

Table 5.1 Revised Parking Levels – Selected Local Authorities

County	District	Status of revisions	Any Max? Yes=1 No=2	Max as upper level of negotiating range? Yes=1 No=2	Max levels less than norm/min? (Stated or Estimate) Yes=1 No=2	Max for whole Area? Yes=1 No=2	All PNR Uses? Yes=1 No=2	Basis for reduced levels? Yes=1 No=2	Less for large scale? Yes=1 No/same=2 Reverse=3	No. of these criteria a met Max 6	Comment
BEDS	Bedford Boro	Adopted SPG	1	2	2	1	1	2	-	2	Maxima expressed as “requirements”. Reduced such only where developer meets conditions. Implies developer wishes to provide less.
	Luton	Adopted 97	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	-
BERKS	County	Adopted Design Guide	1	2	2	1	?	1	?	2-4	Commuted payments to provide off-site
	W & M’head	LP adopted?	1	2	2	1	1	1	3	3	Level increases with scale for B2-7,8 uses
	Wokingham	Draft	2	-	-	-	-	-	1-2	0-1	Max only for residential. On site parking limited in town centres
BUCKS	Wycombe	Adopted 95	1	2	2	1	1	2	3	2	Uses term “normal” rather than maximum. The aim is thus to remove excess parking, not restrict car use
CAMBS	S Cambs	Draft 1997	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	Continued minimum standards
CHESHIRE	Crewe & Nantwich	Adopted	1	1	2 but being revised	1	1	2	2	3	Interim: conversion of old minima to maxima
CORNWALL	Carrick	Adopted LP 1998	2	-	-	-	-	-	3	0	Some restriction in town centres for uses other than retail, leisure
DEVON	County	Draft	1	2	2	1	2	1	1 A1 Non-food only	2-3	“Parking provision assessment” suggested for uses not covered

											by max and min standards
DURHAM	County	Draft St Plan	1	Not clear	2	1	1	2	3	2	Contradictory statements
HERTS	Watford BC	Interim	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	Max also min, except in restraint areas
LANCS	County	Adopted SPG 97	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	Explicit Maxima

County	District	Status of revisions	Any Max? Yes=1 No=2	Max as upper level of negotiating range? Yes=1 No=2	Max levels less than norm/min? (Stated or Estimate) Yes=1 No=2	Max for whole Area? Yes=1 No=2	All PNR Uses? Yes=1 No=2	Basis for reduced levels? Yes=1 No=2	Less for large scale? Yes=1 No/same=2 Reverse=3	No. of these criteria met Max 6	Comment
	West Lance	Deposit	1	1	1	1	1	1	2	5	Also criteria for reducing operational.
LEICS	Leicester City	See Notts									
	MeltonMowbray	D/k	1	1	1	1	1	1	3	5	Zoned Min and Max
LINCS	Lincoln City	Adopted 98	1	2	2	2 city centre	1	2	2	1	Appears only city centre policy, with full standards elsewhere
NORFOLK	North Norfolk	Adopted 1998	2	-	-	-	-	-	-	0	
NORTHANTS	County	Adopted SP	1	2	?	1	?	1	?	At least 2	No details
NORTHUMB	County	Adopted 1996	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	Max also min. Lower max in centres
	Tynedale	Deposit	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	3	Max also min. Lower max in centres
NOTTS	County (East Midlands Joint Cttee on Parking)	Draft	1	2	1-2 (still high out of town)	1	2 (Employment only so far)	1	2	2-3	Reductions based on mode split & other data Out of town high levels still allowed
Joint Cttee Strategic Pl & Transport	City	97 local plan	1	2	1	1	2	1	2	3	Reductions based on mode split & other data. Out of town high levels still allowed
SHROPSHIRE	Shrewsbury	Adopted	1	1	2	1	1	1	3 (retail)	4	Zero PNR required in

	ABC										Shrewsbury loop
WILTS	Salisbury (County/District Transport Team)	Draft	1	2	2	1	1	1 (access zones)	3	3	Existing and target accessibility mapped
WORCS	W. City	Adopted	1	2	1	1	1	1	2-3	4	Commuted payments to provide off-site
N YORKS	Scarborough	Adopted 1998	1	2	2	1	1	1 (Town centre only)	3	2-3	Old min now max

UNITARY		Status of revisions	Any Max? Yes=1 No=2	Max as upper level of negotiating range? Yes=1 No=2	Max levels less than norm/min? (Stated or Estimate) Yes=1 No=2	Whole Area? Yes=1 No=2	All PNR Uses? Yes=1 No=2	Basis for reduced levels? Yes=1 No=2	Less for large scale? Yes=1 No/same=2 Reverse=3	No. of these criteria met Max 6	Comment
AVON Joint Unit, 4 new unitary authorities		Draft	1	Not clear	1	1	1	1	2	4	Reduced provision based on congestion and accessibility criteria. Also developer contributions geared to car use costs.
Isle of Wight		Draft UDP	1	Not clear	2	1	1	1 (zones)	2	3	Max is well below norm in inner 2 zones
Oldham MBC		Draft SPG	1	2	2	2	2	2	3	0	
Liverpool		Adopted	1	Not clear	2	2 city centre only	1	1	3	2-3	
Plymouth City		Adopted	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	Pre unitary info '96
South Tyneside		Adopted UDP	1	2	1	1	1	1	3	4	Max also min. But in centres developers allowed to provide 0% to 80% of max.
Wolverhampton		SPG adopted?	1	2	2	1	2	1	1	3	

Some authorities included where standards adopted or drafted post PPG13, but where maxima not included