

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 DECEMBER 2009

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT - RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

Contact Officer: Dan Massey Tel No: 01962 848534

RECENT REFERENCES:

PHD 187 – ‘Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards’, February 2009

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY:

The Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), Winchester City Council Residential Parking Standards 2009 (Appendix 1) sets out the Council’s standards in respect of residential parking for the District. It supplements the adopted Winchester District Local Plan and will form part of the Local Development Framework (LDF).

The requirement for revised residential standards arises from Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) and the consequent withdrawal of that element from the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2002 by Hampshire County Council.

PPS3 puts the responsibility for developing residential parking standards with the Local Planning Authority, taking into account expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.

The revised residential standards have been developed taking into account statistical data from the 2001 Census and recent Government research into residential car parking. It should be noted that the non-residential parking standards remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and are contained within the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2002.

The preparation of the document has followed the consultation processes set down in the Regulations and the SPD has been amended following consideration of the responses received.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. That the Residential Parking Standards, as set out at Appendix 1 to the report, be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document.
2. That the Head of Access and Infrastructure, in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, be given delegated authority to make minor changes to the SPD prior to publication to correct any errors and for updating purposes.

CABINET (LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK) COMMITTEE

15 DECEMBER 2009

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT - RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

REPORT OF THE HEAD OF ACCESS AND INFRASTRUCTURE

DETAIL

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Government has revised its policy on residential parking standards with the publication of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 (Housing) in 2006. This now gives flexibility for levels of parking provision to be determined at a local level to reflect local circumstances. Winchester's parking standards (Local Plan Policy T4) at present are linked to the Hampshire County Council standards adopted in 2002.
- 1.2 The residential parking standards contained within the Hampshire Strategy and Standards 2002 have now been withdrawn by the County Council. It is therefore opportune for the City Council to review its own standards. The non-residential parking standards remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and are currently unchanged from those contained in the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2002
- 1.3 PPS3 requires that local planning authorities should develop residential parking policies taking account of expected car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.
- 1.4 In accordance with PPS3, the draft Supplementary Planning Document 'Winchester City Council Residential Parking Standards 2009' was prepared using research carried out by the Department for Communities and Local Government, together with data from the 2001 Census. In the draft SPD, new standards for residential parking were recommended, along with the methodology behind them.
- 1.5 The draft SPD moved away from imposing a site maximum for residential parking space, towards a more advisory and flexible approach, but one that seeks to match provision of car parking with the likely car ownership requirements of any development.
- 1.6 The level of parking required will be determined by local circumstances and whether the parking is allocated or shared/communal parking – shared parking facilities are a more flexible and efficient use of space.
- 1.7 The proposed standards seek to provide a minimum provision save where exceptional circumstances exist. The standards are aimed at meeting the needs of occupiers but without over provision. Where for planning reasons it is

proposed that a development should not meet these standards, this will only be acceptable where this is a consequence of other material reasons.

- 1.8 If parking is not provided to meet the likely levels of car ownership for new developments it is probable that cars will be parked in areas not designed for such purposes, such as grass verges and landscaped areas. There is evidence of these effects in newer housing developments where some occupiers and visitors are frustrated by an apparent shortage of parking spaces. Furthermore, such situations can also impact on surrounding areas and adjoining roads as new residents seek alternative parking spaces.

2 Consultation on the draft Residential Parking Standards SPD

- 2.1 The City Council is formulating its LDF Core Strategy. However in light of the new Government guidance it would not be appropriate that the new parking standards be adopted as part of this document as they would be too detailed. Therefore, a draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was prepared for the purposes of consultation.
- 2.2 Following approval of the draft SPD by Portfolio Holder Decision Notice in February 2009, the document was subject to a six week period of public consultation for which ended on 9 April 2009. Those involved have included statutory consultees as well as Elected Members, Parish Councils, local stakeholders and members of the development industry and their advisors. The consultation documents were also made available to the wider public via the Council's website and public notice of the consultation also went in the Hampshire Chronicle on 26 February 2009. A total of 8 responses were received during the consultation period.
- 2.3 A Statement of Consultation has been produced, as required by the relevant LDF Regulations (2008) and is attached at Appendix 2. It has not been necessary to undertake a sustainability appraisal of the SPD, as this requirement has been removed from the latest Regulations.
- 2.4 The Consultation Responses and the Council's consideration of these are presented at Appendix 3. Of the 8 responses received, two were identical and these have been analysed and presented together. The draft SPD and proposed residential parking standards were generally well received, and the majority of comments were minor, but constructive and have assisted in providing further clarity to the document and proposed standards. As a result a number of minor textual alterations to the document have been included in the SPD as indicated in Appendix 3. A consultation response was also received from the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access, and following discussions with the Portfolio Holder further minor changes were made to the draft SPD to clarify the document and its policies.

3 Conclusion

- 3.1 No major issues have come forward during the consultation on the draft SPD and some amendments have been made to reflect a number of suggestions by consultees. The Residential Parking Standards SPD is an essential planning tool and its adoption is recommended.

OTHER CONSIDERATIONS:

4 SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITY STRATEGY AND CORPORATE BUSINESS PLAN (RELEVANCE TO):

- 4.1 The adoption of the SPD will contribute to the 'High Quality Environment' aims of the Council, particularly with regard to promoting the public realm.

5 RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

- 5.1 The publication of the SPD has been undertaken within existing resources, there are no direct financial implications arising from the recommendations.

6 RISK ASSESSMENT

- 6.1 New residential standards are vital for providing guidance for developers to ensure well designed developments which can accommodate a sensible provision for expected car ownership demands and casual/visitor parking so minimising overspill parking and associated highway safety and amenity problems. If the SPD is not adopted, the principal risk is that this would significantly undermine the ability to exercise any form of control over parking provision in respect of future residential developments.

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS:

None

APPENDICES:

Appendix 1: Winchester City Council – Supplementary Planning Document:
Residential Parking Standards 2009

Appendix 2: Statement of Consultation

Appendix 3: Consultation Responses

Winchester City Council

Supplementary Planning Document

RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

December 2009

CONTENTS

POLICY SUMMARY	2
1.0 INTRODUCTION & GENERAL PRINCIPLES	3
2.0 THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT	4
3.0 THE NEW PARKING STANDARDS	5
Sub-divisions of Residential Properties	7
Visitor Parking	8
Garages	8
Developments in Controlled Parking Zones	9
Winchester Town Centre	9
Cycle Parking	9
4.0 DESIGN AND LAYOUT CONSIDERATIONS	10

TABLES

Table 1	Measured and Anticipated Car Ownership per Household
Table 2	Car Parking Standards for Residential Developments
Table 3	Cycle Parking Standards for Residential Development

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	Car Ownership by Household for all Wards in Winchester District (2001)
Appendix 2:	Predicted Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2016)

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

POLICY SUMMARY

- Policy 1:** Parking is to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in this document.
- Policy 2:** Where a development does not provide for the anticipated level of car ownership, the developers are expected to demonstrate that this is an exceptional and legitimate consequence of other material considerations.
- Policy 3:** Where a development results in the sub-division of existing properties, car parking is to be provided to meet the demands of all of the units.
- Policy 4:** A development will be expected to safely accommodate the parking needs of visitors to the site.
- Policy 5:** Where garages are included within a development, due consideration will be made on a site by site basis whether they will count towards the overall parking requirement of the site.
- Policy 6:** When any development takes place within a controlled parking zone, no additional parking permits will be available.
- Policy 7:** In the Winchester Town Controlled Parking Zone, as an area of high accessibility, car parking may be provided to a lower standard than elsewhere in the district. Each development will be negotiated on an individual basis.
- Policy 8:** All new developments must provide appropriately designed and located cycle parking that meets the required standards.
- Policy 9:** All new developments must consider a number of design issues in the provision of parking on the site. Parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- 1.1 This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out the parking standards for residential development.
- 1.2 The requirement for revised residential parking standards arises from the Government's publication of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3)¹ in 2006 and the consequent withdrawal in March 2008 of that element from the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards (2002) by Hampshire County Council. PPS3 puts the responsibility for developing residential parking standards with the Local Planning Authority. PPS3 rescinded all of Planning Policy Guidance Note: 3 Housing (2000) and part of PPG13 Transport (2001) which required local planning authorities to set maximum parking standards in relation to housing and now gives flexibility for levels of parking provision to be determined at a local level to reflect local circumstances
- 1.3 On adoption these will supplement the Winchester District Local Plan Review's (Adopted 2006) Policy T4, and will apply to new residential development, and redevelopment and changes of use for residential purposes. It should be noted that the non-residential parking standards remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and are contained within the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards.
- 1.4 Car parking and its location has an impact upon the quality of the urban environment – how it looks, how it functions and safety. The availability and convenience of parking at the destination of the trip can have a real effect on the choices people make regarding travel. Policies within the current Local Plan seek to use parking restraint to manage the demand for car travel and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of travel, particularly public transport, walking and cycling, but whilst much of the urban area Winchester is well served by public transport and is easily accessible by walking or cycling, the same does not apply across the remainder of the District.
- 1.5 The publication of Manual for Streets² in 2007 highlighted how accommodating parked vehicles is a key function of many streets, especially in residential areas. The level of provision of parking and its location has influences on the appearance and form of a development. Manual for Streets advises providing car parking at residential developments at realistic, but not excessive levels, including parking on-street where appropriate.
- 1.6 Recent research by CABE³ has found that car parking remains a significant issue for residents and house buyers; many feel that designs for new developments should accommodate anticipated levels of parking. Attempts to curb car ownership through restricting parking were considered unrealistic, and had little impact on the number of cars a household would require and acquire.
- 1.7 The experience in residential areas has been that rather than encouraging modal shift away from car ownership, restrictive parking standards have simply intensified the demand for any available on-street parking.

- 1.8 Research carried out by consultants WSP on behalf of Department of Communities and Local Government on Residential Car Parking⁴ concluded that dwelling size and type are major factors in determining the levels of car ownership. The research also showed that the allocation of spaces to individual dwellings rather than shared or communal provision can have an adverse impact upon the efficiency of car parking provision and use.
- 1.9 The residential standards in this document have been developed taking into account statistical data from the 2001 Census, and recent Government research into residential car parking.
- 1.10 Following approval of the draft SPD by Portfolio Holder Decision Notice in February 2009, the document was subject to a six week period of public consultation for which ended on 9 April 2009. Those involved have included statutory consultees as well as Elected Members, Parish Councils, local stakeholders and members of the development industry and their advisors. The consultation documents were also made available to the wider public via the Council's website and a public notice of the consultation also went in the Hampshire Chronicle on the 26th February 2009. A total of 8 responses were received during the consultation period
- 1.11 The consultation responses were considered by Winchester City Council's Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee on 15th December 2009.

2.0 THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT

- 2.1 The geography of Winchester District shows a classic contrast between urban town and rural areas.
- 2.2 In Winchester town the existing street layout in some respects dictates the format and provision of car parking. Much of the town centre is based around a dense network of terraced streets built before the rise of mass private car ownership. With little or no parking on-site residents are forced to park on-street. This further narrows the street scene, especially with parking on both sides of the road. In many areas there is a mismatch between the desire to own a car and the ability to park it close to the place of residence. To manage parking, resident parking zones have been introduced in parts of the city, but several of these are over subscribed for the capacity of the roads.
- 2.3 In contrast much of the remainder of the District is very rural without the space constraints on car parking, but also lacking the public transport and sustainable travel infrastructure that would offer alternative travel modes. In addition, few of the towns and villages in the District can offer a sufficiently diverse range of retail, employment, health and leisure facilities to encourage more 'local' trips that could avoid the need to travel by car.
- 2.4 The 2001 census⁵ reveals that for all of Winchester District there were 61,868 vehicles and 43,132 households, giving an average of 1.43 cars per household, which is well above the national average of 1.11 cars per

household. At that time 16% of households in the Winchester District did not have access to a car.

- 2.5 Further analysis of the 2001 Census data, as detailed in Appendix 1: Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2001) does show that car ownership in some areas is lower than in others. This level of low car ownership is confined to the six Winchester Town Wards, where the average ownership is just over one car per household.
- 2.6 To reflect the measured differences in car ownership the car parking standards have been weighted to create average required standards across the district, excluding the Winchester Town wards. Apart from that factor the variations across the non-town wards are not considered significant to the extent as to suggest that different parking standards should be developed for the different wards outside of Winchester Town.
- 2.7 Accessibility to public transport is not considered to be a factor in establishing appropriate parking provision in future residential development, though where high levels of accessibility are available it may be acceptable to provide reduced levels of parking from the standards set, but the developer will be expected to demonstrate that a lesser standard is appropriate in each case.

3.0 THE NEW PARKING STANDARDS

Policy 1: Parking is to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in this document.

- 3.1 The proposed standards seek to provide a minimum provision to meet the needs of the development save where exceptional circumstances exist. The standards are aimed at meeting the needs of occupiers but without over provision. Where for planning reasons it is proposed that a development should not meet these standards, this will only be acceptable where this is a consequence of other material reasons.
- 3.2 If parking is not provided to meet the likely levels of car ownership for new developments it is probable that cars will be parked in areas not designed for such purposes, such as grass verges and landscaped areas. There is evidence of these effects in newer housing developments where some occupiers and visitors are frustrated by an apparent shortage of parking spaces. Such situations can impact on surrounding areas and adjoining roads as new residents seek alternative parking spaces, potentially leading to road safety issues caused by obstructive and inconsiderate parking.
- 3.3 The parking standards have been developed to reflect and cater for anticipated levels of car ownership. The base point is the known level of car ownership across the District as measured in the 2001 Census and shown in relation to dwelling size. It is important to make some allowance for anticipated increases in car ownership, using nationally developed TEMPRO⁶ growth factors we can anticipate that car ownership is likely to

increase by 12% between 2001 and 2016. The measured and anticipated level of car ownership, excluding Winchester town is shown on Table 1.

Table 1: Measured and Anticipated Car Ownership per Household

	Measured and Anticipated Car Ownership per Household in Winchester District, excluding town wards			
	2001		2016 allowing for growth	
Dwelling Size	Car ownership for all households	Car ownership for all car-owning households	Car ownership for all households	Car ownership for all car-owning households
1 Bed ^a	0.7	1.3	0.8	1.5
2 Bed	1.1	1.4	1.2	1.6
3 Bed	1.5	1.7	1.7	1.9
4+ Bed	2.1	2.2	2.4	2.4

3.4 If a development is to provide parking that is allocated to individual dwellings, then we need to assume that each of those dwellings could attain the higher levels of car ownership indicated, whereas if parking is largely to be available on a shared or communal basis we can allow for the fact that a proportion of households will not have a car, therefore the overall provision of parking for a development can be reduced and the lower standards used. Therefore, from the anticipated car ownership levels shown in the last two columns of Table 1, the required parking standards to accommodate those levels of ownership are determined, and are shown on Table 2.

Table 2: Car Parking Standards for Residential Developments

Dwelling Size	Parking spaces required per dwelling	
	Shared / Communal Parking spaces	Allocated Parking spaces
1 Bed	1	1.5 ^b
2 Bed	1.5	2
3 Bed	2	2
4+ Bed	2.5	3

3.5 Table 2 shows the required parking standards in Winchester District according to dwelling size and whether the parking is provided on an allocated or shared basis. As research referred to earlier has indicated,

^a In Winchester District only 50% of small (1-4 habitable rooms) households are car owning households –the overall level of car ownership for small households was 0.6 cars per household.

^b One allocated parking space to each unit and 1 parking space per two units for use flexibly.

shared parking facilities are a more flexible and efficient use of available space and accordingly enable a reduced number of spaces to be provided to meet the same demand. It would also be possible to allow the combination of allocated and shared parking provision at new developments

- 3.6 Developers are expected to demonstrate that the parking provided is sufficient to meet the needs of the occupiers; developers are expected to calculate the relevant parking provision required for their development using Table 2 and then compare this result against the Predicted Car Ownership level for the relevant ward in Winchester District (2016) as shown in Appendix 2. Developers must demonstrate that the provided level of car parking is sufficient to meet the anticipated needs of the site. Where the required parking is calculated as a non-whole number then the required provision must be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Policy 2: Where a development does not provide for the anticipated level of car ownership, the developers are expected to demonstrate that this is an exceptional and legitimate consequence of other material considerations.

- 3.7 Where it is proposed that a development provide a significantly different level of parking than the anticipated level of car ownership would indicate (whether higher or lower), it would need to be demonstrated that this is a legitimate consequence of other material considerations. These might include the need to maintain an active ground floor frontage, conservation area considerations, the availability of alternative parking facilities or urban design issues, including the physical constraints of the site. However, it would not be acceptable to provide parking below the appropriate standard where this would be likely to be prejudicial to highway safety.
- 3.8 Furthermore, development with less than the expected level of parking provision may be acceptable if accompanied by suitable evidence which justifies the level of parking provided. Factors might include proximity to bus and train services, cycle routes, availability of on-street or off-street public parking close by, tenure of prospective residents, proximity to local services and/or exceptional provision within the development to facilitate and encourage more sustainable transport choices e.g. car clubs.

3.9 Sub-divisions of Residential Properties

Policy 3: Where a development results in the sub-division of existing properties, car parking is to be provided to meet the demands of all of the units.

- 3.10 Conversions of dwellings into flats generally intensify the use of the property and can increase demand for parking because of the greater number of adult occupants living in the property. There may also be a greater demand for visitor parking than if it were in single household occupation. For sub-divisions of houses into flats the standards will be as per the Residential Parking Standards set out in Table 2 of this document. Due consideration

should be made if the development is located within a controlled parking zone (see Section 3.18).

3.11 Visitor Parking

Policy 4: A development will be expected to safely accommodate the parking needs of visitors to the site.

3.12 Additional provision will normally be required for visitor parking; such spaces are in addition to the requirements for residents parking. Manual for Streets recommends that visitors parking generally be provided on-street or in additional capacity in unallocated parking areas. Where it can be demonstrated that there is available space in public off-street parking and on-street facilities the need for additional visitor parking can be ignored.

3.13 Whilst there are times, such as evenings and weekends, when residents are likely to receive significant numbers of visitors in cars, this demand can to some degree be offset by other residents being away at the same time. This balancing effect is most significant when a high proportion of parking spaces are unallocated (and so be available to both visitors and residents). Research^{4,7,8} suggests that no special provision need be made for visitors where at least half of the parking provision associated with a development is unallocated, in all other circumstances an extra 0.2 spaces per dwelling (or 20% overall) are needed to cope with additional demand generated by visitors.

3.14 Garages

Policy 5: Where garages are included within a development, due consideration will be made on a site by site basis whether they will count towards the overall parking requirement of the site.

3.15 Research² has demonstrated that Garages are used for many purposes and less than one half of all garages are used to park a car, many others are used for storage or have been converted to provide additional accommodation.

3.16 If garages are to be incorporated within the design of a residential development then Manual for Streets recommends that the following is taken into account to determine whether they count towards the parking requirement for a development:

- the availability of other spaces, including on-street parking – where this is limited, residents are more likely to park in their garages;
- the availability of separate cycle parking and general storage capacity – garages are often used for storing bicycles and other household items; and
- the size of the garage – larger garages can be used for both storage and car parking, a minimum size of 6m by 3 m is required.

3.17 The assessment of whether garages will count towards the overall parking requirement of a development will be done on a scheme-by-scheme basis. Car ports are unlikely to be used for storage and will therefore count towards parking provision. Where garages are counted towards the provision of car parking, then planning conditions will be applied to retain their use for the intended purpose.

3.18 Developments in Controlled Parking Zones

Policy 6: When any development takes place within a controlled parking zone, no additional parking permits will be available.

3.19 The Council has already adopted the policy that when new and redevelopment for housing take place in one of the Districts controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's), the number of permits available for the new occupiers of the development will not exceed the allocation permitted for the site prior to the redevelopment of the site. (*E.g. If one dwelling that could have had four permits is replaced by six dwellings, then four permits would be available for the new occupiers*)

3.20 In all such circumstances occupiers will not be prevented from purchasing season tickets for the Council's off-street car parks at the standard prices.

3.21 Winchester Town Centre

Policy 7: In the Winchester Town Controlled Parking Zone, as an area of high accessibility, car parking may be provided to a lower standard than elsewhere in the district. Each development will be negotiated on an individual basis.

3.22 Winchester town centre is the most accessible area in the District with regard to public transport services and local facilities. It has the lowest car ownership in the District, it is well serviced by public off-street parking provision and most of the streets are controlled by waiting restrictions and controlled parking zones. It is therefore considered that, within the Winchester town controlled parking zone, parking can be provided to a lower standard than specified in Table 2. Such standards are to be negotiated on a scheme by scheme basis and such flexibility will allow creative schemes to come forward as part of a development. The developer will still be required to demonstrate why their proposed level of parking will be acceptable and to take into account all other sections within this document.

3.23 Cycle Parking

Policy 8: All new developments must provide appropriately designed and located cycle parking that meets the required standards.

3.24 All new development must make sure that adequate secure and accessible cycle parking is provided to meet the following minimum standards for long and short stay cycle parking. These have been adopted from the Hampshire County Council Parking Strategy and Standards 2002.

Table 3: Cycle Parking Standards for Residential Development

Dwelling Size	Long Stay	Short Stay
1 Bed	1 space per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
2 Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
3 Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
4+ Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit

- 3.25 The provision of long stay cycle parking should be in the form of secure, weatherproof facilities. For flats and similar developments the provision of individual cycle stores or lockers that are integral to the building should be the aim. For houses, the provision of a suitable size garage (6m x 3m) can provide sufficient space for a vehicle and cycle parking. Houses without garages should provide a garden shed, which should be constructed so that a cycle hoop or security anchor can be secured to the wall. Facilities in all cases should provide security for the whole bicycle, including accessories.
- 3.26 It is recommended that cycle stores serving blocks of flats, are located within the building and accessed from the entrance foyer. External cycle stores should be as close to a building entrance as possible. It is essential that communal cycle stores be fitted from the outset with cycle lockers. In the case of the smallest stores 'security anchors' or hoops can be fixed to the walls. In the case of communal stores each cycle will require a 1m² of space.
- 3.27 Short stay parking needs to accommodate cycle parking for periods of up to half a day. Security is required for the cycle frame and at least one wheel. Weather protection is desirable. Parking should be located as close to the trip destination as possible. It should be overlooked by adjacent development or on well used pedestrian routes to minimise risks of theft or vandalism.

4.0 DESIGN AND LAYOUT CONSIDERATIONS

Policy 9: All new developments must consider a number of design issues in the provision of parking on the site. Parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment.

- 4.1 PPS3¹ advocates 'a design led approach to the provision of car-parking space, which is well-integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly.'
- 4.2 The design and provision of parking spaces in some developments has not in the past made best use of the level of on-site parking provided. This is apparent in some higher density housing schemes where parking is located in areas away from the street frontage, such as rear courtyard parking, and

appears to lead to indiscriminate on-street parking and no obvious parking areas for visitors, raising issues of highway safety and residents' amenity.

- 4.3 The parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment ¹¹, as appropriate to the scale of the development. The allocation of car parking spaces must be detailed and clearly indicated on submitted plans. Shared parking facilities must remain un-allocated to maintain flexibility and efficiency.
- 4.4 A range of documents ^{9,10} including 'Manual for Streets²' and 'Car Parking – What Works Where⁷' provide considerable information on the provision, design and layout of parking spaces. Developers are encouraged to consider such publications and incorporate their findings and ideas in their developments. Transport and Access statements submitted in support of residential developments should detail how such considerations have been incorporated into the design. In some circumstances the need for good design may influence the provision and layout of parking spaces.
- 4.5 The following key principles, adapted from 'Car Parking: 'What Works Where'', should be followed when designing housing layouts and providing car parking:
- The quality and design of the street is paramount.
 - There is no single best solution to parking provision. A combination of on plot, off plot and on street may be the best solution according to location, topography and the market.
 - On-street parking is efficient in land use terms, easily understandable and can increase vitality, activity and safety in the street, if properly designed into a development scheme.
 - Parking should not be placed within a block to the rear of properties, until on street and frontage parking has been fully considered – rear courtyards should support on-street parking, not replace it.
 - Car parking needs to be designed with security in mind.
 - Consider the needs of visitor and disabled parking.
 - Provide secure and desirable cycle parking as part of all parking solutions.
- 4.6 When parking courts are proposed they should be overlooked by and easily accessible from dwellings. Particular care should be taken in the design of boundaries between garage courts and garden areas. A good design principle is that they should be visually permeable.
- 4.7 The layout of car parking is important to the quality of a housing development. Recommended parking bay dimensions are 2.4 by 4.8m for perpendicular parking and 2.0m by 6.0m for parallel parking. Where a parking bay is provided in front of a garage an additional 1.0m bay length is required to avoid overhang of footpaths and footways.

Bibliography

1. PPS3 Housing November 2006
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pps3housing>
2. Manual for Streets: Department for Transport March 2007
<http://www.manualforstreets.org.uk/>
3. CABE – <http://www.cabe.org.uk>
4. Residential Car Parking Research: DCLG May 2007
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/residentialcarparking>
5. <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/census2001.asp>
6. TEMPRO: Department of Transport forecasting programme
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/economics/software/tempro/>
7. Car Parking: What Works Where: English Partnerships 2006
<http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk/publications.htm#bestpractice>
8. Noble and Jenks (1996) Parking: Demand and Provision in Private Sector Housing Development published by Oxford School of Architecture, Oxford Brookes University
9. Better Place to Live: DTLR and CABE 2000
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/betterplaces>
10. Urban Design Compendium: English Partnerships 2000
<http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk/urbandesign.htm>
11. Guidance on Transport Assessment: Department for Transport 3/2007
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/transportassessments/guidanceonta>
12. Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards: Hampshire County Council 2002
<http://www.hants.gov.uk/carparking/standards.html>

Appendix 1: Car Ownership by Household for all Wards in Winchester District (2001)

Ward	Average No. of cars per Household	Percentage of Households			
		With no cars	With one car	With two cars	with three or more cars
Bishops Waltham	1.52	13%	38%	37%	12%
Boarhunt and Southwick	1.63	10%	37%	40%	13%
Cheriton and Bishops Sutton	1.78	6%	34%	42%	18%
Colden Common and Twyford	1.51	11%	40%	39%	10%
Compton and Otterbourne	1.74	8%	32%	43%	16%
Denmead	1.60	10%	35%	43%	12%
Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon	1.73	9%	32%	44%	15%
Itchen Valley	1.75	6%	37%	41%	16%
Kings Worthy	1.48	12%	40%	38%	10%
Littleton and Harestock	1.48	10%	43%	37%	9%
Olivers Battery and Badger Farm	1.41	10%	50%	32%	8%
Owslebury and Curdrige	1.82	9%	30%	42%	19%
Shedfield	1.76	7%	32%	44%	16%
Sparsholt	1.70	8%	37%	38%	16%
St Barnabas	1.26	20%	43%	29%	8%
St Bartholomew	0.89	36%	43%	18%	4%
St John and All Saints	0.97	31%	45%	19%	4%
St Luke	1.06	29%	42%	23%	6%
St Michael	1.10	26%	45%	24%	5%
St Paul	1.27	17%	46%	30%	6%
Swanmore and Newtown	1.88	7%	26%	48%	19%
The Alresfords	1.49	14%	39%	36%	11%
Upper Meon Valley	1.69	9%	34%	41%	15%
Whiteley	1.68	2%	39%	50%	9%
Wickham	1.44	17%	40%	31%	12%
Wonston and Micheldever	1.65	8%	36%	43%	13%

Appendix 2: Car Ownership by Household for all Wards in Winchester District (2016)

Ward	Expected number of cars per Household
Bishops Waltham	1.70
Boarhunt and Southwick	1.83
Cheriton and Bishops Sutton	1.99
Colden Common and Twyford	1.69
Compton and Otterbourne	1.94
Denmead	1.79
Droxford, Soberton and Hambleton	1.94
Itchen Valley	1.96
Kings Worthy	1.65
Littleton and Harestock	1.66
Olivers Battery and Badger Farm	1.58
Owslebury and Curdrige	2.03
Shedfield	1.97
Sparsholt	1.90
St Barnabas	1.41
St Bartholomew	1.00
St John and All Saints	1.09
St Luke	1.19
St Michael	1.23
St Paul	1.43
Swanmore and Newtown	2.11
The Alresfords	1.66
Upper Meon Valley	1.89
Whiteley	1.89
Wickham	1.62
Wonston and Micheldever	1.85

Statement of Consultation

Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards

This is Appendix 2 to the report to Winchester City Council's Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee (CAB 1945 (LDF)) seeking adoption of the draft Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards.

Following approval of the draft SPD by Portfolio Holder Decision Notice in February 2009, the document was subject to a six week period of public consultation for which ended on 9 April 2009. Those involved have included statutory consultees as well as Elected Members, Parish Councils, local stakeholders and members of the development industry and their advisors. The consultation documents were also made available to the wider public via the Council's website. A public notice of the consultation also went in the Hampshire Chronicle on 26 February 2009. A total of 8 responses were received during the consultation period

The consultation responses and the Council's consideration of these are summarised at Appendix 3 to the report to Winchester City Council's Cabinet (Local Development Framework) Committee seeking adoption of the draft (Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards, CAB 1945 (LDF)). Of the 8 responses received two were identical and these have been analysed and presented together.

List of Consultees

All Winchester City Council Councillors	calfordseaden
All Parish Councils in Winchester District	Caris Architecture Ltd
Environment Agency	Chalkbank Estates
Government Office for the South East	Chaplin Farrant Wiltshire Ltd
Highways Agency	Charles Planning Associates Limited
Hampshire County Council	Charles Planning Associates Limited
English Heritage	Chris Carter RIBA (Winchester)
Natural England	Cluttons LLP
A R Design Studio	Daniel Forshaw Design And Conservation Architects
A. E. J. P. Surveyors Ltd	Design Engine
Adams Hendry Consulting Ltd	Gareth Davies Architectural Design Solutions
Alexander Design	Genesis Design Studio Ltd
Apecs Ltd	Giles Wheeler-Bennett
Architecture PLB	Goadsby
architecture3sixty	Graeme Stevenson Architects
Aventa Architects	Graham Ash Architects
Bays Curry McCowen (BCM)	Guion & Brown Ltd
Bosinney Architects	Haddow Partnership
Bryan Jezeph Consultancy	Househam Henderson
Building Design Partnership	Huw Thomas Associates
C H Design Partnership	

James Lunn-Rockliffe
Jerry Davies Planning Consultancy
John Dowling Chartered Architect
Leo Mulkerns Architects Ltd
Macallan Penfold Architects
Mapledean Developments Ltd
Martin Andrews Architects
Masser Architects
Michael Warren Associates Ltd
Morse Webb Ltd
Owen Davies Architects
Parnell Design Partnership LLP
Perkins Ogden Architects Limited
Pro-Vision Planning & Design
Radley House Partnership
RIBArchitects
Rita Sennik Architects
Robert Adam Architects Ltd
Roger Ward Building & Design
Seymour and Bainbridge Architects
Shawyers Ltd
Snug Projects Ltd

Southern Planning Practice Ltd
Stephens Cox Associates Ltd
Studio Four Architects
The Home Shop
TKL ArchitectsLLP
TS Design Group
White Young Green Planning
Witcher Crawford
Upton McGougan
Giffords
Arups
Atkins
Savills
RPS Group
Turley Associates
Richard Parker
Allan Burns
David Mason
Robert Tutton
WSP.
Scott Wilson Ltd
Mott MacDonald

Consultation Responses

Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards

Consultee	Comment	Response	Recommended Change
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>The expected 2016 car ownership for each number of bedrooms in Table 1 is identical to the standards for shared spaces in Table 2. This is therefore the <u>average</u> that is expected across all developments in the district in the plan period. In a large development the average will be close to that. Consistent with the district average, in a development with only 2 shared spaces they might both be owned by a household with 2 or 3 cars or households with no cars</p> <p>The standards have been set using averages instead of that which will result in say 90% of the expected car parking to be on site and thus a maximum of 10% on the road. Table 1 data illustrates the problem. The ownership for all car owning 1-bed households is 1.5. To achieve this average and assuming there were negligible numbers of owners of 3 cars, then 50% would have to own one car and the other 50% two. This is a vivid illustration of a fundamental flaw that can only be overcome with higher standards for small sites. It is noted that the proposed standards are not very dis-similar to the current ones and also that street parking is a very common problem around many recent high density developments</p>	<p>The previous parking standards were ‘maximum’ parking standards, and in many circumstances developers were able to provide much lower levels of parking without risk of refusal of their planning application. As a consequence some developments in recent years have been permitted with less than the desirable levels of parking and have subsequently created problems with overspill parking.</p> <p>The proposed standards now seek to ensure that development actually complies with the anticipated demand for parking spaces.</p> <p>Household size and occupancy changes over time and therefore we can only use averages to determine the most likely ‘average’ parking requirements. To require each house hold to provide parking spaces to the highest possible demand would inevitably lead to over onerous parking standards and inefficient use of land.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>The information in Appendix 1 shows that this effect tails off as the dwelling size increases. However the 2016 average in Appendix 2 is merely the 2001 average uplifted by 12% but the 2016 uplift in Table 1 ranges between 20% and 33% and is thus about twice what has been justified. In Table 1 the % difference for the average of all households compared to car owning ones is virtually unchanged between the 2001 and 2016 data. It has therefore been assumed that the overall % of non-car owning households is unchanged between the two dates. This is unlikely to be true in the context of 12% growth in ownership and needs to be justified.</p> <p>In any event the average for car owning households is on no relevance because the development has to provide for all households, not just car owning ones. It is however relevant as an indicator of the statistical spread around the average.</p> <p>Suggested resulting changes to Tables 1 and 2 are given below</p>	<p>The uplift in Table 1 is in excess of the 12% TEMPRO growth because it also includes a weighting figure to exclude the impact of the low car ownership levels of the Winchester Town Wards. Also, all of these figures are ‘rounded’ to one decimal place from the actual (more accurate figures used), so it is not possible to retrospectively calculate the uplift % applied. In either case this does not affect the calculated parking standards. These factors notwithstanding it is proposed to clarify the text in Table 1.</p> <p>As a local planning authority we need to provide an evidence base for the proposed parking standards, the table submitted is not supported by any such evidence base and therefore could not be supported in an appeal situation.</p>	<p>Amend values and text in Table 1 to show that Winchester Town wards have been excluded.</p> <p>In Table 1, the 2001 car ownership figures in all households increases for 1bed from 0.6 to 0.7, for 2 bed from 1.0 to 1.1, for 3 bed from 1.4 to 1.5, and for 4 bed from 1.9 to 2.1</p> <p>In Table 1, the 2001 car ownership figures for all car owning households increases for 1bed from 1.2 to 1.3, for 2 bed from 1.3 to 1.4, for 3 bed from 1.6 to 1.7, and for 4 bed from 2.0 to 2.2</p>

<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Effect of Development type - The basis of the standards is that the propensity of 1-bed etc householders to own cars will be the same in 2016 as in 2001 except for a uniform uplift (12%) for growth. However, this takes no account that a major part of the residential dwellings to which the DPD has to relate consists of the W. Waterlooville MDA, other large site allocations and potentially the W. Waterlooville and Winchester large reserve sites and perhaps also the LDF allocations. Compared to the 2001 base these will have a much higher proportion of social and low cost market housing, single person households in starter homes and older persons trading down and social trends and of one and two bedroom units, multi-use sites and live/work units. To allow for this the 2016 data should be validated and probably adjusted by car owning surveys taken on recent developments of all these different types. Without this there is a large risk of adverse environmental impacts from either under provision or conversely inefficient use of land.</p>	<p>It is agreed that current policies are indeed changing the proportion of different housing types and tenures being constructed over the LDF period.</p> <p>It is also accepted that there will be the need to update the parking standards in the future in response to the changing nature of developments; therefore it is recommended that use will be made of the 2011 census to update the parking standards.</p>	<p>The SPD will need to be updated after the 2011 census to ensure that the parking standards remain appropriate.</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Para 1.3 - This cites the relevant WDLPR policy that is only relevant up to 2011 unless saved beyond that date. However the standards have been set to correspond to estimated cars/household in 2016 (para 3.3) and thus into the LDF period. There is no reason however why the same DPD should not at the same time be adopted for WDLPR and held as draft for the LDF.</p>	<p>The relevant Local Plan policy (T4) has now been 'saved' beyond 2011.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Policy 3 - Needs to clarify that (the policy) applies to all forms of development that gain or lose one or more bedrooms (or habitable rooms? See below) by extension, alteration or change of use.</p>	<p>Policy 3 specifically refers to the sub-division of properties to create additional properties, with associated increases in parking demand.</p> <p>Whilst a residential re-development could result in the provision of additional rooms or bedroom(s), it would be over onerous for householders to cover such issues within the SPD especially as many such developments would be within permitted development rights.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Para 3.3 and Table 1 - Note 'a' to table 1 (only 50% of households with 1 to 4 habitable rooms own a car) demonstrates, at least for smaller dwellings, that habitable rooms is a far better indicator of demand for parking than bedrooms. It is also very much better at avoiding ambiguity concerning whether a room is a bedroom or not, particularly when a dwelling is modified eg for home working. In any event the primary driver is the number of resident adults and, particularly for smaller dwellings, is significantly affected by single and double bedrooms.</p>	<p>The possibility of developing parking standards to reflect 'habitable rooms' was considered, but the simpler approach of 'bedrooms' was taken.</p> <p>Where new house designs do include the provision of a 'study' in a house, then this should be considered as having the primary use as a bedroom, and should therefore warrant a higher parking standard.</p> <p>It is not possible to develop parking standards to reflect the likely 'number of resident adults'.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Para 3.4 and Table 2 - See also S.1 above. The lower level permitted for shared parking assumes that the district wide average will</p>	<p>The SPD makes clear reference to research that has demonstrated that efficient use of space can come about through the use of shared parking facilities</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>apply regardless of size (eg shared between 2 or 100) or type of development (eg low cost/social or luxury apartments, mixed residential/retail, live/work units, retirement homes etc). It is only a more efficient use of space (para 3.5) if it can be demonstrated that the proposed standards are not diverting parking onto the streets and this has not been done.</p> <p>Para 3.4 (or elsewhere in the DPD) does not take account of WDLPR 6.82 et seq in relation to car parking for special needs housing, or of the need for allocated parking places for the disabled (para 4.5 refers but has not been taken into account). The number of disabled badges in issue and the trend would at least provide the total that is needed. The potential need to provide this for every dwelling means that every dwelling has to have a minimum of one allocated parking spaces.</p> <p>Taking account of all the comments here made it is suggested that Table 2 should be replaced by the following: (see table at the end of this appendix) Consistent with 3.12 the 20% requirement for visitors should be added to the requirements in Table 2</p>	<p>The replacement Table 2 submitted (see the end of this appendix) makes reference to single and double bedrooms in relation to parking standards, yet there is no evidence trail to substantiate the standards submitted, the lack of evidence would inevitably lead to such standards being questioned at an appeal hearing.</p> <p>Use of the suggested table of parking standards would lead to the requirement of excessive levels of parking spaces in relation to the likely average occupancy, this would be both inefficient in land use terms and would most likely result in being the subject of an appeal should a development be refused on failure to meet that tables standards.</p> <p>Furthermore, the use of 'double bedroom' in relation to setting the parking standard is not a sensible requirement as it would not correspond to any agreed definition in terms of room size within a residential unit.</p> <p>The requirement for special needs and disabled parking can be met through the Planning / development control process and there is no need for specific requirements to feature in the parking standards.</p>	
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Para 3.7 - This refers to the restriction of permitted development rights to retain the use of garages for parking where they have been counted towards parking provision. Exactly the same problem arises with open parking spaces. These can be lost through permitted development and restriction of PD rights needs to be applied to all parking spaces</p>	<p>Agreed – but planning conditions can and do already require the retention of open parking spaces; therefore no mention is required in the parking standards document.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr John Hayter / Bishops Waltham Parish Council</p>	<p>Appendix 1 and 2 - Add district averages to the tables so that it can be readily seen whether the adjustments of 3.6 are necessary.</p> <p>Add data for W. Waterlooville and all other large sites that did not exist in 2001 but to which the DPD has to apply during its currency. Expand Appendix 2 to include the same breakdown of car ownership as in Appendix 1 and the district average which must have been used to construct Table 2. Without this additional data it is not possible to use the appendices for the purposes set out in 3.6</p>	<p>As the district ward averages are clearly set out in Appendix, their inclusion in the main text would complicate the document.</p> <p>It would not be feasible to add data for W. Waterlooville as this development has not been commenced or occupied. It is proposed to update the SPD after the completion of the 2011 census as this will include updated car ownership information.</p>	<p>The SPD will need to be updated after the 2011 census to ensure that the parking standards remain appropriate.</p>
<p>Denmead Parish Council (Kelvin Andrews, Parish Clerk)</p>	<p>The Parish Council of Denmead has reviewed the Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Residential Parking Standards and fully supports the proposals contained therein.</p>	<p>The support is noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Denmead Parish Council (Kelvin Andrews, Parish Clerk)</p>	<p>Members look forward to the parking standards being adopted and hope that they will go some way to alleviate the problems which have been encountered on recent developments within Denmead when new developments are being considered.</p>	<p>The support is noted</p>	<p>None</p>

<p>Mr Matthew Gibbs Architecture Pib</p>	<p>WCC has now adopted HCC Transport Contributions Policy and there appeared to be no reference to Section 106 obligations for Highway Contributions. Might this be a good document to mention these requirements?</p>	<p>The Parking standards are not related in any way to the HCC Transport Contributions Policy, and it would therefore not be sensible to make reference to that Policy within the Parking Standards SPD.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr Matthew Gibbs Architecture Pib</p>	<p>The sub-division of existing dwellings does cause additional pressure on existing parking provision and in controlled parking zones this can cause significant problems – most noticeable around Winchester is Fairfield Road, but there are probably many other examples. Should this not be addressed, rather than requiring the greater intensity of accommodation meets the parking standards, would it be feasible to restrict parking to the number of spaces of the original dwelling size? Therefore encouraging fewer vehicles and greater reliability on public transport and reducing pressures on available spaces.</p>	<p>It would not be reasonable to expect the parking standards for new and redevelopment to deal with any existing on-street parking problems. The standards and policies have been written with the aim that development does not exacerbate existing problems, and that new development provides adequate parking for any additional demands.</p> <p>It is not council policy to try and address or reduce existing car ownership levels through the control of parking spaces.</p> <p>The Council has already adopted the policy that when new and redevelopment for housing take place in one of the Districts controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's), the number of permits available for the new occupiers of the development will not exceed the allocation permitted for the site prior to the redevelopment of the site</p> <p>Policy 6: <i>When any development takes place within a controlled parking zone, no additional parking permits will be available.</i></p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr Matthew Gibbs Architecture Pib</p>	<p>As a practice, we generally endeavour to remove the dominance of parked vehicles from the public realm. We appreciate the need for secure parking, although it was interesting to see that there was a preference for on street and frontage parking. It will be interesting to see how newer developments manage to integrate car parking with public spaces successfully.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Mr Alan Burns</p>	<p>Current version of PPG 13 was published in 2001, not 1994 as indicated in the draft SPD</p>	<p>Agreed</p>	<p>Amend text to reflect change see revised Para 1.2 below.</p>
<p>Mr Alan Burns</p>	<p>Believes that the draft SPD is a flawed document in that it fails to comply with current guidance in PPG 13 "Transport".</p> <p>The SPD does not accurately describe the changes made by the publication of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing in that PPS3 specifically indicates that paragraphs 12 to 17 of PPG13 are cancelled. However these paragraphs do not make any reference to car parking standards.</p> <p>Paragraph 52 of PPG 13 clearly requires that "<i>policies in development plans should set maximum levels of parking.....There should be no minimum standards for development</i>" This paragraph and hence this requirement is not cancelled as a result of PPS guidance.</p> <p>Believes that the new residential parking standards should be set as maximum parking standards and there should be no</p>	<p>The notion of 'maximum' parking standards was introduced in Planning Policy Guidance Note: 3 "Housing" in 2000, Planning Policy Guidance Note: 13 "Transport" (2001) also included the use of 'Maximum' parking standards. But the publication of Planning Policy Statement 3: Housing in 2006 rescinded all of PPG3 and parts of PPG13 referring to housing.</p> <p>Some of the comments made are incorrect, paragraphs 16 & 17 of PPG 13 refer to Parking Standards for Housing, and all have been rescinded with the publication of PPS 3 Housing.</p> <p>Furthermore the rescinded Para 17 of PPG13 specifically reads "<i>PPG3 requires parking policies to "be framed with good design in mind, recognising that car ownership varies with income, age, household type, and the type of housing and its location". They should not be expressed as minimum standards. Local authorities "should revise their parking standards to allow for significantly lower levels of off-street</i></p>	<p>Amend Para 1.2 to read:</p> <p>"The requirement for revised residential parking standards arises from the Government's publication of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) in 2006 and the consequent withdrawal in March 2008 of that element from the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards (2002) by Hampshire County Council. PPS3 puts the responsibility for developing residential parking standards</p>

	<p>suggestion of minimum standards being applied. PPS3 does allow authorities to set their own locally based, maximum standards, to reflect local circumstances...It does not allow the requirement for maximum standards to be set aside.</p> <p>Table 2 gives the car parking standards and indicates that this is shows the "required" provision. This is clearly a minimum standard, contrary to the current guidance, I accept that the text may indicate that developers would be able to argue for a different level of provision, either a higher or lower number, but I do not consider that this overcomes this fundamental problem.</p> <p>Suggests that a revised SPD is capable of being produced that would comply with PPG13 guidance and still achieve the objectives. A set of maximum standards could be clearly specified. The document could then explain that the developers that intend to provide significantly lower levels of parking would need to justify the level of provision and show that this would not result in significant adverse. It could also indicate that there would have to be an over-riding case put forward to justify a higher provision.</p> <p>Just because a development provides fewer spaces than the maximum that would be specified does not make it acceptable. You will be aware that PPG13, Paragraph 51, tells local planning authorities that they should:-</p> <p><i>"not require developers to provide more spaces than they themselves wish, other than in exceptional circumstances which might include for example where there are significant implications for road safety which cannot be resolved through the introduction or enforcement of on-street parking controls;"</i></p> <p>The SPD could describe what the Authority consider to be "exceptional circumstances" and indicate that significant adverse effects on these would be likely to result in a refusal of planning consent. The Authority could also indicate where parking controls might be accepted and where this would not be appropriate. It could also advise that where parking controls would be considered appropriate, the developer would be required to fund them.</p>	<p><i>parking provision, particularly for developments in locations, such as town centres, where services are readily accessible by walking, cycling or public transport"</i></p> <p>It is our understanding that the direct rescinding of all of PPG3 including Para 17 of PPG13 removes the obligation for Maximum parking standards in relation to Housing and residential purposes. Whilst the SPD applies to only to residential parking standards, the objectives of maximum parking standards can and do still apply for all other types of development.</p> <p>The SPD is setting standards that seek for development to provide sufficient parking to meet its needs and The SPD is written so that Developers have the opportunity in appropriate locations to seek and negotiate lower parking provision than set out in Table 2 of the SPD.</p> <p>PPS3 makes no mention of 'Maximum' standards in relation to parking, but actually reads "51. <i>Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.</i>"</p> <p>Within Annex D of PPG13 'Maximum' Parking Standards remain defined at certain levels, but none of the uses identified therein refer to Residential uses.</p>	<p>with the Local Planning Authority. PPS3 rescinded all of Planning Policy Guidance Note: 3 Housing (2000) and part of PPG13 Transport (2001) which required local planning authorities to set maximum parking standards in relation to housing and now gives flexibility for levels of parking provision to be determined at a local level to reflect local circumstances."</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>The HA would be very concerned if car parking provision was, firstly, based upon unrestrained car ownership growth and, secondly, not related to the accessibility of the area (with the exception of Winchester Town Centre) as suggested in the Consultation Draft. An oversupply of parking is likely to limit the effectiveness of demand management measures which, in accordance with PPG13, are important in encouraging a reduction in travel and the use of sustainable modes. Subsequently, in</p>	<p>The standards are based on recognised research and statistical data to provide residential parking in-line with expected car ownership levels, as set out within PPS3:</p> <p><i>"51. Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently."</i></p> <p>The research does not indicate that accessibility</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>accessible locations the Council should seek to reduce the number of car parking spaces where appropriate.</p>	<p>has a bearing on car ownership and there appears to be little evidence that restricting car parking at the home end of the journey has any real effect on car trips on the network, hence the reason for residential parking requirements now being included within PPG/PPS3 Housing rather than PPG13 Transport. The major factors in determining car ownership levels are dwelling size, type and tenure. The research goes on to suggest that where all on-street parking is controlled by controlled Parking Zones (as is the case for the Winchester Town), it maybe acceptable to provide parking below normal levels of demand, and this led to the decision to allow a variation in the standards in respect of this area. No other locations within Winchester District have such comprehensive on-street controls combined with access to large range of public transport services.</p>	
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>The Council should also seek to balance any 'City wide' increase in residential car parking spaces with the provision of sustainable transport modes and ensure that every opportunity is taken to encourage the provision and use of sustainable transport modes as in accordance with PPG13</p>	<p>PPG13 as amended by PPS3 provides no guidance specifically relating to residential parking, this is covered by PPS3, but it does include advice relating to non-residential parking. Non-residential parking is considered the area where parking restraint, demand management and the availability of alternative transport can influence car based travel.</p> <p>The setting of non-residential parking standards is still the responsibility of Hampshire County Council, the Highway Authority.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>It is noted that developers are expected to demonstrate that the residential parking provision is sufficient to meet the anticipated needs of the site. It is suggested that with this approach there is a risk than an over supply of residential parking will occur. It is not clear what would prevent the developer from simply choosing the maximum level of parking in each case.</p>	<p>An oversupply of parking would not be seen as efficient use of land and therefore would not be acceptable in planning terms. Furthermore, the standards set out in the SPD are not 'maximum' or 'minimum' standards but the approach is one where the developers will be required to demonstrate that the provision should meet the anticipated demands of the development.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p>Winchester Town Centre – Policy 7</p> <p>By simply stating that 'Parking in Winchester Town centre can be provided to a lower standard than specified in Table 2', the HA is concerned that the <i>expected</i> level of parking provision is unclear.</p> <p>In line with PPG 13, it may be beneficial for the Council to provide revised parking guidelines / parking standards to allow for lower levels of parking where services are readily available by walking, cycling and public transport. Such an approach would help to encourage the provision and use of sustainable transport modes within the City.</p>	<p>Whilst the overall levels of car ownership across the town are very low, reflecting the generally good level of accessibility. The area covered by Winchester Town wards also includes areas with low levels of accessibility.</p> <p>The standards are written so that the developer would still need to demonstrate why their proposed level of parking is acceptable, but it is accepted that the parking demands are considerably less than other, more rural wards.</p> <p>The SPD advocates that the standards will be negotiated on a site by site basis.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p>Miss E Spencer, PFA Consulting</p>	<p>We support for WCC's general approach to calculating the new parking standards and agree with the objective to seek to provide a balance between reasonable expectations of car ownership and the need to encourage a more sustainable approach to meeting future transport demands.</p> <p>Accordingly, we support, in principle, expected levels of car ownership to be a</p>	<p>The support is noted</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>material consideration in determining the appropriate level of parking provision for a new development. We also support the application of this general methodology in calculating car parking standards, the approach of which is in accordance with recently published national policy, guidance and research.</p> <p>In particular , 'PPS3' states that "<i>Local Planning Authorities should, with stakeholders and communities, develop residential parking policies for their areas, taking account of expected levels of car ownership...</i>" Also, Manual for Streets' (fT) makes reference to recent CABE research which found that many people feel that the design of new residential development should accommodate typical levels of car ownership.</p> <p>It is considered that car parking standards which reflect local car ownership levels should result in adequate car parking for residents and visitors, whilst at the same time make efficient and effective use of space and land, in accordance with government policy.</p>		
<p>Miss E Spencer, PFA Consulting</p>	<p>The research paper ' Residential Car Parking Research' (DCLG, May 2007) found that there were a number of factors which have a significant influence on car ownership, including</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dwelling size, type and tenure • Dwelling location. <p>The research paper also identifies an number of other factors which have a significant influence on car parking demand, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Availability of allocated and unallocated parking spaces; • Availability of on-and off-street parking; • Availability of visitor parking; and • Availability of garage parking. <p>The research paper identifies the census as the most suitable source of car ownership data that is more widely available; however, more specific, up to date, data may be available which is more appropriate.</p> <p>The draft SPD makes reference to the DCLG research paper at paragraph 1.8 however, the draft SPD only then refers to dwelling size and type as major factors in determining the levels of car ownership, thus ignoring dwelling tenure. The draft SPD takes account of dwelling location to some degree by considering how car ownership levels differ across the local authority's area by ward. Although the draft SPD goes on to sat, at paragraph 2.6, that the variations across the non-town wards are not considered significant to the extent to warrant the development of different parking standards. We consider that the car parking standards should take account of differences in car ownership levels</p>	<p>Whilst it is accepted that tenure can affect car ownership levels, the differences recorded in the census data are not significant to warrant the development of different car parking standards for different tenures, especially as the data for both private and socially rented properties is amalgamated.</p> <p>Furthermore, as there is such a variety of 'affordable' housing tenures now available it would make the development of parking standards by tenure difficult. However it is believed that the SPD is flexible enough (Para 3.8 mentions that 'tenure' can be a consideration in parking standards) in that should a developer be in a position to demonstrate that a lower level of parking provision would be appropriate, then this can be considered through the Planning Application / development control process.</p> <p>The Parking Standards are designed to meet the likely levels of parking demand. The definition of the word 'exceptional' relates to something that is uncommon, or not of a normal consequence. Development which does not provide for the anticipated parking demand would certainly be exceptional, and therefore the policy wording is appropriate.</p>	<p>None</p>

	<p>according to dwelling tenure.</p> <p>Generally car ownership levels are lower for affordable tenure compared to private however, the margin varies across differing dwelling and tenure types and is also affected by dwelling location. We are not suggesting a blanket reduction factor applies to the car parking standards for non-private tenure, but we suggest that there should be flexibility for reduced levels of parking, where the supporting evidence is available to demonstrate lower expected car ownership levels. The draft SPD makes brief reference to this at Policy 2 and paragraph 3.8 however, it is considered that this should be emphasised earlier in the document in section 2, where at paragraph 2.7, the draft SPD states that it may be acceptable to provide reduced levels of parking from the standards set where high levels of accessibility are available. Other material considerations may be relevant and the use of the word "exceptional" is unnecessarily draconian. The draft SPD goes on to make the point, in respect to sites with good accessibility, that the developer will be expected to demonstrate that a lesser standard is appropriate in each case, which would seem entirely reasonable and sensible. It is therefore sufficient only to require that a reduced level of parking provision is as a legitimate consequence of other material considerations and not an exceptional consequence.</p>		
<p>Miss E Spencer, PFA Consulting</p>	<p>Further, in determining the level of car parking which might be appropriate, the draft SPD, at paragraph 3.3, states that it is important to make some allowance for anticipated increases in car ownership. The draft SPD goes on to make reference to TEMPRO growth factors which have been used to calculate that car ownership is likely to increase by 12% between 2001 and 2016. It should be noted that TEMPRO offers a growth level by car ownership level; i.e. the projected growth in car ownership for those properties which currently do not own a car and those properties which currently own 1,2 or 3 cars etc. TEMPRO does not specifically consider dwelling size, type or tenure and how these factors can influence the levels of car ownership. The application of a global growth factor to 2001 measured car ownership levels can only provide a broad brush calculation of anticipated future car ownership levels as an average across all dwellings in the authority level.</p>	<p>It is accepted that the TEMPRO growth figures can only represent average calculation of anticipated future car ownership levels across all dwellings.</p> <p>It would be over complicated to calculate growth rates for different dwelling sizes, type's tenures and locations; instead it is proposed to update the SPD standards after the completion of the 2011 census as this will include updated car ownership information.</p>	<p>The SPD will need to be updated after the 2011 census to ensure that the parking standards remain appropriate.</p>
<p>Miss E Spencer, PFA Consulting</p>	<p>We support the application of different parking standards according to whether the parking is to be provided on an allocated or shared basis. The DCLG research paper found that parking arrangements can have significant efficiency advantages whereas the allocation of spaces to individual</p>	<p>The support is noted.</p> <p>The SPD is flexible enough to allow the combination of allocated and shared parking provision at new development, to reinforce this point it is proposed to make textual changes to para 3.5</p>	<p>Additional sentence at the end of paragraph 3.5 to read:</p> <p>"It would also be possible to allow the combination of allocated and shared</p>

	<p>dwellings can have an adverse impact upon the efficiency of car parking provision. We consider that the car parking standards should be flexible enough to allow for a combination of allocated and shared parking provision at new development, the benefits of which have already been acknowledged by national guidance.</p>		<p>parking provision at new developments.”</p>
<p>Cllr K Wood, WCC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access</p>	<p>The current policy has failed to achieve its objective in that it has created a severe shortage of parking spaces in some areas with the resultant problems we continually see. By restricting parking it doesn't seem to have caused people to give up their cars but simply park them on narrow roads blocking access. It makes neighbourhoods look more like disorganised car parks so rationing parking space clearly doesn't stop people owning cars. Therefore we have to live with things as they are by making adequate provision</p> <p>Therefore I would like to see the table 2 on page 6 amended so that 1 bed has 1 space or 1.5 in allocated ;2 bed 2 spaces ;3 bed 2 spaces ;4 bed as before.</p>	<p>The proposed amendment is essentially increasing the parking standards in the first section of Table 2, which applies to the use of 'Shared Spaces'.</p> <p>Having considered and discussed this issue with the portfolio holder, there is some merit in the proposal. Evaluation of a few worked examples has shown that the draft standards would under provide for parking in a number of circumstances, an uplift in the table values has been agreed in order to overcome this issue.</p> <p>1 bed - 0.8 spaces (increase to 1 space) 2 bed - 1.2 spaces (increase to 1.5 spaces) 3 bed - 1.7 spaces (increase to 2 spaces) 4 bed - 2.4 spaces (increase to 2.5 spaces)</p> <p>This also has the benefit of simplifying the standards so that they all relate to the nearest half space, rather than having smaller decimal units.</p>	<p>Amend the values in the first section of Table 2 under the Shared / Communal Parking spaces as follows:</p> <p>1 bed - 1 space 2 bed - 1.5 spaces 3 bed - 2 spaces 4 bed - 2.5 spaces</p>
<p>Cllr K Wood, WCC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access</p>	<p>Policy 2 - whilst I agree that any lower level would be exceptional, I don't really agree with the examples you provide developers to find a way out. It seems to me more important that development in the city centre should have adequate parking as we are trying to get cars off the roads. Though I accept the logic re the proximity of train/bus services etc it doesn't seem to deter people from having/needing cars with the resultant problems.</p>	<p>The emphasis in the standards is one where a development must meet the needs of the likely occupiers, but it is important that the standards allow for some degree of flexibility to reflect certain circumstances.</p> <p>It is proposed policy that if a development provides a significantly different level of parking than the anticipated level of car ownership would indicate (whether higher or lower), it would need to be demonstrated that this is a legitimate consequence of other material considerations. However, it would not be acceptable to provide parking below the appropriate standard where this would be likely to be prejudicial to highway safety</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Cllr K Wood, WCC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access</p>	<p>Policy 5 - size of garages; is 6m long enough?</p>	<p>Manual for Streets recommends that larger garages can be used for both storage and car parking, a minimum size of 6m by 3 m is required.</p> <p>Garages provided of less than this size will not be considered to count towards the parking requirements of the site.</p>	<p>No change</p>
<p>Cllr K Wood, WCC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access</p>	<p>Policy 7 - Do we need to define what we mean by the town centre? Is Chilcomb place, Quarry Rd town centre?—what are we doing with Silver Hill?</p> <p>It is accepted that if the centre is tightly defined then a lower standard is probably OK but that developers should be required to make a case perhaps put more strongly than suggested.</p>	<p>Agreed – To simply include Winchester Town Centre as that area can allow lower parking standards could allow the under provision of parking in the suburbs of the town, which would create unnecessary burdens on the on-street parking availability.</p> <p>Therefore it is suggested that any reduced parking standard should be permitted in the area covered by the Controlled Parking Zone as this includes mechanisms to control on street parking demands created by new developments.</p>	<p>Amend Policy 7 to read: In the Winchester Town Controlled Parking Zone, as an area of high accessibility, car parking may be provided to a lower standard than elsewhere in the district. Each development will be negotiated on an individual basis</p>

<p>Cllr K Wood, WCC Portfolio Holder for Planning and Access</p>	<p>Some sections (eg paras 1.6 and 1.7) seem to leave the policy wide open to any interpretation a developer wishes to place on it for his own purposes. We have moved from a maximum to no mans land. If we are to set standards surely they should be a minimum; these are just advisory and will not necessarily put right the previous mistakes in which we are seeing as people with nowhere to park.</p> <p>Suggested rewording of - SPD 3.1</p> <p>The proposed standards seek to provide a minimum provision to meet the needs of the development save where exceptional circumstances exist. The standards are aimed at meeting the needs of occupiers but without over provision. Where for planning reasons it is proposed that a development should not meet these standards, this will only be acceptable where this is a consequence of other material reasons.</p>	<p>Whilst the standards seek to provide a balance between reasonable expectations of car ownership and the need to encourage a more sustainable approach to meeting future transport needs. In view of the problems seen in developments approved in recent years with insufficient parking there is some justification in tightening the policy wording to ensure that there is due emphasis on providing sufficient parking for housing developments, especially as the majority of Winchester District is predominantly rural with little opportunity for sustainable travel</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 3.1 to read:</p> <p>The proposed standards seek to provide a minimum provision to meet the needs of the development save where exceptional circumstances exist. The standards are aimed at meeting the needs of occupiers but without over provision. Where for planning reasons it is proposed that a development should not meet these standards, this will only be acceptable where this is a consequence of other material reasons.</p>
---	---	---	--

Replacement Table2 submitted By Mr Hayter: (but not recommended for inclusion in the SPD):

	2001 all households average +12%	5 or less shared parking spaces	6 to 20 shared parking places inc 20% visitors	21 or more shared parking places inc 20% visitors	Sole use allocated parking, including garage
1 to 4 habitable rooms of which 1 is a single bedroom	0.72	1	0.96	0.9	1
1 to 4 habitable rooms of which 1 is a double bedroom	0.72	2	0.96	0.9	2
1 single and 1 double bedroom	1.2	2	1.8	1.5	3
2 double bedrooms	1.2	3	2	1.5	4
3 Beds	1.68	3	2.7	2.1	4
4 Beds	2.28	3.5	3.3	3	4