



| | |
|-------------------------|------------------------|
| Report for: | Cabinet |
| Date of meeting: | 20 October 2020 |
| Part: | 1 |
| If Part II, reason: | |

| | |
|--|---|
| Title of report: | Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document |
| Contact: | Councillor Graham Sutton, Portfolio Holder for Planning and Infrastructure Author/Responsible Officer: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Alex / Robinson / Stephen Mendham – Strategic Planning Team • James Doe – Assistant Director: Planning, Development and Regeneration |
| Purpose of report: | To seek Cabinet’s agreement to adopt the draft Parking Standards Supplementary Document (the draft SPD). |
| Recommendations | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. That Cabinet recommend to Full Council that the draft SPD is adopted. 2. That authority to make changes to the documents, including any necessary to reflect the Cabinet’s discussions and decision, be delegated to the Assistant Director Planning, Development and Infrastructure in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning and Infrastructure. |
| Period for post policy/project review | Once new car parking standards are adopted within an SPD, a review of their operation should be undertaken within 5 years. |
| Corporate objectives: | Having a clear set of standards to govern parking requirements for new development will help support the following objectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Safe and clean environment:</i> e.g. support policies in the Local Plan that promote a safe built environment • <i>Dacorum delivers:</i> e.g. helps provides a clear framework upon which planning decisions can be made. |
| Implications: | <u>Financial</u> |

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>'Value for money' implications</p> | <p>None directly associated with this report.</p> <p><u>Value for money</u></p> <p>Consultants Markides were appointed through a formal procurement process where cost and value for money considerations were reflected in the scoring criteria.</p> |
| <p>Risk implications</p> | <p>If the SPD is not approved, the Council will continue to apply the existing parking standards. However, the existing standards are expressed in terms of 'maximum standards' which should not normally be exceeded. This makes the existing standards out of date in relation to the National Planning Policy Framework and the Government's Planning Practice Guidance on 'Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements'. These documents state that maximum standards should be set only where there is a clear and compelling justification.</p> |
| <p>Community Impact Assessment</p> | <p>Community Impact Assessment carried out – see accompanying report</p> |
| <p>Health and safety Implications</p> | <p>Ensuring an appropriate level of parking provision as part of new development will support future highway safety.</p> |
| <p>Monitoring Officer/ Deputy S.151 Officer Comments</p> | <p>Deputy S151 Officer:</p> <p>No further comments to add to the report.</p> <p>Deputy Monitoring Officer:</p> <p>The SPD will ensure that the Council's standards are consistent with the latest government guidance and should assist consistent decision making and reduce the likelihood of successful challenges to planning decisions.</p> |
| <p>Consultees:</p> | <p>Officers have been consulted on the Draft SPD as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Development Management • Legal • Dacorum's Parking team • Environmental Health (Air Quality) • Local highway authority (HCC) <p>The Strategic Planning and Environment Overview & Scrutiny Committee (SPAEOSEC) considered a report on the draft SPD on 28 July 2020. This report explained the rationale behind amendments to the consultation draft SPD and that put before SPAEOSEC. A summary of SPAEOSEC's feedback and recommendations to this Committee are given in points 2.3 and 2.4 below.</p> |
| <p>Background</p> | <p>1. The draft SPD</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| papers: | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 2. Dacorum Borough Local Plan (April 2004) 3. Parking Standards Review, Markides Associates, October 2017 4. Draft Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document, Markides Associates, July 2020 5. Dacorum Area Based Policies Supplementary Planning Guidance on 'Accessibility Zones' (May 2004) 6. Roads in Hertfordshire – a Design Guide, HCC, January 2011 |
| Glossary of acronyms and any other abbreviations used in this report: | <p>HCC: Hertfordshire County Council SPD: Supplementary Planning Document</p> |

1.0 COMMITTEE CONSIDERATION OF PARKING STANDARDS REVIEW DOCUMENT

- 1.1 In determining planning applications for new development, the Council's standards for the provision of car parking are set out in the Dacorum Borough Local Plan 2004 that have been 'saved' for ongoing use. A review of parking standards, given that the current levels date from the early 2000's is therefore needed.
- 1.2 Officers have been working on a new set of parking standards based on the most up-to-date evidence of need, transport policy and local circumstances. A report on the Parking Standards Review, prepared by the Council's consultants Markides Associates, was considered by SPAEOSC on 19 June 2018.
- 1.3 The June 2018 SPAEOSC report explained the existing national and local planning policy context. Members were advised that local planning policies or guidance on parking deals with (a) level of provision (usually through local parking standards) and (b) design and layout of parking areas and spaces, including space dimensions. Responsibility lies with this Council for (a) and Hertfordshire County Council (HCC) as local highway authority for (b).
- 1.4 The main purpose of the June 2018 Committee report was to inform Members of the 'Parking Standards Review' study (October 2017) undertaken for the Council by Markides Associates. This study is available on the Council's website as part of the evidence underpinning the emerging new Local Plan:

<http://www.dacorum.gov.uk/home/planning-development/planning-strategic-planning/new-single-local-plan/technical-work-for-the-early-partial-review>
- 1.5 The study reviewed the Council's existing parking standards and provided an evidence base to underpin an SPD containing revised parking standards. Key recommendations were:
 - The Council should move away from maximum standards (which no longer form part of Government guidance which dates from the late 1990s). Instead, the starting point should be that all parking is accommodated on site, with the standards applied as 'requirements' from which departures may be justified with appropriate evidence.

- Two ‘accessibility zones’ should be defined within and close to Hemel Hempstead and Berkhamsted town centres. Car ownership is lower in these areas, so reduced car parking standards could be appropriate.
 - The recommended new residential parking standards in the study reflected the above bullet points and 2011 census data on car ownership.
 - The existing non-residential parking standards should essentially be retained, but applied as broad requirements rather than maximum standards.
- 1.6 As the study was a technical report, its recommendations could not be used in planning decisions until formally embedded in an adopted policy document. Therefore, the preferred approach was to provide updated policy guidance in the new Local Plan and an SPD containing the revised parking standards.

2.0 DRAFT PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT (DRAFT SPD)

- 2.1 Markides Associates produced a draft Parking Standards SPD which was considered by the Committee in March 2019. In June 2019 Cabinet resolved that the draft SPD should proceed to public consultation.
- 2.2 The consultation was undertaken in July and August 2019. The Council received a wide range of views to the consultation and as a result undertook further analysis of approach to the SPD. Following consideration of the issues raised by consultees, Officers, in conjunction with Markides, made revisions to the draft SPD.
- 2.3 The revised draft SPD was placed before SPAEOSC at its meeting on 28 July 2020. The Report detailed the main differences between the draft SPD which was consulted upon in 2019 and the revised draft put before SPAEOSC on 28 July 2020. At the July meeting the Chairman put forward the following views to Cabinet:
1. All large developments should provide adequate onsite parking.
 2. Arbitrary residential parking provision figures in the Appendices should be replaced for all Accessibility Zones except Zone 1 with one space per bedroom.
 3. For business developments adjacent to or within residential areas, provision of parking should include not only commercial vehicles, but also cars belonging to employees.
 4. The proposed standard should be firmly applied and such “wriggle room” offered by Page 19 para 6.11 and Page 38 para 12.1 should be deleted from the policy. Allowing developers to pay money in this way to dodge their obligations to residents is completely unacceptable.
- 2.4 The Committee agreed with those recommendations. Further details of the Committee’s view and Officer response can be found at Appendix 2.

- 2.5 Following the 28 July 2020 SPAEOSC meeting Officers, in conjunction with Markides Associates, further reviewed the provisions of the draft SPD and have now produced a revised draft Parking Standards SPD seeking to address the proposals made at that meeting. The full Draft SPD can be found in Appendix 1. There are five appendices to the Draft SPD and the following are particularly important:

Appendix A – Car parking standard tables

Appendix B – Accessibility plans, showing the accessibility zones, within which lower parking standards apply

- 2.6 The main differences between the standards now recommended and those in the previous draft SPD consulted on in July 2019 are summarised in the table below. Appendix 3 gives more detailed information on the main differences.

| Subject | |
|---|---|
| General approach | <p>The move made in the 2019 consultation draft SPD from the currently adopted maximum to a 'standard' approach has been maintained. Those standards have been further refined by the measures summarised below in this table, including revision to the accessibility zones, of which there are now 3. The higher accessibility zones 1 and 2 being in Hemel Hempstead with the remainder of the Borough all being in the remaining zone.</p> |
| Parking standards for different land uses | <p>Accessibility Zones 1 and 2 have been redrawn and are smaller and more tightly drawn in the draft SPD compared to the consultation draft SPD to more fully represent the available public transport. Following the SPAEOSC July meeting these were further refined. Zone 1 covers Hemel Hempstead town centre and has been extended to include the part of Two Waters Opportunity Area to align with the Council's aims and aspirations for the area. Zone 2 has been further reduced following the SPAEOSC July meeting and now covers only the Hospital and Paradise sites.</p> <p>Zones 3 and 4 no longer show a significant difference in parking standard and have therefore been merged to form Zone 3. As a consequence of the reductions much more of Hemel Hempstead, together with the entirety of the towns of Berkhamsted and Tring and the larger villages are now within Accessibility Zone 3 where a higher standard applies.</p> <p>The draft SPD slightly reduces the parking standard for accessibility zones 1 and 2 compared to the consultation draft SPD but are slightly higher than that contained in the draft to the July SPAEOSC meeting, what was the Zone 3 in the consultation and July SPAEOSC draft SPDs has the slightly higher standard applied to Zone 4.</p> |

| | |
|--|---|
| | <p>The proposed standards have been based on a more qualitative assessment of parking needs and pressures across the Borough, reflecting views put forward throughout the extensive engagement undertaken in preparing the SPD.</p> |
| <p>Accessibility zones and reduced parking standards in high accessibility locations</p> | <p>Following the review of the Consultation draft the accessibility zones were increased to four but were modified to emphasise variations in accessibility:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Zone 1 – Highest Accessibility – the immediate ‘core’ of central Hemel Hempstead where there are extensive local facilities and buses and highest density of development ▪ Zone 2 - High Accessibility – easy walking distance (approximately 10-minutes walk) of the centre of Hemel Hempstead, as well as core areas close to central Berkhamsted and to the stations and other facilities at Hemel Hempstead and Apsley railway stations. ▪ Zone 3- Medium Accessibility – remaining areas of the larger towns, where there are some public transport routes and local facilities. ▪ Zone 4 – Low accessibility – the rest of the borough, either villages or rural areas. <p>The result was that most of the Borough is in Accessibility Zone 4 and the majority of towns and villages in Zone 3, where higher parking standards will apply. Zones 1 and 2 would apply to the most accessible locations within Hemel Hempstead and parts of Berkhamsted.</p> <p>Following the July SPAEOSC meeting, and drawing on local knowledge and experience of parking issues in the Borough, it was decided to revert back to the higher accessibility Zones 1 and 2 (as redrawn above) and to merge Zones 3 and 4 for the rest of the Borough into the new Zone 3</p> |
| <p>Deviating from the standards</p> | <p>The SPD includes a mechanism to deviate from the standards. The applicant may submit robust evidence to the Council to demonstrate why a development should deviate from the standard and the Council will consider whether circumstances exist to justify a different approach.</p> <p>Equally, the Council will have the ability to require higher standards in areas, particularly where there are known on-street parking stress issues. It will be important for the Council to evidence these requests and provide this to the applicant at the earliest opportunity.</p> <p>Any deviations require the submission of a parking stress survey.</p> <p>Car-free residential development will be considered where</p> |

| | |
|-----------------------|--|
| | <p>developers can provide robust evidence that this will be appropriate. This type of development will not normally be acceptable outside Accessibility Zone 1.</p> |
| Visitor parking | <p>The standards encourage shared rather than allocated parking as this results in a more efficient use of parking space and a better use of EV charging points. It also gives the added advantage that visitors can use unused spaces when available.</p> <p>Visitor demand can fluctuate, but in general, particularly in evenings and weekends, are when residents are likely to receive significant numbers of visitors in cars. A key issue is whether spaces are allocated or not. These standards assume that at least 50% of all parking is unallocated. Should the level of unallocated parking be lower, then an additional 20% visitor parking spaces will be required.</p> |
| Servicing | <p>The SPD requires adequate provision and space within a site for parking, manoeuvring, loading and unloading to meet the operational servicing requirements of the development.</p> <p>The space set aside for servicing should be of suitable size for the type and quantity of vehicles likely to be associated with the development. Delivery vehicles should be able to safely enter and exit the site in a forward gear.</p> |
| EV Charging Provision | <p>The SPD proposes that 50% of all parking spaces to have active charging point. All remaining parking spaces to have passive provision. This assumes all the electric spaces are unallocated; if allocated, the Council will require a higher proportion of provision agreed on a case by case basis.</p> |
| Change in Use Classes | <p>A purely cosmetic change to Annex A to the draft SPD arises from the recent changes to the Use Classes Order (The Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) (Amendment) (England) Regulations 2020 (SI 2020 No.757), whereby a number of classes such as A1 – A5, B1 (a-c) and D1, D2 are now to be found in the new Use Classes E, F.1 and F.2. References to the former Use Classes have been retained for ease of reference.</p> |

- 2.7 It is important to note that the SPD must supplement the Council's existing policies on parking standards and cannot change them. The Council's adopted standards are expressed as maximum standards. As a consequence until the new Local Plan is adopted there remains a risk that applicants challenge the standards contained in the new SPD.
- 2.8 Whilst the Census 2011 data has been a starting point for assessment of the new parking standards a considerable amount of other evidence has been obtained and utilised in arriving the proposed standards.

- 2.9 In their Parking Review Report of October 2017 Markides in paragraph 1.5 set out the evidence base / information used on arriving at their recommendations, namely:
“1.5 This Technical Review has been developed based on the following evidence/information:
- Policy and guidance*
 - 2011 Census data*
 - Local site surveys and parking surveys*
 - Information on parking standards from other authorities*
 - Feedback from officers and councillors in applying existing standards*
 - Responses to consultation letters sent to developers/local business organisations”*
- 2.10 Markides have advised your Officers that they believe is currently no evidence to justify higher standards, including one space per bedroom and that during planning appeals this would likely be established.
- 2.11 Regarding commercial overspill parking, the Local Plan is seeking to resolve this, in conjunction with Hertfordshire County Council and Highways England, through the expansion of the existing lorry park off Junction 9 of the M1 near Redbourn (Proposal Cy03).

3.0 Conclusions

- 3.1 If the SPD is not adopted there is a risk that the Council will be unable to successfully defend planning appeals if planning permission is refused on the basis of the existing maximum standards.
- 3.2 The new standards are based on a wide range evidence available, not only the Census 2011 data, and have undergone considerable scrutiny and review from members and officers alike.
- 3.3 Representations and proposals from stakeholders, members and officers have been considered and addressed as far as the evidence available allows and also bearing in mind matters of policy.

4.0 Recommendations

- 4.1 Please see recommendations made on Page 1 above.