

WOKING BOROUGH COUNCIL

DRAFT MINUTE EXTRACT FROM NOTES OF A MEETING OF THE LDF WORKING GROUP

HELD ON 6 MARCH 2018 IN BOARDROOM

Present: Councillor David Bittleston
Councillor Ashley Bowes
Councillor Mary Bridgeman
Councillor Kevin Davis
Councillor Louise Morales
Councillor Melanie Whitehand

Ernest Amoako
Stephanie Broadley
Terry De Sousa
Douglas Spinks
James Stanfield

Actions

5. Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Ernest Amoako provided a brief summary of the report which outlined the various responses to the consultation on the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SDP). The current Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document allowed for a maximum provision of parking spaces in developments, which presumed that lower numbers of parking places could be provided in highly sustainable locations. The proposed Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document recommended that a minimum provision should be set to allow the Planning Authority a higher degree of flexibility and would allow them to argue for a higher provision in places where they thought this was required. It would also allow the Planning Authority to refuse applications that did not meet this minimum requirement.

The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SDP) that had gone out to Consultation was previously approved by the LDF Working Group in January 2017. The Working Group was requested to recommend that the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) be approved by Council at the meeting on 5 April 2018.

The Group were invited to make comments on the report and discussion ensued.

Councillor K Davis commented that he was appreciative of the additional note on page 47 of the report which referred to the consideration to be given to the parking provision of motor bikes. This had been one of Councillor K Davis' concerns but he was happy this addressed the point.

Councillor K Davis commented that he had grave concerns regarding the proposed provision of 0.5 parking spaces for one bedroom flats, apartments or maisonettes. Councillor M Whitehand and Councillor L

Morales also agreed with this view and it was thought that by not providing sufficient spaces this would push resident parking onto unsuitable roads and onto pavements. There was concern that the data used from the 2011 Census to inform these proposals was out of date and that car ownership trends had changed; specifically that there had been an increase.

Councillor D Bittleston disagreed with these comments and suggested that car ownership was likely to decline over the next 10-15 years when technology such as automatic cars was introduced. Councillor D Bittleston was keen that the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document should not hamper development by forcing car parking spaces that were not needed.

Councillor K Davis clarified that his comments regarding the provision of 0.5 parking spaces for one bedroom flats, apartments or maisonettes did not relate to the town centre and that he agreed there was no need for additional parking spaces in the town centre as season tickets for off-street car parks could be used. Councillor K Davis also commented that Councillor D Bittleston may be right regarding future technologies and the reduction of car ownership, however he was not happy to create a policy based on what 'might' happen in the future.

Following a query from Councillor L Morales regarding the conversion of garages, it was clarified by Officers that these Parking Standards would be applied to any new application regarding a new build house or an existing house that wanted to convert the garage. Any new planning applications would be considered on their own merit on a case by case basis.

The Chairman queried whether the evidence set out on page 43 justified the conclusion for only 0.5 parking spaces for one bedroom flats, apartments or maisonettes, as it was noted that over half of the dwellings (0.62) owned one car or more. Ernest Amoako advised the Group that an average had been applied to achieve these conclusions and that the methodology applied had rounded up the figure for houses/bungalows and rounded down the figure for flats, apartments and maisonettes.

Ernest Amoako commented that an increase in the provision of parking conflicted with the Councils objectives to maximise use of land and to minimise congestion and that this must be balanced.

Concerned by the data used, Councillor L Morales commented that the Parking Standards SPD should not impose the car ownership statistics of the town centre on the rest of the Borough. Ernest Amoako advised the Group that this point was discussed by the Group at their last meeting where it was concluded that setting a separate standard for every single area would be difficult to do. This is why an average had been applied and a minimum standard was proposed to allow flexibility. Douglas Spinks commented that there was a note in the Parking Standards SPD that allowed for this provision to be reduced in the town centre.

In his original comments, Councillor K Davis had suggested an amendment to the visitor parking guidance may address his concerns as this would allow some flexibility for parking where there was a high concentration on one-bedroom apartments. Following discussion it was proposed and duly seconded that this paragraph be changed to read 'Visitor parking is encouraged where appropriate. However, such spaces do not contribute towards the minimum parking standards set out in the table, which provide spaces per dwelling. At the discretion of the Council and based on the merits of the proposal, extra car parking spaces for visitors parking ~~may~~ **will** be provided up to a ~~maximum~~ **minimum** rate of 10% of the total number of car parking spaces provided for the development.'

The Group agreed the amendments details above.

Recommendation

Subject to the agreed amendment detailed in these minutes, the Working Group requests the Executive to recommend to Council that:

- (i) The various representations to the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document consultation together with the Officer's responses and recommendations as set out in Appendix 1 be noted;**
- (ii) Subject to the proposed modifications, the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document in Appendix 2 be adopted for the purposes of managing development across the Borough;**
- (iii) The requirements of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document should apply to all relevant planning decisions on and after the date of adoption, in this case 5 April 2018; and**
- (iv) Authority be delegated to the Deputy Chief Executive in consultation with the Portfolio Holder for Planning to approve amendments to the revised SPD to reflect new information before it is adopted.**