations.

11.48 In order that developers are not given a perverse incentive to maximise the provision of parking spaces provided at a site it is recommended that accessibility payments are either based on the number of parking spaces provided or on the number of car trips calculated to be generated by a development.