

REVIEW OF CAR PARKING STANDARDS FOR DEVELOPMENT IN THE NEW FOREST DISTRICT

1 Introduction

- 1.1 A review of current policy and standards for the provision of car parking space by developers was requested last year by the then Economy and Planning Review Panel. The review was aimed at generating a policy and standards which would be more responsive to local circumstances and take advantage of the increased flexibility recently introduced into Government planning policy. Reports on the subject were considered by the Panel on 15 March and 21 June 2006.
- 1.2 The Panel of June 2006 was advised of Government proposals to issue a revised policy on housing development in the form of Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3. The Panel noted that in December 2005 the consultation draft of PPS3 had suggested the abandonment of what amounted to a national target to limit car parking provision on new housing developments to an average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling.
- 1.3 A copy of the Panel's resolution is attached at **Annex A**. It will be noted that this report is a response to paragraph (a) of the resolution. Attached at Annex B is a draft supplementary planning document (SPD) which also addresses the specific issues raised in paragraphs (f) and (g). Paragraphs (e) and (i) have been drawn to the attention of the County Council and the National Park Authority respectively but no response has been received.
- 1.4 In November 2006 the Secretary of State published the new PPS3 and, as expected, abandoned the 1.5-space-per-dwelling target.

2 The Draft Supplementary Planning Document

- 2.1 The draft SPD attached at **Annex B** to this report is intended as a basis for consultation with interested persons and organisations. It is designed to be used, if approved, alongside the relevant local plan policy and the Council's April 2006 SPD *Housing design, density and character*.
- 2.2 The SPD cannot replace the policy in the Local Plan, which will remain the statutory planning policy until the Local Development Framework has reached an appropriate stage - likely to be late 2009 or thereabouts. It will however operate in the meantime as a material consideration, providing an interpretation of the local plan policy.
- 2.3 Unlike the Core Strategy and other "development plan documents" (DPDs), SPDs are not required to undergo independent examination by an Inspector. In order to be taken into account as a material consideration in determining planning applications, however, they must conform to the relevant DPD or local plan and must be prepared in

accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004. Among other things, the Regulations require the Council to carry out a sustainability appraisal of the SPD and to consult on its content. The consultation process is explained in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement, adopted in June 2006.

3. Key features of the proposed supplementary planning document

- 3.1 The concerns expressed by the Review Panel relate primarily to residential development proposals, since (as the draft SPD explains) that is where there is the greatest need for review. Accordingly, the proposed SPD deals **only with residential development**. Any changes needed to the Council's policy and standards for other types of development will be addressed through the formal review of the Local Plan and the preparation of development plan documents (see paragraph 2.2 above).
- 3.2 The proposed SPD:
- (i) takes account of new Government policy as set out in PPS3, particularly as regards the relationship between parking space provision and other aspects of the design process
 - (ii) moves away from imposing a site maximum for residential parking towards a more advisory and flexible approach
 - (iii) advocates a broad interpretation of the expression "environmental damage" in Policy DW-T9
 - (iv) derives its numerical values directly from data on car ownership in the District
 - (v) abandons, for residential development, the division of the District into accessibility zones
 - (vi) counts on-plot garages as only one half of a parking space
 - (vii) takes into account the greater efficiency of shared parking spaces compared with those exclusively available to individual dwellings
 - (viii) sets out minimum internal dimensions for garages
 - (ix) allows for a modest amount of parking space for visitors.
- 3.3 The proposed SPD will complement the Council's established policies and guidance, including the SPD *Housing design, density and character* adopted in 2006. In addressing local concern about overspill from developments where demand for parking space exceeds supply, it also draws on recent research and technical advice on the effective design and use of parking space in residential areas.

- 3.4 The levels of parking space provision recommended in the proposed SPD are not unlike those currently set out in the standards at Appendix G7 of the Local Plan. Table 1 below provides a comparison.

Table 1: current standards and proposed recommendations

(Note: does not include elderly people in sheltered housing)

Dwelling size (bedrooms)	NFDC Standard 2005 (Local Plan Appendix G7) (rural areas)	NFDC Standard 2005 (Local Plan Appendix G7) (main towns/centres)	Proposed recommendation 2007 (all shared / all on plot)
1	1.0	0.8	1.4 - 1.7
2	2.0	1.6	1.5 - 1.9
3	2.0	1.6	1.9 - 2.4
4 or more	3.0	2.4	2.1 - 2.6

- 3.5 It is important to remember that the proposed new figures are part of a package which, unlike the current policy, takes specific account of the effects of including garages and visitor parking (see paragraph 16 of the proposed SPD). To illustrate how the recommendations would operate in practice, a number of examples are given at **Annex C**.

4. Sustainability appraisal

- 4.1 In accordance with Part 5 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004, the sustainability appraisal of the proposed SPD referred to in paragraph 2.3 above) is in course of preparation.

5. Consultation

- 5.1 The proposed supplementary planning document has been produced in consultation with officers representing the Council's planning and housing services, the transport authority Hampshire County Council, the New Forest National Park Authority and other Hampshire district councils.
- 5.2 A draft of this report has been circulated to all such consultees, and no responses have been received.

6. Conclusion

- 6.1 The proposed draft SPD addresses the concerns of the Economy and Planning Review Panel, takes advantage of the greater flexibility introduced by PPS3 and provides an improved framework for the application of local plan parking policy pending the adoption of new development plan documents through the Local Development Framework.

7. Financial implications

- 7.1 The proposed refinement of policy for car parking provision has no major financial implications for the Council. Any enhancement of the Council's planning control framework should make possible swifter and more efficient (because more structured) assessment of development proposals. On the other hand, there is evidence that the current reliance on County Council officers to give comprehensive advice on individual planning applications issues related to car parking is increasingly failing to address all the relevant considerations, and there is a need to consider broadening the role of the Council's development control planning officers. This may have financial implications, particularly if additional training is involved.

8. Environmental implications

- 8.1 As already pointed out, the proposed SPD is a response to the concerns of the Review Panel and to revised Government policy, both of which are broadly based on what are effectively environmental objectives.
- 8.2 The rapid run-off of rain water falling from paved areas such as impermeable driveways can overload existing drainage systems and increase the risk of flooding. The use of sustainable drainage systems and the use of permeable surfaces will reduce such risks.

9. Crime and disorder implications

- 9.1 The proposed SPD refers to its sister publication *Housing design, density and character* and in particular to Annex 1 which identifies some typical problems related to parking in new residential developments. These problems include certain types of unlawful or anti-social behaviour, and while the causes are many and conflicts associated with the driving and storage of motor vehicles are unlikely to be eliminated, the inclusion in new housing developments of a basic minimum amount of space for car parking can make a valuable contribution towards reducing the frequency of such incidents.

10. Equality and diversity implications

- 10.1 The proposed SPD is not expected to have significant impacts on equality or diversity.

11. Portfolio Holder comments

11.1 The Portfolio Holder has contributed informally to various stages in the development of the proposals. Having now received this final report the Portfolio Holder commends it to the Cabinet for acceptance.

12. Consideration by Planning Development Control Committee

12.1 This report was considered by the Planning Development Control Committee on 12 September 2007. The Committee expressed no formal views on the report. However, in the light of discussion at the meeting, the opportunity has been taken to correct and clarify the content of paragraph 16 of the proposed SPD.

13. RECOMMENDATION

13.1 That the Cabinet publish the proposed Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) *Provision of Car Parking Space for Residential Development* (attached at Annex B to this report) for consultation in accordance with the Council's adopted Scheme of Community Involvement, with a view to considering the public response towards the end of the year and formally adopting the SPD with any appropriate amendments.

13.2 That the Head of Planning investigate options for requiring the appropriate use of sustainable drainage systems and permeable surfaces to minimise the surface water run-off from driveways and parking areas and report his conclusions to the Cabinet.

Further information:

Patrick Hughes
Transportation
Appletree Court, Lyndhurst
(023) 8028 5355
E-mail:Patrick Hughes at NFDC

Background papers:

Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards (Hampshire County Council, 2002)
Residential Car Parking Research (WSP Ltd and others, for the Department of Communities and Local Government)
Census of England and Wales 2001
Other published documents

EXTRACT FROM MINUTES OF ECONOMY AND PLANNING REVIEW PANEL, 21 JUNE 2006

7. CAR PARKING STANDARDS REVIEW - FINAL REPORT (REPORT A).

The Panel considered possible changes to car parking standards and their application.

The Panel noted changes made to the document since it was last considered at their March meeting, notably section 7 of the report. The report identified key points to work towards the production of a Transport document.

Members felt that ideally the National Park Authority should work in tandem with the District Council on the development of these policies, but it was pointed out that the National Park Authority may not be in a position to give these issues priority at the present time. The District Council wished to work jointly with the NPA but at the same time was anxious to avoid further delay.

The Panel discussed the issues in detail, during which the following points emerged:-

- It was reported that the forthcoming PPS3 document (to be published by the Secretary of State, possibly later in the year), was expected to omit the present target (in PPG3) of no more than 1.5 car spaces per new dwelling.
- Some members felt that the District Council should set its own parking standards, even if it meant they were different from other authorities in Hampshire and those adopted by the County Council. The Portfolio Holder pointed out that if the District Council chose different policies or standards, this might result in the District Council having to resource all transport advice for Development Control itself, which would have cost implications. It was therefore better to work with the County Council and other Hampshire district councils, to get a consensus on issues of concern.

Members made the point that some new residential development included garages which were too small to properly accommodate a car, and were therefore being used as storage spaces, so that this parking space was lost.

The Panel thanked Mr Hughes for a very thorough analysis of the Council's current parking limits and standards, and for the amount of time and effort he had invested in producing the document.

RESOLVED:

- (a) That, bearing in mind that the consultation draft of PPS3 (the proposed national Planning Policy Statement on Housing) seeks to abandon the "1.5 spaces per dwelling" target which appears in the current PPG3, the

Economy & Planning Portfolio Holder be asked, following PPS3's publication, to consider bringing forward in the Policy Team's work programme a Supplementary Planning Document in relation to parking standards which applies the maximum flexibility allowed under the new guidance;

- (b) That it be noted that the attention of the Planning Development Control Committee and Planning Officers has been drawn to the fact that Policy DW-T9 allows environmental reasons as well as highway reasons to form objections to certain schemes involving reduced car parking;
- (c) That it be noted that the Panel looks forward to the opportunity to comment on the draft Traffic Management Strategy document at its next meeting (Panel members to receive an advance copy of the strategy document as soon as it is available);
- (d) That the responses to consultation referred to in paragraph 5 of the report from those organisations set out in Appendix 5 be noted;
- (e) That the Economy & Planning Portfolio Holder be asked to request Hampshire County Council to:
 - update the accessibility maps referred to in paragraph 7.6.1 of the report, and consider the inclusion of an accessibility index related to leisure facilities.
 - review its position in relation to counting garages as half a parking space;
- (f) That the Economy & Planning Portfolio Holder be asked, in respect of (a) above and paragraph 7.5.3 of the report, to note the Panel's view that the maximum parking permitted for one-bedroom dwellings should be increased (say from 1 to 1.5 spaces) when the parking standards are revised;
- (g) That details of the County Council's prescribed minimum dimensions for garages be brought to the next meeting, together with observations on their appropriateness and adequacy;
- (h) That the Panel be given the opportunity to review the policy in the light of experience following the Council's review of off and on-street parking management; and
- (i) That the National Park Authority be informed of the District Council's progress on parking standards issues, and that they be invited to work jointly with the Council in developing consistent policy and standards for use throughout the two authorities' adjoining areas.

NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN (FIRST ALTERATION)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACE IN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT

- 1 This Supplementary Planning Document sets out guidance to developers and others on the provision of car parking space on residential developments. It should be read alongside Policies DW-E1 and Policy DW-T9 of the New Forest District Local Plan (First Alteration) (November 2005) and the District Council's supplementary planning document *Housing design, density and character* (April 2006). The local plan policies form part of the Development Plan for the area, and can be expected to remain in force until altered or replaced through the statutory policy review process. Insofar as they relate to housing development, they are reproduced on the following page.
- 2 General guidance at national level for the provision of parking space to serve new development appears in Planning Policy Guidance Note (PPG) 13 *Transport* (March 2001). Paragraphs 12 to 17, which deal specifically with housing development, have been replaced with new Government policy set out in Planning Policy Statement (PPS) 3 *Housing* (November 2006). The relevant paragraphs are as follows (emphasis added).

Extracts from PPS3 *Housing* (November 2006)

16. Matters to consider when assessing design quality include the extent to which the proposed development:
- Is easily accessible and well-connected to public transport and community facilities and services, and is well laid out so that all the space is used efficiently, is safe, accessible and user-friendly.
 - Provides, or enables good access to, community and green and open amenity and recreational space (including play space) as well as private outdoor space such as residential gardens, patios and balconies.
 - Is well integrated with, and complements, the neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally in terms of scale, density, layout and access.
 - Facilitates the efficient use of resources, during construction and in use, and seeks to adapt to and reduce the impact of, and on, climate change.
 - **Takes a design-led approach to the provision of car-parking space, that is well-integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly.**
 - Creates, or enhances, a distinctive character that relates well to the surroundings and supports a sense of local pride and civic identity.
 - Provides for the retention or re-establishment of the biodiversity within residential environments.
-
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.**

NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN (FIRST ALTERATION) (2005):

Policy DW-E1

Development shall be appropriate and sympathetic in scale, appearance, materials, form, siting and layout, and shall not cause unacceptable effects by reason of visual intrusion, overlooking, shading or other adverse impact on local amenities. Developers shall have regard to:

- a the scale and siting of the proposal in relation to adjoining development, spaces, the character of the area and the wider landscape. This will involve consideration of height, massing and density, relationship to adjoining buildings and land uses and landscape features on and off site, and other potential impacts of the proposal on local amenities e.g. noise, light or other forms of pollution, including those arising from traffic generated by the development (see also Policy DW-E43, Section C6); and*
- b materials and built form in relation to the character of adjoining development, local vernacular and any historic features (see also Policies DW-E18 to DW-E29, Section C2).*

Policy DW-T9 (extract)

The provision of additional car parking space in the District will be controlled in accordance with upper limits for each class of development, as set out in Appendix G7. Provision beyond these limits will not be permitted.

Development will be required to provide

- i parking facilities for bicycles in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Appendix G7;*

.....

Development will not be permitted which, as a result of failing to meet expected car parking demand on site, is likely to lead to the parking of additional vehicles on nearby roads or other land, resulting in:

- i. a significant road safety hazard, or*
- ii. significant environmental damage, having regard to the character of the surrounding area.*

Such consequences may however be avoided in some circumstances to the satisfaction of the local planning authority by means of an undertaking by the developer to contribute either financially or otherwise towards one or more of the following as appropriate:

- a the provision of additional or improved public car parking, including provision in accordance with a proposal of this Plan;*
- b measures to improve the accessibility of the application site by walking, cycling and/or public transport;*
- c measures which directly prevent the relevant safety hazard or environmental damage.*

Public car parking provided or improved under sub-paragraph (a) above should be of good quality, secure and suitably located in relation to the proposed development (normally within reasonable walking distance). These and other measures undertaken under sub-paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) should be likely to be implemented within a reasonable time.

- 3 The local plan policies have been operating since before the adoption of the First Alteration in 2005. The upper limits for parking space provision set out in Appendix G7 of the local plan are based on those recommended in *Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2000*, Hampshire County Council's supplementary guidance to the Hampshire County Structure Plan Review. They also provide an approximation to the level of car ownership for each type of housing, and are thus used in applying the latter part of Policy DW-T9 (the part that seeks to avoid safety and environmental problems caused by "overspill" parking).
- 4 The District Council's experience of operating the local plan policies, coupled with changes in guidance (particularly the publication of PPS3 *Housing*), has prompted a review of the way in which the local plan policies are applied. The issues emerging from this review mirror closely those which form the basis of the guidance in PPS3.

The purposes of parking space control

- 5 PPG13 seeks to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. One of its main provisions is a reduction in the provision of new car parking space on development sites, exploiting the direct relationship between the level of car parking provision and the number of car journeys made. However, the key to this relationship is the level of provision at the trip *destination*. Reductions in car parking space at the trip *origin* - generally the home - have little effect on travel patterns.
- 6 Likewise, the pursuit of the PPG13 objectives necessarily focuses on *car use*, whereas the main - or at least the initial - effect of constraining domestic parking space is likely to be on *car ownership*; and even that effect is likely to be very limited in extent. It is in fact no part of current policy to seek to reduce - or indeed to limit - car ownership.

Parking and the quality of the residential environment

- 7 It is now recognised that the impacts of both the provision of space for parking and the parking itself - whether or not in the space provided for it - are central to the success or failure of the wider residential environment. The District Council's supplementary planning guidance *Housing design, density and character* (newforest.gov.uk/media/adobe/7/e/housing_design_density_and_character_SPD.pdf) devotes an annex to the issue of car parking, identifying some typical problems related to parking in new residential developments and offering a menu of possible solutions.
- 8 This design-led approach is reflected in paragraph 16 of PPS3 (see above):

a design-led approach to the provision of car-parking space, that is well-integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly.

In other words, "how" is as important as "how many".

Car ownership, housing design and the efficient use of land

- 9 While there is no overriding reason to constrain residential parking space, it is important to avoid serious over-provision. Estimates of future car ownership should therefore be used as a guide in order to avoid both the inefficiency of over-provision and the safety and environmental costs of under-provision.
- 10 Minimum car parking requirements for new development may be able to assist in the design process but should not be allowed to dominate it. Their greatest value lies in protecting the environmental quality of existing residential areas rather than dictating the design parameters of the new.
- 11 Car ownership in New Forest District (or to be precise, the availability of car and vans) at the time of the 2001 Census stood at some 1.4 per household. This is more than the national average, but very close to the average for Hampshire (that is, the county area excluding the unitary cities of Portsmouth and Southampton).
- 12 Nationally, car ownership has increased steadily over recent decades and is forecast to grow by 25% between 2001 and 2026 (the end of the period covered by the currently emerging development plan). It also varies widely with the type and size of household and dwelling. The 2001 Census relates car ownership to household type, as shown in Table 1A.

Table 1A

New Forest District: average car ownership 2001 (by household size)

Household size (persons)	Average car ownership per dwelling
	2001
1	0.8
2	1.5
3	1.8
4 or more	1.9

- 13 Car parking standards are conventionally specified by reference to the number of bedrooms in each dwelling on a development (in other words a measure of the size of the dwelling). The relationship between the size of a dwelling and the size of the household which occupies it is not straightforward and is constantly shifting. There is a tendency for the larger households in an area to occupy the larger dwellings (and the smaller households conversely), but this relationship is quite weak when compared to the variations of household size *within* each category of dwelling. Thus for example in the New Forest District in 2001, of the largest fifth of the total dwelling stock (the 14,182 dwellings with 4 bedrooms or more), only 4,592 or less than a third were occupied by the largest households (4 people or more): a greater number, 5,566 households in these dwellings were two-person households and even 1,534 were occupied by a single person.

- 14 In order to obtain a realistic picture of how car ownership varies with dwelling size, allowance needs to be made for this “spreading” effect: otherwise predicted car ownership will be based on the assumption of a much closer fit between household and dwelling sizes than is realistic. Table 1B below takes the “spreading” effect into account, and then by applying the growth rate referred to in paragraph 12, provides a forecast of car ownership in 2026.

Table 1B

New Forest District: anticipated average car ownership 2001 and 2026 (by dwelling size)

(Note: does not include elderly people in sheltered housing)*

Dwelling size (bedrooms)	Average car ownership per dwelling	
	2001	2026
1	1.0	1.4
2	1.2	1.5
3	1.5	1.9
4 or more	1.7	2.1

- 15 These are of course average values, and at any given time the number of cars or vans associated with each individual dwelling in a development will be greater or less than the average. To make reasonable allowance for this, where parking space is provided on-plot for each dwelling, the recommended provision should be increased by a further 25%, as follows:

Table 2

New Forest District: recommended parking provision

(Note: does not include elderly people in sheltered housing)*

Dwelling size (bedrooms)	Recommended average provision (spaces per dwelling) (on-plot)
1	1.7
2	1.9
3	2.4
4 or more	2.6.

*Note: This supplementary planning document does not cover elderly people’s sheltered housing or nursing or rest homes.

A development which provides substantially more than the recommended amount of parking space does not represent efficient use of land. On the other hand, if the total provided is significantly less, consideration will need to be given to whether there is likely to be an unsatisfied demand which could lead to road safety hazards or environmental damage of the type referred to in Policy DW-T9 of the Local Plan**. If there is, then developers should aim to bring the level of provision up to match the above figures as closely as possible.

16 In comparing the proposed parking space provision with the recommendations in Table 2, account will need to be taken of the layout and design of the development. In particular:

- Parking spaces provided in **communal or shared parking areas**, provided they are well-designed and convenient to use, make more efficient use of land than spaces provided on-plot and/or assigned to a particular dwelling. It is suggested that the greater contribution of such “unassigned” spaces to meeting demand should be recognised by counting each as 1.25 spaces. It will be noted that this cancels out in respect of those spaces the 25% uplift referred to in paragraph 13.
- Given that at any given time many of them are likely to be put to use for other types of household storage, **single on-plot garages** should be counted as one half of a space each. Single garages should normally be of sufficient size to accommodate a car and at least one bicycle, i.e. minimum internal dimensions of 6m x 3m. Where the developer makes a case for garages smaller than this, consideration will need to be given to whether those garages should be counted towards the total car parking provision at all. Car ports should be counted as a whole space; and a double garage will be counted as two singles, i.e., as one parking space.
- In addition, and outside town centres where there is public parking space and on-street parking is regulated, layouts based on on-plot parking may include **lay-bys and/or other visitor parking space**, providing that highway safety is not prejudiced and up to a maximum of 20% of the total amount of parking on site. Such spaces may be counted towards the total provision on the site.

**Note: In applying Policy DW-T9, the District Council will take the term “environmental damage” to include problems of the type listed in Annex 1 of *Housing design, density and character* and caused by a significant reduction in opportunities for on-street parking by residents already established in the neighbourhood.

PRACTICAL EFFECT OF THE PROPOSED SPD**Example 1:** A development of 2-bedroom houses with on-plot garages

Recommended provision is 1.9 spaces per dwelling. A conventional layout in which each house has a single garage (at least 3m x 6m) and driveway would produce the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{garage} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{ space} \\ \text{driveway} &= 1 \text{ space} \\ \\ \text{Total} &= 1.5 \text{ spaces per dwelling.} \end{aligned}$$

This is rather lower than the recommended provision, and if. It could be brought closer by replacing the garages with open parking spaces (2 spaces per dwelling), or alternatively by providing a small number of shared or visitor spaces.

(Considered against current policy and standards, this proposal would attract an upper limit on parking provision varying according to the location of the site and ranging from 1.2 spaces per dwelling in the case of a town centre site in Totton, Lymington or New Milton to 2 spaces per dwelling in a village or other rural location or in parts of the smaller towns. The provision of one garage and one parking space per dwelling (total 2 spaces) would be regarded as excessive in any of the District's larger settlements or town centres.)

Example 2: A development of 4-bedroom houses with on-plot garages

Recommended provision is 2.6 spaces per dwelling.

This could be achieved through a conventional layout in which each house has a single garage and driveway with another space adjoining (or a double-length driveway):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{single garage} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{ space} \\ \text{double-width driveway} &= 2 \text{ spaces} \\ \\ \text{Total} &= 2.5 \text{ spaces per dwelling.} \end{aligned}$$

Alternatively, providing a double garage on each plot, still with a double driveway, would bring the total provision to 3.0 spaces per dwelling: somewhat higher than the recommended provision of 2.6, but not necessarily so much so as to warrant a refusal of planning permission.

(Considered against current policy and standards, this proposal would attract an upper limit on parking provision varying according to the location of the site and ranging from 1.8 spaces per dwelling in the case of a town centre site in Totton, Lymington or New Milton to 3 spaces per dwelling in a village or other rural location. The provision of two garage spaces and two parking spaces per dwelling (total 4 spaces) would therefore be regarded as excessive anywhere in the District.)

Example 3: A development of 10 x 2-bedroom houses with parking in a shared car park

Recommended provision with on-plot parking is 1.9 spaces per dwelling, i.e. 19 spaces in total, accommodating the forecast average car ownership for 2-bedroom dwellings of 1.5 vehicles plus an allowance for the variation in use of on-plot spaces. However where parking space is shared, the more efficient use of the available spaces renders this allowance unnecessary. The proposed SPD allows each space provided to be counted as 1.25 spaces, and thus a shared parking area for 15 vehicles is considered sufficient to avoid a serious “overspill” problem from the site. Effectively, the recommended provision is reduced to 1.5 spaces per dwelling, or a total of 15 spaces.

(Considered against current policy and standards, this proposal would attract an upper limit on parking provision varying according to the location of the site and ranging from 1.2 spaces per dwelling in the case of a town centre site in Totton, Lymington or New Milton to 2 spaces per dwelling in a village or other rural location or in parts of the smaller towns. The total for the development would thus range from 12 to 20 spaces.)