

## **CABINET**

**DATE OF MEETING: 4 AUGUST 2022**

### **TITLE OF REPORT: CYCLE & CAR PARKING IN NEW DEVELOPMENT TECHNICAL ADVICE NOTE**

**Report of:** Place

**Cabinet Portfolio:** Place

**Key Decision:** No

**Confidentiality:** Non-Exempt

### **PURPOSE OF REPORT**

1. To replace the [Parking Provision Interim Guidance](#) adopted by Cabinet in August 2008 with updated guidance, including new residential cycle and car parking standards, in the form of a Technical Advice Note.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Cabinet is recommended to:

1. Endorse the content of the Cycle and Car Parking in New Development Technical Advice Note (TAN);
2. Adopt the cycle and car parking standards set out at paragraphs 4.11 and 5.4 of the TAN as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications;
3. Revoke the [Parking Provision Interim Guidance](#) adopted in 2008; and
4. Authorise the Head of Place to make further edits and re-publish the TAN as and when required, except for the numerical cycle and car parking standards setting out quantum of parking to be provided with new development, which can only be amended with Cabinet approval.

### **BACKGROUND**

2. The Council's current parking standards and associated guidance were adopted in 2008. Since then, the context for setting parking standards has moved on and the key issues of good design, climate change, health and active travel have risen further up the agenda:
  - The Hart Local Plan (Strategy & Sites) 2032 was adopted in April 2020;
  - The Council declared a Climate Emergency in April 2021;
  - The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has seen several updates, promoting good design, healthy, inclusive places, active travel and carbon reduction;
  - Building Regulations have also moved on and are increasingly addressing climate change. For example, they now require electric car charging points with new homes.
3. It is also an opportunity to learn from previous developments - where parking works well, and where it has been less successful. Some developments experience a range of parking issues, such as parking on pavements and verges, arising from insufficient or poorly designed parking. We have sought to address these issues in this TAN.

- 4. An early version of the TAN was discussed by [Overview and Scrutiny Committee on 15 February 2022](#), and then by the **Climate Change Working Group on 22 March 2022**. Feedback from those meetings is summarised later in this report.

**THE PURPOSE OF THE TAN**

- 5. The aim of the TAN is to achieve sufficient and well-designed cycle and car parking with new development, encouraging a shift towards sustainable, active travel. This is an important element of place-making and contributes to tackling climate change and promoting healthy living.
- 6. The TAN has been informed by evidence commissioned from i-Transport, a specialist transport planning consultancy. It has also been informed by feedback from a professional urban design consultant (Urban Design Doctor), and internally from Development Management colleagues.
- 7. If endorsed by Cabinet, the TAN will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications with immediate effect.
- 8. The intention is to apply the document, make refinements if required, and put it through the formal processes needed to make it a Supplementary Planning Document, including public consultation. This takes several months, but it will then attract greater weight in the decision-making process.

**COMPARING THE CURRENT AND NEW STANDARDS**

- 9. One of the main changes over the current standards is a greater requirement for residential cycle parking as shown below:

Size of home	Current 2008 standard: Cycle spaces per home	New standard: Cycle spaces per home
1 bedroom	1	2 + 0.2 visitor
2 bedrooms	2	3 + 0.2 visitor
3 bedrooms	2	4 + 0.2 visitor
4 bedrooms	2	5 + 0.2 visitor
5 bedrooms	2	6 + 0.2 visitor

- 10. Cycle parking must be convenient, secure, and able to accommodate a range of cycles including electric, cargo and adapted cycles. The new guidance requires at least one cycle space close to the front door to ensure it is at least as convenient as getting in the car.
- 11. With regards to residential car parking, the new standards better recognise the range of factors that influence the need for resident and visitor parking. They also seek to accommodate the overall need for parking in a more efficient way.
- 12. Firstly, the new standards move away from the current zonal approach where less parking is required in more accessible areas. In Hart district, car ownership rates are high and are unlikely to be influenced by differences in accessibility between one part of the district and another (even if car use is influenced to some extent). For example, a family may need two cars to run the children to different places, even if the parents take the train to work, or work from home.

13. The new standards also place a slightly greater emphasis on *unallocated* car parking as a proportion of the total. This provides more flexibility and more efficient use of space when accommodating both resident and visitor parking. It means the development can better cope with those occasions when there is pressure on visitor parking, such as the dinner party, Christmas or bar-b-que examples where several households may be invited. Residents can use unallocated parking themselves if their allocated parking is insufficient. So on average, a shift towards unallocated provision should work better in terms of meeting needs whilst also making efficient use of land.
14. Appendix 2 shows a worked example of 30 homes to compare the old and the new standards. Key points to note are:
  - Cycle parking almost doubles.
  - The new standards provide more parking than the current restrictive approach in Zone 1, and slightly less parking than the current standard for Zone 3.
  - The new standards require an overall level of provision akin to current Zone 2, but with the *unallocated* element increasing from 13% to 22%. This provides extra flexibility to accommodate the overall need for resident and visitor parking while making efficient use of land.
15. The worked example is illustrative. The difference between the current and proposed standards will vary depending on the actual mix of properties and the zone it would have been in.
16. Appendix 3 sets out the actual standards per home for both the current (2008) standards and the new standards. The key points to note are:
  - For 1-bed homes the *allocated* parking requirement of 1 space per home remains, but the *unallocated* element increases quite notably. In Zone 1 it almost doubles from 1.1 to 2 spaces in total. This seeks to address problems of under-provision for 1-bed properties which can be purchased by couples with two cars (a likely scenario given the nature of Hart district and property prices).
  - For 2-bed and 4-bed homes the new district-wide standard is actually the same as that for Zone 2 in the current standards. The 3-bed standard is similar to Zone 3.
17. Providing sufficient car parking is consistent with objectives for modal shift. Ownership does not necessarily translate into higher usage, and if insufficient car parking is provided in new developments, displaced car parking can make it more difficult to walk or cycle around places easily, safely, and enjoyably.
18. The standards are neither maximum nor minimum standards, but guidance on the level to be provided. In any individual scheme applicants can submit evidence to support a different level of provision which would need to be considered.

## PREVIOUS FEEDBACK FROM MEMBERS

19. The emerging TAN was discussed at [Overview and Scrutiny on 15 February 2022](#). Member's discussions included:
  - The process and timescale to progress to a Cycle & Car Parking Standards SPD.

- The zonal approach and why the revised standards would not include these.
- Whether a zonal approach might be more relevant to cycle parking given challenges around cycling in more rural locations.
- How cycling provisions have progressed over the past few years in Hart.
- How car clubs could benefit Hart.
- Pressure on parking when properties extend or convert garages.
- The options for removing permitted development rights on schemes.

RECOMMENDATION Members noted the report and progress with the Cycle and Car Parking Standards SPD and provided feedback in the following areas:

- General support for the revised approach to residential cycle and car parking, including removing the zonal approach.
  - The differences between the current and revised car parking standards would be beneficial to see in the report.
  - Secure parking for bicycles and E-bikes and sufficient places.
  - Pavement parking and how the Council can further address this.
20. The **Climate Change Working Group** on 22 March 2022 raised similar issues with the additional comments:
- A query as to whether the new parking standards go far enough given they have not changed that dramatically.
  - That electric bikes are bulkier, need charging, are expensive and must be secure, but the standards are silent on this.
21. The document has been revised following these discussions, and with input from colleagues in Development Management. In particular, the guidance has been clarified for extensions and garage conversions, which can have an impact on on-street parking but where there is no scope to design-in off-plot parking. It will be for the applicant to use peak time parking surveys to demonstrate that there is sufficient capacity on-street.
22. Where there are permitted development rights the Council cannot enforce the parking standards. It is not proposed to introduce Article 4 directions to address this matter given the challenges in justifying that approach, and it would divert resources from existing priorities.
23. Members made points about the need for secure cycle parking that accommodates electric and other cycles. The revised document does address this matter but if it is apparent that there are ways to improve the guidance it will be fed into future iterations.

#### **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

24. The option to publish as a draft SPD for consultation was rejected at this stage. It is helpful to test the revised approach first, learn any lessons and garner feedback before refining the document. It can then go through the formal stages for an SPD, which in summary are:
- 1) Consultation with statutory bodies on an SA/SEA Screening Statement (SA is Sustainability Appraisal, SEA is Strategic Environmental Assessment)
  - 2) Consultation on a draft SPD (approved by the Portfolio Holder) along with a statement setting out any previous informal consultation, and an SA/SEA if needed
  - 3) Consider responses and make changes as required
  - 4) Adoption by Cabinet

25. The other option is not to update the guidance. This option was rejected given the current emphasis on good design, active travel and climate change, and the fact that the current 'interim' guidance dates from 2008.

## **CORPORATE GOVERNANCE CONSIDERATIONS**

### **Corporate Plan**

26. The Corporate Plan promotes healthy communities and people including the delivery of infrastructure that encourages people to walk, cycle and use buses

### **Hart Vision**

27. The Hart Vision to 2040 promotes cycling and healthy lifestyles through the Green Grid. Alongside this ambition it is equally important to ensure residents can safely and securely store cycles at home.

### **Service Plan**

- Is the proposal identified in the Service Plan? No
- Is the proposal being funded from current budgets? Yes
- Have staffing resources already been identified and set aside for this proposal? Yes

### **Legal and Constitutional Issues**

28. Technical Advice Notes do not normally require Cabinet approval. Other TANs have been prepared and published by officers as informal guidance. However, in this case Cabinet approval is needed to revoke the current guidance that was adopted by Cabinet in August 2008 and endorse its replacement.
29. Cabinet is *not* being asked to *adopt* the whole TAN. This will allow the TAN to be refined, improved and updated more quickly (as is the case with other TANs). It will then be published as a Draft Supplementary Planning Document subject to approval by the Portfolio Holder under delegated powers. *Adoption* of the SPD is an Executive function (see [Part 3 of the Constitution](#)) so it would return to Cabinet at that point.

### **Financial and Resource Implications**

30. There are no resource implications arising from endorsing the TAN. Further work to make the next iteration a Supplementary Planning Document will come from the existing planning policy budget and staff resources.

### **Risk Management**

31. There are no significant risks of revoking the current interim policy, which is quite old, and endorsing the TAN. The current guidance needs replacing, and this is a first step to doing so through a formal SPD.
32. There is a risk that the TAN attracts little weight at this stage prior to becoming an SPD. However, it is considered that the current guidance attracts little weight anyway given its age, and it is better to have up to date guidance for applicants to use. By adopting the numerical standards at this stage they will be given more weight in the determination of planning applications.
33. There is a risk that SPDs (by that name) no longer feature in the planning system after the latest raft of changes announced through the Levelling Up and Regeneration Bill. However, it is inconceivable that guidance of this type will not have a place in the new system in some shape or form, even if terminology or processes change.

## **EQUALITIES**

34. This TAN will have a positive impact on equalities as it promotes provision for non-standard bikes including adaptive bikes and sets out the requirements for disabled car parking with associated guidance. It therefore has a positive impact on the 'disability' group.

## **CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS**

35. A key driver for the cycle parking standards and associated guidance is the desire to encourage use of cycles instead of the car where possible. The document also refers to charging for electric cars (now required through Building Regulations) to ensure these are conveniently located.

## **ACTION**

36. The document will be used as a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.
37. A project plan will be developed to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document, building on the TAN at Appendix 1.

**Contact Details:** [daniel.hawes@hart.gov.uk](mailto:daniel.hawes@hart.gov.uk)

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1: Technical Advice Note: Cycle and car parking in new development

Appendix 2: Worked example comparing current and proposed residential car parking standards

Appendix 3: Comparing current and proposed residential car parking standards

## **Background Papers:**

Parking Standards Review, Client: Hart District Council, i-Transport, 22 March 2022