

Bolsover District Council

Meeting of the Planning Committee on 17th January 2024

**Local Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document
– consultation feedback and proposed document for adoption**

Report of the Portfolio Holder for Growth

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| Classification | This report is Public |
| Contact Details | Jonathan Hendy Senior Planning Officer |

PURPOSE / SUMMARY OF REPORT

- To update Members on the outcome of the consultation exercise on the draft Local Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document and seek their approval to make appropriate revisions and refer to Council the adoption of the revised document as a material consideration in planning decisions.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Background

- 1.1 In accordance with the Council's approved Local Development Scheme (February 2022), work has recommenced on the preparation of a number of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) to provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies of the Local Plan for Bolsover District (March 2020).
- 1.2 In relation to the Local Parking Standards SPD, work began in October 2018 to support the preparation of the Publication version Local Plan for Bolsover District. As part of this work, a report was taken to Planning Committee regarding a draft Parking Standards SPD and approval was given to carry out a public consultation exercise on the draft document and this exercise ran during December 2018 and January 2019.
- 1.3 However, during the Local Plan Examination the Inspector ruled that the parking standards information in the draft SPD should be included within the Local Plan for Bolsover District as an appendix. This instruction was followed and this saw the local parking standards being referred to in policy ITCR11: Parking Provision and set out in Appendix 8.2 of the Local Plan, with a reference to the preparation of a SPD to provide more detailed guidance on how development proposals should include an appropriate provision for vehicle and cycle parking.
- 1.4 As the Local Parking Standards SPD cannot revise the standards set out in the Local Plan for Bolsover District, the recommencement of work on its preparation

has focussed on how the required parking provision should meet the requirements of policy ITCR11: Parking Provision, namely:

- a) Relate well to the proposed development;
- b) Be well designed, taking account of the characteristics of the site and the locality;
- c) Provide a safe and secure environment;
- d) Minimise conflict with pedestrians and / or cyclists;
- e) Make provision for service and emergency access.

1.5 In addition, the Government through the recent revisions to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) has placed greater emphasis on achieving well designed and beautiful places and this has influenced the recommended work on the preparation of the Local Parking Standards SPD.

1.6 Based on this policy background, the prepared SPD for public consultation focussed and provided further detailed guidance on how developments should address criteria a) to e) of policy ITCR11 through their design and implementation and was set out in the following sections:

- A. General Approach to Parking
- B. On Street Parking
- C. On Plot Parking (Drives and Garages)
- D. Parking Courts
- E. Shared Spaces
- F. Non-Residential Parking
- G. Accessible Parking (Disabled)
- H. Cycle Parking
- I. Motorcycle Parking
- J. Electric Vehicle Charging

1.7 The prepared Local Parking Standards SPD was reported to the Local Plan Implementation Advisory Group on 18th October 2023 for information and any appropriate advice and was then subject to a targeted consultation exercise with statutory consultees, as well as developers and agents and other consultation bodies registered for on the Council's Local Plan database, given the more operational nature of the SPD. However, copies of the document and representation forms were also made available at local libraries and contact centres.

1.8 This consultation exercise ran for 4 weeks between Monday 30th October to 5pm on Monday 27th November 2023. The outcome of this consultation exercise is discussed below.

2. Details of Proposal or Information

Outcome of the Consultation Exercise

2.1 The Council received four submissions during the consultation period, from:

- Historic England;
- the Bolsover North Consortium;
- UK Coal;
- Highways England.

2.2 In addition, one late submission was received from Derbyshire County Council from the Highways Department. Despite this being received late, as the statutory highway authority their comments are valued and have been incorporated into summary of representations received and considered.

2.3 A summary of the outcome of the consultation exercise and the main points that are considered to merit revisions to the approved consultation draft Local Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document is set out below. However, the full schedule of responses and the Council's proposed response to the points is contained in Appendix 1 to this report.

Treatment of parking in Conservation Areas

2.4 Historic England considered that the document could be enhanced by ensuring that the design responds to local distinctiveness, the significance of heritage assets and their setting, if relevant for example, within a conservation area. Also that it would be beneficial to have a section in the SPD that considers parking considerations when in a Conservation Area or where development will affect the significance of a heritage asset and whether there are specific design considerations that protect and conserve these assets.

2.5 In response to this point, a new paragraph at 2.11 has been added to say that *"Within conservation areas materials will be important in the treatment of parking spaces. We would seek to avoid car parking next to listed buildings so that their setting is protected."*

Requirement for a 2-metre landscape strip between driveway parking

2.6 The Bolsover North Consortium considered that the requirement for a 2-metre landscaping verge or boundary fence between parking spaces does not constitute good use of land and would result in reduced densities and could affect development viability. They agreed with the sentiment that this would break up rows of parking, however, in their view, only soft landscaping and not hard landscaping such as boundary fences (as referred to in the text) would have this positive impact. They considered that this 2-metre landscaping verge between parking spaces would be trodden on and would likely be removed by the homeowner in any event.

2.7 In response to this point, it is considered that a fixed requirement for a 2-metre landscape strip between driveway parking may be too prescriptive and not be flexible to respond to the wide variety of development sites. However, it is considered that it remains important to achieve a 'meaningful landscape strip' and seek its retention in order to achieve well designed and beautiful places. Therefore, it is proposed to make this revision to the SPD in paragraph 2.9.

Use of a garage as a parking space

2.8 The Bolsover North consortium considered that this statement conflicts with the principle of developers providing garages, noting that it is contrary to the adopted Manual for Streets guidance which Derbyshire County Council Highways direct developers to when preparing development proposals intended for local highway authority adoption.

2.9 In response to this point, it is noted that Manual for Streets, paragraph 8.3.41, states:

“In determining what counts as parking and what does not, it is recommended that the following is taken into account:

- *car ports are unlikely to be used for storage and should therefore count towards parking provision; and*

- *whether garages count fully will need to be decided on a scheme-by-scheme basis. This will depend on factors such as:*

- *the availability of other spaces, including on-street parking;*
- *where this is limited, residents are more likely to park in their garages;*
- *the availability of separate cycle parking and general storage capacity;*
- *garages are often used for storing bicycles and other household items; and*
- *the size of the garage;*
- *larger garages can be used for both storage and car parking, and many authorities now recommend a minimum size of 6 m by 3 m.”*

2.10 Following consideration of the guidance within Manual for Streets, it is noted that this point needs to be decided on a scheme-by-scheme basis and so it is proposed that the paragraph 4.4 of the SPD will be revised to state that garages can count as a parking space as long as they are of a minimum dimension and are assessed on a case-by-case basis, in order that a different approach could be arrived at based upon local circumstances.

On-Street Parking

2.11 Derbyshire County Council consider that whilst on street parking is accepted, it is in the context of visitor provision where there is short term attendance. They consider that there should be a clear distinction made that parking which is directly associated with a residential dwelling is not counted on street. Where laybys are used they argue that the same principle applies, i.e. the highway cannot be reserved for individual users and private islands within the highway cannot be accepted due to the ability to ensure that street users are fully protected when using the highway surrounding them, they also have practical issues of maintenance and drainage.

2.12 In response to this point, the view of the highway authority is noted and it is considered that there is merit to adding text to help clarify this matter. Therefore, the following text has been added to Paragraph 3.4 that says, *“Where we consider that the parking design response requires dedicated*

on-street parking, early consultation with the Highways Authority is recommended to ensure acceptability. It is recommended that the developer discusses with the Highways Authority the spatial arrangement with regards to adoption or maintaining the highway as a private road.”

Acceptability of Gravel Drives

- 2.13 Derbyshire County Council consider that it is typical for loose material, such as a gravel drive, to be acceptable where there is a 5m hardstanding from the edge of highway to ensure that vehicles have good traction and don't drag gravel onto the highway. On this basis, they state that where such an arrangement is proposed the wider use of loose material, such as gravel drives, would be acceptable.
- 2.14 In response to this point, the view of the highway authority is noted and it is considered that there is merit to adding some wording to paragraph 4.10 that states, *“Consideration will be given to gravel drives where there is an appropriate apron or set back from the back of the footway, and there is an appropriate gradient to the driveway itself to prevent gravel slippage.”*

Lifetime Homes

- 2.15 Derbyshire County Council would encourage a reference to be made lifetime homes standards.
- 2.16 In response to this point, the view of the highway authority is noted and it is considered that there is merit to inserting an additional paragraph 4.13 to say, *“In respect of residential properties that are to meet Lifetime Home standards we will require circulation around parking spaces to meet part M of the building regulations.”*

Other changes

- 2.17 A new section on shared access has been added at paragraph 6.1 and several new and better images have been inserted to improve the quality of images and aid with the visual representation of the proposed guidance.

Final Document

- 2.18 A final version of the SPD with the above revisions is attached as Appendix 2.

3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 3.1 The report updates Members on the feedback received during the consultation exercise and sets out the Council's response to this feedback and any consequential revisions to the SPD. On this basis, it is recommended that Members approve the Local Parking Standards SPD and refer it to Council for formal adoption.

4 **Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection**

- 4.1 It would be possible to not approve this final version of the Local Parking Standards SPD at this time but this alternative option has been rejected as this would mean that the Council would not provide sufficient guidance to developers and agents on this matter and may undermine efforts to achieve well designed and beautiful places in Bolsover District.

RECOMMENDATION

That Planning Committee:

- 1) note the outcome of the consultation exercise as set out in the report and set out in Appendix 1;
- 2) approve the proposed responses to the main points and the consequential revisions to the proposed SPD as set out in the report and set out in Appendix 2;
- 3) recommends to Council that the Local Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document is adopted as a material consideration in planning decisions.

Approved by Councillor Ritchie, Portfolio Holder – Growth

IMPLICATIONS:

Finance and Risk: Yes No

Details: There are no specific finance or risk issues arising from this report.

On behalf of the Section 151 Officer

Legal (including Data Protection): Yes No

Details: There are no specific legal or data protection issues arising from this report

On behalf of the Solicitor to the Council

Environment: Yes No

Please identify (if applicable) how this proposal / report will help the Authority meet its carbon neutral target or enhance the environment.

Details: The SPD includes design guidance relating to cycle parking and Electric Vehicle Charging.

Staffing: Yes No

Details: There are no human resources implications arising from this report.

On behalf of the Head of Paid Service

DECISION INFORMATION

| | |
|--|----|
| <p>Is the decision a Key Decision? A Key Decision is an executive decision which has a significant impact on two or more District wards or which results in income or expenditure to the Council above the following thresholds:</p> <p>Revenue - £75,000 <input type="checkbox"/> Capital - £150,000 <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <i>Please indicate which threshold applies</i></p> | No |
| <p>Is the decision subject to Call-In? <i>(Only Key Decisions are subject to Call-In)</i></p> | No |

| | |
|---|--------------------|
| <p>District Wards Significantly Affected</p> | All |
| <p>Consultation: Leader / Deputy Leader <input type="checkbox"/> Executive <input type="checkbox"/> SLT <input type="checkbox"/> Relevant Service Manager <input type="checkbox"/> Members <input type="checkbox"/> Public <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/></p> | No Details: |

| |
|--|
| <p>Links to Council Ambition: Customers, Economy and Environment</p> |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Enabling housing growth; • Developing attractive neighbourhoods; • Increasing customer's satisfaction with our services. |

| | |
|---|------------------------------------|
| <p>DOCUMENT INFORMATION</p> | |
| <p>Appendix No</p> | <p>Title</p> |
| <p>1</p> | <p>Consultation Responses</p> |
| <p>2</p> | <p>Local Parking Standards SPD</p> |
| <p>Background Papers</p> | |
| <p><i>(These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Executive you must provide copies of the background papers).</i></p> | |
| | |