

**REPORT TO CABINET MEMBER FOR TRANSPORT AND HIGHWAYS**

Date **12 January 2010**

agenda item number

**3.1**

**RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW DEVELOPMENTS**

**Decisions Recommended**

1. That the County Council's Supplementary Planning Guidance "Parking Provision For New Developments" (May 2004) is withdrawn with immediate effect.
2. That the County Council re-affirm its commitment to the parking policy as set out in Planning Policy Guidance 13 (Transport) and the East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009).
3. That the County Council adopt the temporary residential parking standards as outlined in the report until such time as each Local Planning Authority adopts its own standards through the Local Development Framework Process.

**Delegated Authority**

4. Scheme of Delegation TH.1. To prepare and to recommend to Council policy on matters relating to transport excluding those within the remit of the People and Performance portfolio including, but not limited to, the following plans: Local Transport Plan.

**Policy Framework**

5. Central Government planning policy and guidance relating to car parking associated with new development is contained in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 (Housing), Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) 13 (Transport) and Regional parking is within the East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009).

6. Current policy and guidance for Nottinghamshire is contained in NCC's "Parking Provision for New Developments" (hereafter "the guidance").

## **Background**

7. In May 2004 the County Council adopted the "Parking Provision for New Developments" document as Supplementary Planning Guidance to support Policy 5/7 of the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Draft Joint Structure Plan for applications within the area covered by the County Council.
8. The Guidance applies to both new residential and non-residential developments and is aimed at encouraging the use of alternative modes of transport to the private car. The approach applied a different level of parking provision for new developments, depending on the availability of alternative means of transport to the car and on local characteristics.
9. The Guidance helped to ensure that development proposals conformed to parking policies and standards which in turn took into account strategic and local objectives. These objectives have since been reviewed to reflect changes in circumstances relating to transport policies and the planning process.
10. In particular, the continued relevance of the guidance has altered significantly with the publication of PPS3 (Housing) and the adoption of the East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009) to replace the Structure Plan.
11. The recently published PPS3 on Housing includes the following statement in paragraph 51 on residential parking standards:

"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."
12. This supersedes the previous guidance in Planning Policy Guidance 3 (PPG3) which recommended a maximum average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling. It was not made clear at the time whether this should be an average across the development, a district, or even a county. This led to much confusion and inconsistency and concerns about the mismatch between levels of car ownership and off-street parking in new homes. It has become one of the most contentious and unpopular planning policies in operation.

13. It is considered that it was never intended to be a means of restricting car ownership or usage, hence its inclusion in PPG3 rather than PPG13 which relates to transport. It was more to do with land usage and housing densities 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. It does, however, lead to excessive parking on street which in many areas is causing road safety issues, emergency and public transport access difficulties, neighbour disputes and visually unappealing streetscapes. Conversely restricting car parking availability and cost at the destination is generally accepted as having a real effect on reducing car trips.
14. It is, therefore, considered that parking standards for residential development should, particularly in view of the wording in PPS3 (para 9 above), be a matter solely for district councils as planning authorities and that the County Council should not seek to formulate a policy on this matter. The County Council has little or no involvement in the layout of individual residential developments. Consequently, responsibility for the number of residential parking spaces and how they are integrated into the development is more appropriately for the district planning process.
15. Policy 48 in the East Midlands Regional Plan is related to parking and states that:

“Local Planning Authorities should apply the maximum amounts of vehicle parking for new development as set out in PPG13. In the Region’s Principal Urban Areas and Growth Towns and environmentally sensitive areas, opportunities should be taken to develop more challenging standards based on emerging public transport accessibility work.
16. PPG13 contains detailed maximum parking standards for non residential (i.e. “destination”) development. Car parking facilities in excess of the maximum standards in PPG13 should only be provided in exceptional circumstances.
17. In the Region’s Principal Urban Areas and Growth Towns, net increases in public car parking not associated with development should only be permitted where it is demonstrated that:
  - Adequate public transport, cycling or walking provision cannot be provided or a shortage of short stay parking is the principal factor detracting from the vitality and viability of an area; or
  - Excessive on-street parking is having an adverse effect on highway safety or residential amenity which cannot be reasonably resolved by other means; or

- The nature of new car parking can shift from long stay spaces to high quality short stay provision; or
  - It is linked to public transport provision, for example as part of a park and ride scheme.”
18. Consequently, the East Midlands Regional Plan (March 2009) with reference to PPG13 provides policy guidance for non-residential parking, with the Local Transport Plan providing the overall context for parking policy in the county. However, it is for the local development documents to set parking levels and standards for new residential developments.
19. However, by withdrawing the residential parking guidance in advance of the Local Planning Authorities implementing their own standards they will be left in the difficult position of not having any standards with which to refer. As such it is suggested that the County Council adopt temporary residential parking standards for use until such time as each Local Planning Authority has had the opportunity to adopt its own. These are recommended as maximum standards (unless exceptional circumstances – with strong evidence - justify otherwise) and should be applied as follows;

		Number of bedrooms			
		1	2	3	4+
Accessibility					
Average number of buses during the peak hour	> 2	1	1	1	2
	0 - 2	1	1	2	3

(note – this table is copied from the Supplementary Planning Guidance “Parking Provision for New Developments (May 2004))

All other uses not covered by National Guidance or the recently adopted Regional Design Guide should be individually justified on a sound evidence base.

### Statutory and Policy Implications

20. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of Finance, Equal Opportunities, Human Rights Act 1998, Disability Discrimination Act 1995, Personnel, Crime and Disorder

(Community Safety) and those using the services. Where such implications are material, they have been brought out in the text of the report.

### **Equal Opportunities Implications**

21. The regional guidance document is based on national guidance, which fully encompasses equality issues. It is therefore felt that the equality impact is acceptable and that an equality impact assessment is not required.

### **STEVE CALVERT**

Service Director (Planning, Sustainability and Regeneration)

### **Comments of the Service Director – Finance**

There are no financial implications arising from the contents of the report. [KP – 16/12/09]

### **Legal Services Comments**

Cabinet Member has power to make this decision. [SHB – 17/12/09]

### **Background Papers Available for Inspection**

Parking Provision for New Developments Supplementary Planning Guidance (May 2004).

### **Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected**

All

Author of the report / Case Officer

Richard Smith, Service Manager Development Control (Highways)  
(0115) 977 4925