

# FAREHAM

## BOROUGH COUNCIL

### **Report to Planning and Development Policy Development and Review Panel**

**Date**                    **19 May 2015**

**Report of:**            **Director of Planning and Development**

**Subject:**              **FAREHAM BOROUGH NON-RESIDENTIAL PARKING  
STANDARDS: DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION**

#### **SUMMARY**

This report describes the background and rationale for the production of a revised Non-Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Draft for Consultation) that has been issued for consideration by the Planning and Development PDR Panel. The SPD sets out guidance for developers and other interested parties on the levels of parking expected in non-residential developments within the Borough.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the PDR Panel approves the contents of Appendix A of this Report “Non-Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Draft for Consultation)” in order to issue for consultation.

## **INTRODUCTION**

1. This report describes the background and rationale for the production of a revised Non-Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (Draft for Consultation) that has been issued for consideration by the Planning and Development PDR Panel.
2. The SPD (Draft for Consultation) document attached as Appendix A to this report sets out guidance for developers and other interested parties on the levels of parking expected in non-residential developments within the Borough.
3. The requirement to review current non-residential parking standards has arisen as a result of Hampshire County Council's (HCC) decision to withdraw its Parking Strategy and Standards (2002), which had previously been used as guidance on parking standards for relevant developments in the Borough. Once adopted, it will replace the HCC document which has continued to form the basis of guidance during the interim period and until further notice (Planning Committee Meeting 23 April 2014).
4. The Council has used this opportunity to review recent local experiences in the application of these standards and consider current local and national planning policies in order to issue updated guidance that will also apply to major development proposals such as Welborne and Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus.
5. The published version of this SPD will complement the guidance for residential developments given in the "Residential Car & Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Fareham Local Development Framework)" issued by Fareham Borough Council in November 2009.

## **SCOPE**

6. The Non-Residential Parking Standards SPD (Draft for Consultation) has been prepared to ensure that all new non-residential development in the Borough has due regard to the importance of providing appropriate, well-designed parking that satisfies the principles of transport sustainability.
7. The SPD represents an important material consideration in the determination of planning applications. It provides further guidance on adopted Policies in the Borough's Local Plan. Once adopted, it will replace the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards (2002) document that was withdrawn in April 2014.
8. The provision of parking standards for different land uses is important in influencing travel choices. It is also vital to ensure that otherwise well-planned development does not adversely affect the operation, aesthetic, and safety of, or access to, the highway. This SPD sets out a revised strategy for parking provision in all forms of non-residential development in the Borough including mixed-use developments.
9. The SPD applies to all development sites in the Borough including Welborne and Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus. Parking standards are defined for individual use class types, including spatial requirements for cars, cycles, motor-cycles (powered two-wheelers), disabled users and operational parking, loading or unloading.

## APPROACH TO THE DERIVATION OF NEW STANDARDS

10. In March 2015 the Government issued a Planning Update which included supplementary guidance on the provision of car parking spaces to that contained in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). In particular, the Planning Update states that *“Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network”*.
11. The evidence available from case studies where parking standards have been applied to non-residential development in the Borough demonstrates conclusively that there is a sound case for providing relevant guidance on the spatial requirements for car and cycle parking. For example, inadequate levels of parking provision have led to over-spillage of parked vehicles on the road network surrounding a development site.
12. Issuing guidance should therefore contribute positively to the planning of developments, and this SPD sets out a revised strategy for parking provision in all forms of non-residential development in the Borough including mixed-use developments.
13. The review of previous planning applications showed that in some cases inappropriate parking provision has led to the under- or over-provision of parking spaces, resulting in various problems as developments have come into use, including the occurrence of overspill parking on the surrounding roads. It was also apparent that the previous standards have been interpreted as either ‘maximum’ or ‘minimum’ figures, potentially leading to an inappropriate quantum of parking spaces for the development.
14. It was also realised from the experience of case studies that where parking is a material consideration, it is important to specify a standard that represents the type and location of development and as far as practicable gives a robust provision over the full life-cycle of the development.
15. There was also the need for a more detailed resolution of Use Classes than that given in the 2002 publication, particularly within the Retail classification, to differentiate between the different types of development proposals across the Borough.
16. A principal conclusion from the review of case studies was that the HCC 2002 maximum parking standards could generally be applied as a requirement, with an appropriate reduction in the Town Centre and scope for flexibility as supported by a Transport Assessment or Travel Plan submitted as part of a planning application.
17. The need for flexibility within a defined set of requirements is also seen as critical to ensuring that the guidance included in the SPD document remains applicable in the future commensurate with possible intensification of use and other changes in land use patterns.
18. In certain circumstances planning permission is not required to change between different non-residential uses. In such cases the Council has no control over whether such schemes have adequate parking provided. Therefore, when considering the parking standards for a particular use type, the Council will also need to be mindful of which uses can be permitted without a future planning application.
19. The preparation of the new SPD has also been informed by an assessment of the standards documents issued by other adjoining local authorities. Where new guidance

has been issued this is typically based upon the HCC Parking Standards (2002), in some cases retained as maximum standards for motor vehicles, adopted as a single standard across the Borough or District and amended to reflect local experience and following a consultation exercise.

## **LOCAL AND NATIONAL POLICY CONTEXT**

20. The relevant policy guidance within the Local Plan is Core Strategy Policy CS17: High Quality Design, which states that development will be designed to: *“Provide appropriate parking for intended uses taking account of the accessibility and context of a development and tackling climate change.”*
21. The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) sets out Government planning policies that must be taken into account in the preparation of Local Plans and is a material consideration in planning decisions. The revised Parking Standards should be prepared in accordance with the policy context set out in the NPPF.
22. Chapter 4 of the NPPF states that *“All developments which generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a Travel Plan”* (Paragraph 36). It also provides guidance on setting parking standards:
- “If setting local parking standards for...non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:*
- *The accessibility of the development;*
  - *The type, mix and use of development;*
  - *The availability of and opportunities for public transport;*
  - *Local car ownership levels; and*
  - *An overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles”.* (Paragraph 39)
23. Additional guidance in a Planning Update from Government dated March 2015 states that *“Local planning authorities should only impose local parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is a clear and compelling justification that is necessary to manage their local road network.”*
24. It was concluded from the review of previous planning applications referred to in the paragraphs above that the issuance of guidance on parking standards for non-residential developments would be beneficial in providing developers and project promoters with a consistent framework for bringing forward proposals. The guidance also allows flexibility to modify the recommended figures where necessary to reflect particular local conditions, justified by details submitted in a Transport Assessment or equivalent supporting documentation as part of a planning application.
25. For larger developments it will be necessary to assess the requirements for operational parking space through submission of a Design and Access Statement and/or Management Operations Plan.

### **Fareham Town Centre**

26. The application of parking standards to sites in Fareham Town Centre will need to take account of their distinct characteristics, the specific spatial requirements and viability of the proposed development.

27. In comparative terms this location benefits from the availability of public off-street parking spaces and better access to rail and bus services. It can therefore be expected that these amenities would lead to lower levels of parking demand at individual sites with a consequential reduction in appropriate parking standards for these sites, particularly for retail-related planning applications.
28. This Design Guidance SPD (Draft for Consultation) recommends that where spaces are required, then in certain locations and when appropriate to the development consideration should be given to providing parking areas through the implementation of underground or undercroft solutions.

### **Other Local and District Centres (excluding Welborne)**

29. Although other centres in the Borough are less well-connected in terms of public transport, generally there are off-street parking spaces available and these facilities may provide opportunities for departures from standards in the consideration of parking provision for development site proposals. This would be expected to apply particularly to planning applications related to the retail use class.

### **Welborne**

30. For parking standards applicable to employment areas the Welborne Design Guidance SPD calls up the Fareham Borough Council Non-Residential Parking Standards SPD.
31. The Design SPD recommends the establishment of a clear strategy for the relationship between employment and residential areas of Welborne. The relative location of these areas may contribute positively towards a reduction in the overall requirement for parking provision.
32. The Welborne Design Guidance SPD states that car parking within all centres should be provided in accordance with Fareham Borough Council's Non-Residential Parking Standards SPD, ensuring that the parking areas are convenient, well-enclosed by adjacent buildings and connecting directly to key areas of the public realm. This SPD also states that proposals for multi-level car parking should demonstrate that the facilities will complement the area's public realm.

### **Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus**

33. Major development proposals in the Borough being brought forward in 2015 and subsequent years include Solent Enterprise Zone at Daedalus.
34. The scale of development may provide an opportunity for the sharing of parking spaces across adjacent sites, with the possibility that land allocated for parking can accommodate greater demand in the future associated with intensification of use, or otherwise reallocated to more sustainable uses.

### **DESCRIPTION OF NEW PARKING STANDARDS**

35. Parking standards for each Use Class type and sub-type to be applied to new developments are defined in tables contained within the SPD document (Draft for Consultation) attached as Appendix A.
36. For the avoidance of doubt, each standard should be interpreted as a 'requirement' rather than a maximum or minimum figure, with permitted variations where these can

be supported by evidence contained within a Transport Assessment or other compelling evidence.

37. Provided the quantum of parking space meets the overall requirement in larger developments then consideration can be given to a departure from standards if there is a clear benefit in doing so. A balance will need to be struck between unnecessarily partitioning individual site requirements and ensuring that overall provision is appropriate to the proposed development and its location.

### **Use Classes**

38. The standards are categorised by the following Use Classes, with sub-type descriptions given in the tables in the SPD document:

- Retail (A1-A2)
- Food and Drink (A3-A5)
- Commercial (B1-B8)
- Hotels, Assembly and Leisure (C1, D2)
- Health Establishments (C2, D1)
- Care Establishments (C2, D1)
- Educational Establishments (C2, D1)
- Other Uses (Sui Generis)

39. The parking standards defined in the Non-Residential Parking Standards SPD (Draft for Consultation) are for Use Class sub-types that relate to planning applications received by Fareham Borough Council.

40. It should be noted that the proposals for educational establishments are consistent with the standards set out in the document entitled "On-Site School Parking Guidelines" (April 2013) from Hampshire County Council. This document updates the guidance given in the County Council's (now withdrawn) 2002 Standards, and is based on a sample audit of school sites across Hampshire which gave a better understanding of travel patterns.

### **Parking Space Requirements - Operational**

41. Total spatial requirements for a particular land use can generally be represented as the combination of operational and non-operational needs.

42. Operational needs will include parking for vehicles directly associated with servicing, essential maintenance, deliveries and storage, together with space for set-down and loading. For example, in the case of Health and Care establishments this will include areas which enable ambulances and mini-buses to operate efficiently.

### **Parking Space Requirements – Non-Operational**

43. Parking for non-operational needs will include spaces for staff, visitors and customers

to park their vehicles. In the case of Educational establishments it may also be necessary to consider requirements for student parking spaces.

44. These requirements are sub-divided as follows:

- Regular parking spaces
- Disabled parking spaces (typically 6% of total spaces located in the most accessible areas)
- Motorcycle parking (also referred to as 'Powered Two Wheelers')
- Cycle stands

45. The provision of cycle facilities is key to the objective of promoting the use of sustainable modes, and due consideration should be given to appropriate provision for secure, covered storage and showers that encourage cycling. For major developments these details will be included in a Travel Plan, and higher provision than the cycle standards presented in this document may be relevant, particularly where complementary measures are confirmed as part of an infrastructure delivery package.

### **Parking Standard Tables**

46. Table 1 of Part B of the SPD document (Appendix A) defines the parking space requirements by Use Class whilst Table 2 of Part B sets out the car and car parking standards and operational parking space standards by Use Class type and sub-type. Standards are defined in terms of units representing the land use for the premises involved, for example total gross floor area (gfa), number of staff employed, seats or bedrooms.

47. The required standards given in Tables 1 and 2 of the SPD document (Appendix A) represent the recommended figures for each Use Class type and parking category. However, where there is compelling evidence to depart from these standards it will be necessary to submit a Transport Assessment, Travel Plan or other supporting documentation as part of a Planning Application.

48. For development sites within town, district or local centres with higher levels of public parking and accessibility to public transport, consideration should be given to an appropriate reduction in the required vehicle parking standards.

### **SUSTAINABILITY AND CONSULTATION**

49. Under the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004 (the Regulations), Councils must carry out a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) of land-use and spatial plans (including Supplementary Planning Documents). However, where the Council can demonstrate that any land-use or spatial plan is unlikely to have significant environmental effects (Regulation 9(3)), a SEA will not be required.

50. In principle, supplementary planning documents should not be subject to the SEA Directive or require sustainability appraisal because they do not normally introduce new policies or proposals or modify planning documents which have already been subject to sustainability appraisal. However, a supplementary planning document may occasionally be found likely to give rise to significant effects which have not been

formally assessed in the context of a higher-level planning document.

51. In order to determine whether this supplementary planning document is likely to have a significant effect on the environment, and hence require a SEA, the Council has to undertake a screening process against a specified set of criteria. The results of the screening process indicate that a SEA is not required to be undertaken for this supplementary planning document, although the screening process has to now be verified through consultation with Natural England, English Heritage and the Environment Agency.
52. This process can be undertaken in parallel with the main consultation exercise, which is expected to be programmed over a 6-week period commencing in mid-June 2015.
53. All individuals and organisations listed on The Council's Local Plans database will be informed of the Consultation and will have an opportunity to submit comments on the document. The document and Consultation details will also be published on the Council's Website.
54. Following completion of the Consultation period, the Council will produce a short report summarising the comments made, the Council's initial response to them and identifying where the Council believes revisions to the SPD should be made. Once a final version is produced, the SPD does not have to undergo external examination and can be formally adopted by Members.

## **RISK ASSESSMENT**

55. There are no significant risk considerations in relation to this report.

## **CONCLUSIONS**

56. The withdrawal of Hampshire County Council's Parking Strategy and Standards (2002) in April 2014 has led to the need to consider appropriate guidance for non-residential parking standards in the Borough. The guidance for residential developments given in the "Residential Car & Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (Fareham Local Development Framework)" issued by Fareham Borough Council in November 2009 is unaffected by this change and continue to be applicable.
57. A recent Planning Statement issued by Government has further clarified the interpretation of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and recommended that local parking standards for residential and non-residential development only be imposed where there is a compelling justification required to manage the local road network. It is considered that providing guidance on standards would be beneficial in order to enable viable and sustainable developments to be brought forward and ensure consistency in parking provision across the Borough.
58. A review of case studies drawn from recent planning applications has informed the preparation of new parking standards, in particular where difficulties have been experienced in the definition of Use Classes and as a result of intensification of use at specific sites.
59. It was concluded from this review that it would be appropriate for the HCC 2002 maximum figures to form the basis for specifying revised parking standards. These would be specified as 'required' standards recommended for all developments within each Use Class type category, but with exceptions permitted including reduced levels

of parking for retail developments in Fareham Town Centre characterised by the availability of public off-street parking spaces and better access to rail and bus services. The guidance would also provide scope for departures from standards in cases where these can be supported by a Transport Assessment, Transport Statement or Travel Plan.

60. The proposed parking standards given in the SPD Document (Draft for Consultation), attached as Appendix A, apply to both operational and non-operational space requirements of development. Non-operational requirements comprise regular car, disabled and motorcycle parking spaces and cycle stands.

### **Background Papers:**

Non Residential Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document Background Research Note (Draft V1), Fareham Borough Council, April 2014

### **Reference Papers:**

None

### **Enquiries:**

For further information on this report please contact Robert Burton. (Ext 2373).

## **APPENDICES**

**Appendix A:** [Fareham Borough Council Non-Residential Parking Standards Draft for Consultation \(May 2015\)](#)

