

**NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN (FIRST ALTERATION):
NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL DEVELOPMENT SCHEME****SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: THE PROVISION OF
CAR PARKING SPACE IN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT****1. INTRODUCTION**

- 1.1 In October 2007 the Cabinet approved for consultation the draft supplementary planning document (SPD) *The Provision of Car Parking Space in Residential Development*. The consultation process is now complete and this report recommends the Cabinet to adopt the document with a number of changes which address the representations received.

2. CONSULTATION ON THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

- 2.1 The consultation period for the draft SPD ran from 5 November to 17 December 2007. Representations were received from eighteen persons and organisations. Annex A summarises the representations received, and sets out officer comments on each.
- 2.2 It will be noted that there is considerable support for the proposed SPD. A number of relevant criticisms are also made, however, and the commentary identifies those parts of the document where officers consider amendments are appropriate.
- 2.3 Applying these amendments, which are quite limited in scope, and taking the opportunity for further editing of the text, officers have drafted a revised version of the SPD, which appears at Annex B.
- 2.4 The Planning and Transportation Review Panel considered the proposed new SPD at their meeting on 23 January. They supported the recommendations contained in this report.

3. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The Cabinet has previously been advised that the proposed refinement of planning policy for car parking provision has no major financial implications for the Council; that it should improve the efficiency of the development control process; but that at the same time it may add to pressure to broaden the role of development control officers, with implications for expenditure on additional staff training.

4. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1 The Cabinet has previously been advised that the proposed SPD is a response to concerns of an environmental nature. Attention has been drawn particularly to increases in the risk of flooding resulting from the spread of impermeable parking

areas. Options for promoting sustainable drainage systems, already identified as an issue in the SPD *Housing design, density and character* and the emerging Core Strategy development plan document, will be explored further as such initiatives progress.

5. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

5.1 Previous advice suggests that catering for anticipated demand for parking space can contribute towards reducing certain types of anti-social behaviour.

6. EQUALITY AND DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

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

7. CONCLUSION

7.1 The response to consultation on the draft SPD has revealed support for its preparation, together with some minor shortcomings the most important of which are addressed in the proposed amendments. Officers believe the amended document will make a positive contribution to the Council's planning policy framework.

8. PORTFOLIO HOLDER COMMENTS

8.1 The Planning and Transportation Portfolio Holder supports the recommendations in this report.

9. RECOMMENDATION

9.1 That the Cabinet adopt and publish as a Supplementary Planning Document the revised text at Annex B of this report.

For Further Information Please Contact:

Patrick Hughes
Transport Policy Officer
Tel (023) 8028 5355
E-mail: Patrick Hughes at NFDC

Background Papers:

The Provision of Car Parking Space
in Residential Development (outside
the New Forest National Park) :
Consultation Draft, NFDC
November 2007

Consultation letters sent and
representations received (File Ref.
501.9)

REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED (5.11.07 to 17.12.07)

Representations received from:

Councillor Carpenter	New Forest National Park Authority
The Fordingbridge Society	New Milton Town Council
Hampshire Constabulary (Crime Prevention)	Pennington Residents' Association
The Highways Agency	Pennyfarthing Developments
Hordle Parish Council	Ringwood Town Council
Hythe and Dibden Parish Council	Test Valley Borough Council
The Lymington Society	Totton and Eling Town Council
Marchwood Parish Council	Turley Associates
Milford Parish Council	Whitsbury Parish Council

In addition, the following confirmed they had no comments to make:

The Environment Agency	Hampshire County Council	Southampton City Council.
------------------------	--------------------------	---------------------------

SUMMARY OF THE REPRESENTATIONS

(Officer comments follow in *italics*, with those suggested amendments with which officers agree identified by **bold type**)

General approach, scope and assumptions of the proposed SPD

The proposed SPD is supported. (HPC, MaPC, RTC, TETC, PenningtonRes, TurleyAssocs)

Comment: Noted

Increased flexibility and recognition of the importance of design quality* is supported. (LymingtonSoc, WPC, *TurleyAssocs)

Comment: Noted

Increased flexibility must not mean less spaces provided. (Carpenter)

Comment: Agreed. The increased flexibility allows developers to provide more spaces if they wish.

Proposed SPD does not go far enough, but it should improve the relationship housing / parking / street scene. (NMTC)

Comment: The proposals go as far as is considered reasonable given the characteristics of the area and the requirements set out in PPS3 and PPG13.

Emphasis on trip *destinations* as the key determinant of travel patterns is supported (TurleyAssocs) / restricting parking space for housing will not deliver traffic reduction (Carpenter).

Comment: Agreed. This position has also been endorsed by HCC

Pleased that the proposed SPD addresses overflow parking. (HPC, MaPC)

Comment: Noted

The relationship between the proposed SPD and the development plan is unclear (NFNPA)

Comment: The proposed SPD clearly sets out its relationship with the parent policies in the local plan and with national policy.

Adequate provision of parking space on residential developments is particularly important in rural settlements. (MiPC)

Comment: Agreed

Problems are caused particularly by young adults constrained by property prices to remain in the parental home. (WPC)

Comment: Accepted that this is one of a number of pressure points. At the 2001 Census, about 7,000 households in the District (10% of the total) contained at least one non-dependent "child", and accounted for about 15,000 motor vehicles. By 2026, such households can be expected to have on average about 2.5 vehicles.

In Lymington, car ownership is above average and the assumed increase of 25% over the next 20 years may be inadequate. (LymingtonSoc)

Comment: While car ownership in the District as a whole is high by national standards, the 2001 Census shows car ownership in Lymington to be among the lowest in the District. There is no obvious reason why the rate of growth of car ownership in Lymington should differ significantly from that elsewhere.

The proposed figures per dwelling are rather low. (FordingbridgeSoc)

Comment: The proposals go as far as is considered reasonable given the characteristics of the area and the requirements set out in PPS3 and PPG13.

Car ownership in affordable housing is no lower than in other housing developments. (Carpenter)

Comment: Noted. The proposed SPD makes no distinction between affordable and other housing.

"Car-free" developments have run into problems elsewhere. (HConstabulary)

*Comment: Noted. The proposed SPD does not advocate "car-free" development, but allows for development without on-site parking where a developer consider this feasible **and** the Council as local planning authority is satisfied that unmet demand for parking space will not lead to road safety hazards or environmental damage as set out in Policy DW-T9 of the local plan.*

The proposed SPD will have no significant impacts on the New Forest National Park. (NFNPA)

Comment: Noted

Retirement flats often have inadequate parking space (the level of need generally being underestimated by developers) and need minimum standards. (Carpenter)

Comment While the issue of parking provision for sheltered housing is commonly addressed alongside that for “general” residential development, there is an important difference. A major component of the demand for parking space at sheltered housing developments consists of visitors’ rather than residents’ cars, and in transport planning terms the development is thus to a significant degree a “destination” as well as an origin. In order to avoid the complications which could arise from this, the proposed SPD deliberately does not deal with sheltered housing.

Maximum v minimum

It is not clear whether there are still to be maximum standards. (NFNPA)

Comment: The status of the figures and how they are to be applied is clearly set out in the draft SPD.

The proposed figures should be a minimum. (LymingtonSoc)

Comment: The status of the figures and how they are to be applied is clearly set out in the draft SPD.

Minimum standards are inappropriate. (PennyfarthingDevs)

Comment: The SPD and the parent policy in the local plan set out clearly the circumstances in which the Council will look for a certain minimum level of car parking provision to be made.

Concerned that requiring too many spaces will stifle housing development: need to be flexible. (RTC)

Comment: The proposals generally increase flexibility. The SPD and the parent policies in the local plan set out clearly the circumstances in which the Council will look for a certain minimum level of car parking provision to be made.

The relationship between parking space provision and accessibility by other modes

PPG13 calls for demand management to reduce road traffic. Key links in the strategic road network are (and will be increasingly) under stress or unable to cope. The proposed SPD should not cater for unrestrained growth in car ownership but should balance any new parking space provision with the provision of alternative transport modes. (HA)

Comment: PPS3 clearly acknowledges the different effects of restrictions on parking space at trip destinations and at the home: it is the former which has the potential to help deliver traffic (growth) reductions.

Increased emphasis on alternative transport modes is supported, but more investment is needed (possibly using developer contributions*) (including improvement of pedestrian and cycle routes around Marchwood and reopening of the passenger railway to Hythe**). (*HDPC, **MaPC)
Comment: Both the local plan and the emerging LDF Core Strategy identify the need for more investment in transport infrastructure, but responding to this need is outside the scope of the proposed SPD.

PPS3 paragraph 37 includes accessibility to major infrastructure (including public and other transport services) as a criterion for selecting broad locations for housing: so why is the division of the District into accessibility zones to be abandoned at least in relation to residential development, and what will they be replaced with? (HA)
Comment: The paragraph of government policy referred to addresses the location of new housing, but not its design or parking provision. The location of new housing is outside the scope of the proposed SPD.

The planning/design process should be able to take account of accessibility (Pennyfarthing, TVBC) as well as the character of the area and the setting of development. (TVBC)
Comment: In accordance with PPS3, the levels of parking provision recommended in the proposed SPD are based on forecasts of car ownership and considerations of design and the efficient use of land. To a degree, these factors in turn reflect others such as the character of the area, the setting of the development and the accessibility of the site by means other than the car. It remains open to prospective developers to propose lower levels of provision provided this does not bring them into conflict with Policy DW-T9 of the local plan.

Shared and on-plot spaces

The distinction between “shared” and “on-plot” parking spaces should be more clearly defined* / is welcomed, but the developer’s freedom to choose between them should be acknowledged.** (*TurleyAssocs) (**NFNPA)
*Comment: **Agreed. Recommend that paragraph 15 of the proposed SPD be revised to make this clearer.***

Communal parking will only be appropriate on the largest developments. (FordingbridgeSoc)
Comment: Agreed that it is more likely to be a realistic option on larger sites, though not ruled out on smaller ones.

Inadequate or “off-plot” parking increases friction between neighbours. (Carpenter, LymingtonSoc)
Comment: This can, but need not, be the case. The proposals are considered reasonable given the characteristics of the area and the requirements set out in PPS3 and PPG13.

Parking space not close to the dwelling is often unused. (HConstabulary)
Comment: Agreed. The need to take account of this is acknowledged in the Council's supplementary planning document Housing design, density and character.

Whole numbers v fractions of a space

The proposed figures per dwelling should be clarified / rounded up to the nearest whole number, at least on smaller developments* / in respect of on-plot parking**. (Carpenter, HDPC, *RTC, *FordingbridgeSoc, **HPC)

Partially agreed. Recommend that in relation to on-plot parking, the figures should be rounded up to the next half-space ("half-spaces" being an available design option in the form of garages - see below).

Garages

The minimum size for a recognised garage is supported. (MaPC)

Comment: Noted

The treatment of garages as half a parking space is supported (with the possible exception of dwellings having separate workshop or utility space*). (MaPC, *TurleyAssocs)

Comment: Noted (it is always open to a prospective developer to make the case for treatment of garages as whole spaces where particularly generous alternative provision is made elsewhere).

**New Forest District Local Plan (First Alteration)
New Forest District Local Development Framework**

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

**THE PROVISION OF CAR
PARKING SPACE IN
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT**

(outside the New Forest National Park)



NEW FOREST DISTRICT LOCAL PLAN (FIRST ALTERATION)

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT: PROVISION OF CAR PARKING SPACE IN RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT (OUTSIDE THE NEW FOREST NATIONAL PARK)

- 1 This Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) 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) (August 2005) and the Council's SPD *Housing design, density and character* (April 2006). The local plan policies form part of the Development Plan, and are 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 National guidance 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 with housing development, have been replaced by new 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.**

- 3 The local plan policies have operated since before the adoption of the First Alteration. 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 2002*, Hampshire County Council's supplementary guidance to the Hampshire County Structure Plan (Review). They also give an

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.

approximation to the level of car ownership for each type of housing, and are used in applying the latter part of Policy DW-T9 (the part concerned with avoiding safety and environmental problems caused by “overspill” parking).

- 4 This SPD takes advantage of increased flexibility in Government policy, to arrive at a policy and standards which are more responsive to local circumstances. It also incorporates the findings of recent research on residential parking, in particular *Residential Car Parking Research (2007)* produced by WSP and others for the Department of Communities and Local Government.

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 car parking space on development sites, concentrating on provision at trip destinations and on car use rather than ownership. It is no part of current policy to seek to reduce or limit car ownership.

Parking and the quality of the residential environment

- 7 The impacts both of designated parking space and of parking activity wherever it occurs 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 car parking, identifying typical problems related to parking in new residential developments and offering a menu of possible solutions.

- 8 This design-led approach is reflected in the highlighted portion of paragraph 16 of PPS3 (see paragraph 2 above). “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 new ones.
- 11 Car ownership in New Forest District at the time of the 2001 Census stood at about 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 size, as shown in Table 1.

Table 1: New Forest District: average car ownership 2001 (by household size)

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

- 13 Parking standards are usually related to the number of bedrooms in each dwelling (dwelling size). The relationship between the size of a dwelling and the size of the household which occupies it is not straightforward. The larger households in an area do tend to occupy the larger dwellings (and conversely for the smaller households), but this relationship is quite weak compared to the variation of household size *within* each category of dwelling. For example in 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 (less than a third) were occupied by the largest households (4 people or more); more (5,566) by 2-person households, and even 1,534 by a single person.
- 14 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 assuming a much closer fit between household and dwelling sizes than is realistic. Table 2 takes this “spreading” effect into account to arrive at a realistic estimate of car ownership by dwelling size for 2001. It then applies the growth rate referred to in paragraph 12 to provide a forecast for 2026.

Table 2: New Forest District: average car ownership 2001-26 (by dwelling size)
(Note: excludes elderly people in sheltered housing)

Dwelling size (bedrooms)	Average car ownership per dwelling	
	2001	2026 (forecast)
1	1.1	1.4
2	1.2	1.5
3	1.5	1.9
4 or more	1.7	2.1.

- 15 These average figures provide a reasonable guide for developments where parking within the site is in well-designed and conveniently-located shared or communal parking areas. Much development however makes individual parking provision on each dwelling plot. To allow for the reduced flexibility of this arrangement, provision in such cases needs to be at least 25% greater.
- 16 The table on page 6 sets out recommended levels of car parking provision based on these principles. On top of the factoring-up by 25% as per paragraph 14, the figures for on-plot provision are also rounded up to the next 0.5 space .

**NEW FOREST DISTRICT (outside the New Forest National Park):
RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT*:
RECOMMENDED PARKING PROVISION**

Dwelling size (bedrooms)	Recommended average provision (car spaces per dwelling)	
	Shared/communal parking	OR On-plot parking
1	1.4	2.0
2	1.5	2.0
3	1.9	2.5
4 or more	2.1	3.0

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, developers should aim to bring the level of provision up to match the above figures as closely as possible.

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

- 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: This SPD does not cover elderly people’s sheltered housing or nursing or rest homes.

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