

MAIDSTONE BOROUGH COUNCIL

**CABINET MEMBER FOR PLANNING, TRANSPORT AND
DEVELOPMENT**

REPORT OF HEAD OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Report prepared by Steve Clarke

Date Issued: 04/03/2015

**1. ADOPTION OF INTERIM PARKING STANDARDS FOR NEW
DEVELOPMENT**

1.1 Key Issue for Decision

- 1.1.1 To consider whether the Kent County Council: Kent & Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006 and Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008 should be adopted as interim parking standards for new development in the Borough.

1.2 Recommendation

- 1.2.1 That the Kent County Council: Kent & Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006 and Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008 be adopted as interim parking standards as a material consideration for Development Management purposes.

1.3 Reasons for Recommendation

- 1.3.1 Vehicle Parking Standards are a development management tool that are used to ensure there is an appropriate balance between proposed land use within new development and the level of parking required to service those proposals. Parking standards are also used as an advisory tool for members of the public and developers intending to prepare plans for the development of land.
- 1.3.2 The Council does not currently have any locally adopted parking standards for new development. Parking provision within applications for new development is currently looked at on a site-by-site basis taking into account the site's location and available alternative means of transport and comments received from Kent Highway Services on behalf of the Highway Authority.

1.3.3 It is , intended, following the adoption of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan (currently at various Reg 18/19 consultation stages) to prepare a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and to introduce local parking standards. This is, however, unlikely to occur until mid-2017 at the earliest.

1.3.4 Members have also expressed concerns regarding the current lack of locally adopted parking standards when making decisions on applications.

1.3.5 Given the likely timescale before the SPD can be adopted and as an interim measure, it is therefore proposed to adopt the following two documents as material considerations for development management purposes as parking standards for new development across the Borough.

- Kent County Council: Kent & Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006
- Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008

These are attached as Appendices A and B respectively to this report.

1.3.6 The first document sets out standards for various types of development based on the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order ranging from Class A1 Retail to Class D2 Assembly and Leisure and also covers other sui-generis uses as well as setting out information on parking layout design and dimensions. The standards themselves are set out on pages 14-28 of Appendix One.

1.3.7 The second document focuses on residential development (Class C3) with the standards also focusing on the location of development sites rather than just the types of dwelling unit proposed. The standards are also expressed as a mixture of maximum and minimum requirements. They are shown on page 10 of Appendix Two.

1.3.8 Careful judgment will still need to be exercised by Development Management Officers and applicants concerning the design of parking provision to ensure that parking provision is designed in an appropriate manner and that an acceptable balance is struck between the extent of hard surfacing and soft landscaping within development. For example, the need to bear in mind that the standards for larger dwellings in suburban/suburban edge/village and rural locations seek to ensure parking spaces are independently accessible and that garage provision is seen as an addition to the need for individual parking spaces.

- 1.3.9 The NPPF provides clear support for 'sustainable transport', emphasising that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes giving people a real choice about how they travel whilst at the same time recognising that there will be different conditions in different areas and between urban and rural areas. The NPPF also encourages the use of Travel Plans as a tool to assist in promotion of sustainable transport modes.
- 1.3.10 Planning authorities are advised to support a pattern of development, where it is reasonable to do so, that facilitates the use of sustainable means of transport. This includes in my view a need to reduce parking provision in areas that are adequately served by a choice of sustainable transport modes, to encourage that choice.
- 1.3.11 The approach in The Kent Design Interim Guidance Note 3 relating to residential parking follows that principle with a graduated approach to provision and the use of maximum standards in town centre and edge of centre areas with more relaxed standards for village and rural areas for example, where other options are generally less available.
- 1.3.12 Adopting the standards as an interim measure will give a greater degree of certainty as to the Council's requirements for applicants, the general public and Members. But it is still important to employ a degree of flexibility where appropriate, to ensure high quality streetscapes and places are delivered and to promote sustainable transport.
- 1.4 Alternative Action and why not Recommended
- 1.4.1 The Council could continue to consider planning applications and give advice to developers and members of the public on a site-by site basis. This however, provides for a continuing degree of uncertainty and the potential for inconsistency in decision making.
- 1.5 Impact on Corporate Objectives
- 1.5.1 Ensuring appropriately located and well-designed parking as an integral element of new development in order to secure a high quality of design for new development in the Borough is consistent with the Council's objective of Maidstone being a great place to live and work.
- 1.6 Risk Management
- 1.6.1 There are no significant risks associated with the adoption of the documents as interim parking standards as a material consideration for development management for the Borough of Maidstone.
- 1.7 Other Implications

1.7.1

1. Financial
2. Staffing
3. Legal
4. Equality Impact Needs Assessment
5. Environmental/Sustainable Development
6. Community Safety
7. Human Rights Act
8. Procurement
9. Asset Management

X

1.7.2 The environmental/sustainable development implications are dealt with in the body of the report.

1.7.3 The legal implication is that the documents to be adopted would become a material and relevant consideration in development control decisions. Therefore, any challenge against those decisions in relation to the parking standards issues they raise, can be rebutted.

1.8 Relevant Documents

1.8.1 Appendices

A: Kent County Council: Kent & Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006

B: Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008

1.8.2 Background Documents

Kent County Council: Kent & Medway Structure Plan Supplementary Planning Guidance SPG4: Kent Vehicle Parking Standards: July 2006

Kent Design Guide Review: Interim Guidance Note 3: Residential Parking: November 2008

IS THIS A KEY DECISION REPORT?

Yes

☐

No

☒

If yes, this is a Key Decision because:

.....

Wards/Parishes affected:

.....

How to Comment

Should you have any comments on the issue that is being considered please contact either the relevant Officer or the Member of the Executive who will be taking the decision.

David Burton

Cabinet Member for Planning, Transport and Development

Telephone: 07590229910

E-mail: davidburton@maidstone.gov.uk

Steve Clarke

Principal Planning Officer

Telephone: 019622 602418

E-mail: steveclarke@maidstone.gov.uk