

## Response from Stansted Parish Council to the proposed Heads of Terms for Lower Street Car Park

### A minimum of 64 and a maximum of 85 for the applicant's use

The indicative lay-out submitted with the draft Heads of Term shows the applicant's need as 50 spaces for a Health Centre and 14 for 14 apartments, making a total of 64 spaces. 50 spaces is presumably acceptable to the PCT.

**14 spaces** for two and three bed apartments, which, according to the Essex Parking Standards Guide and the standards recently adopted by UDC, would require two spaces per dwelling, making a total of 28 spaces, **is inadequate**.

The developer could have up to 85 spaces, so could increase the number of parking spaces for the apartments, but this would of course reduce the number of available public parking spaces.

### The applicant should provide at least 120 public spaces

On the submitted parking lay-out there are 151 public spaces shown, including pay and display, season ticket and disabled. There are 109 spaces at present so this is a gain of 42 in the car park, but as three will be lost on the street because of the pedestrian crossing, a gain of 39 to the community. If the developer were to have the full 85 spaces this would reduce to a gain of 21 in the car park. So the number of spaces available for the public would be between 130 and 151.

**So we question why the Heads of Terms only require "at least 120 spaces" when more could be achieved, and the lay-out shows 151.**

### Comments on the proposed lay-out

The parish council was originally told that the Health Centre spaces would only be available for visitors to the Health Centre, and to prevent use by others would have a barrier, which would require a token or card on exit. **It is difficult to see how this could be achieved on the indicative lay-out.**

The entrance and exit and the direction of travel is not clear from the plan. Will there for instance be an exit in the area where the coaches and lorries will turn? If not, how will this be discouraged?

**We ask please that the lay-out is scrutinised so that the Cabinet is clear how this car park will operate.** One way to achieve more spaces would be to remove the skate park. However, unless a suitable site is found elsewhere and new equipment is funded, **the parish council would strongly resist the loss of this popular community asset.**

It has been said that there is "significant spare capacity" in the car park at present. **This is not the case. Even in the winter when the Castle is closed it is sometimes difficult to find a space in the pay and display area.**

The development includes a large element of retail space, which will require parking. If the car parking provision is **inadequate this new retail facility and the existing retailers and local businesses will suffer**, as people will not spend time trying to find a parking space, but will go elsewhere.

The lay-out refers to short term parking spaces. It should be clarified how these will be operated.

**There is no provision for trolley parking bays**, which would be necessary in the event of a supermarket taking a retail unit, and given that most of the public parking will be at the far end of the car park, a considerable walk from the development.

### Future of car park

We request that the car park is monitored and if a year after the development is occupied there is evidence of insufficient car parking spaces then this should be remedied by the construction of a deck.

Also, the ratio of pay and display and season ticket parking spaces should be reviewed, and the pricing of the season tickets changed if it undercuts the cost of parking at the station car park,