

<b>Item No.</b>	<b>Classification:</b> Open	<b>Date:</b> 7 January 2015	<b>Meeting Name:</b> Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Transport
<b>Report title:</b>		Revised Parking Standards consultation leaflet	
<b>Ward(s) or groups affected:</b>		All	
<b>From:</b>		Acting Transport Policy Manager	

### RECOMMENDATION(S)

That the Cabinet Member for Planning, Regeneration and Transport:

1. Agree the proposed changes to residential and non-residential cycle parking standards and residential car parking standards for consultation.
2. Agree the publication of the leaflet consultation purposes alongside to the New Southwark Plan: Options Version - Draft Policies and Area Visions (October 2014).

### BACKGROUND INFORMATION

3. We are currently in the process of preparing the New Southwark Plan which will replace the Core Strategy (2011) and the saved Southwark Plan (2007) and have prepared a set of issues and options for informal consultation between 31 October 2014 and 6 March 2015.
4. The New Southwark Plan Issues and Options includes proposed strategic and development management options for new policies. These are labeled as Strategic Policy X and DMXX. Strategic Policy 4: 'Sustainable Transport covers travel policies.
5. Within Strategic Policy 4: 'Sustainable Transport', DM15: "Walking and cycling" criteria DM15.1.7 references parking standards for bicycles and mentions "the standards set out in a leaflet for consultation." For car parking, in DM17 "Car parking," criteria DM17.1.1 mentions that development must "...adhere to the maximum standards," without specifying which standards. The standards and leaflet are also mentioned in the "Reasons" for DM18: "Parking standards for disabled people and the mobility impaired."
6. The standards referred to are those contained within the consultation leaflet (Appendix A) and are yet to be made publically available. These include:
  - Cycle and car parking standards for non-residential and non-self contained residential uses (hereon in abbreviated to non-residential);

- Cycle and car parking standards for self contained residential uses (hereon in abbreviated to residential);
7. It is important to note that standards for cycle parking are minimum, while standards for car parking are maximum.

## **KEY ISSUES FOR CONSIDERATION**

8. Changes are proposed to the cycle parking and residential car parking standards and it is necessary to consult the relevant bodies, organisations, public forums, societies and individuals on the proposed changes and options.
9. The standards are defined in a series of tables. The distinction between the policy context of each set of standards is critical, and will be from either:
- the current standards in adopted policy or;
  - the proposed standards (the basis for inclusion in the draft New Southwark Plan) or;
  - the standards as set out in the draft Further Alterations to the London Plan (FALP) 2014.
10. The type of space is used to distinguish standards. For all car parking and residential cycle parking, this is where the development is located (through either Southwark's adopted density zones or proposed use of PTAL, as in the FALP). For non-residential cycle parking, this is in terms of long stay spaces (i.e. the primary occupiers) or visitor/short stays spaces.
11. The car parking and cycle parking standards differentiate between use classes. There is no change to the use of use classes for car parking, however it is proposed that the non-residential cycle parking standards distinguish further between them (see below for an example).
12. The standards themselves, within each of these categories (type of space, policy context and use class) identify the trigger point in cycle space provision in terms of:
- How much floor space a development will provide or;
  - How many staff members are/will be employed on the completed development or;
  - How many bedrooms or bed spaces a development will provide (for self contained and non-self contained residential, i.e. C1 and C2 including care homes and student residences).

## **Non-Residential Car Parking Standards**

13. The key difference with the proposed car parking standards (and also proposed residential cycle parking) is the use of PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) for categorisation purposes, and is in line with the FALP. Southwark's standards are currently based on our designated density zones (Central Activities Zone, Urban Zone and Suburban Zone).

14. The level of non-residential parking provision for new development is unchanged from either existing adopted policy or that prescribed in the FALP and so does not need to be consulted on.
15. There is also a table specific to car parking for retail uses in town centres, however this does not deviate from current standards or the FALP and so does not need to be consulted on.

#### **Non-Residential Cycle Parking Standards:**

16. The non-residential cycle parking standards are in all cases more stringent than current adopted policy and in line with FALP standards. In some cases they are more stringent than FALP standards, for example the standard for use class B1a (offices) is double that in the FALP.
17. Further to this, where the standards do not deviate from the FALP, the proposed at least require a minimum number of spaces, which the FALP does not.
18. It is also proposed to distinguish within some use classes, for example A1 (retail) being split into food retail and non-food retail, with corresponding standards proposed.

#### **Residential Car and Cycle Parking Standards**

19. The standards for residential cycle and car parking are detailed in a separate set of tables defining the options available. These are categorised as:
  - Preferred option (option 1);
  - Car and cycle parking standards in the Draft FALP (2014);
  - Option 2: Existing car parking with modified draft FALP cycle parking;
  - Car and cycle parking standards in the Southwark Plan (2007).
20. Again the key difference with the new set of residential standards tables is the use of PTAL (Public Transport Accessibility Level) rather than Southwark's density zones for categorisation purposes.
21. In the preferred option, in all instances residential car parking standards are more stringent than existing policy and the FALP, in particular locations with higher PTALs have a maximum of zero car parking provision.
22. Cycle parking is also more stringent in the preferred option. Here it is proposed to link the number of cycle parking spaces to the number of bedrooms within a unit rather than the number of units as is current policy.
23. Option 2 keeps existing policy for car parking, and proposes the same standards in the draft FALP with the additional criteria of one visitor space per every 10 units, as is required in current policy.

## **Policy implications**

24. The leaflet summarises the key differences between current adopted standards, standards as proposed in the draft FALP and Southwark's new proposed standards.
25. The proposed cycle and residential car parking standards deviate from adopted policy and indeed the proposed standards in the draft FALP.
26. As they are currently proposed, the new cycle parking standards for both residential and non-residential land uses, and car parking standards for residential uses are much more stringent than in adopted policy and the FALP.
27. It is proposed that *more* cycle parking should be provided and *less* car parking should be provided than is currently possible through existing policy and the draft FALP. This is to reflect targets for cycle growth in both Southwark's draft Cycling Strategy and the Mayor's vision for cycling.
28. Further to this, the distinction within Use Classes in the non-residential cycling standards and the use of PTAL instead of density zones will help pin point a number of cycle and car parking spaces more appropriate to context on each development than is currently possible through adopted policy.
29. Both the increase in provision for cyclists and restrictions on car parking provision will help make cycling and public transport more attractive and convenient and therefore the proposed standards have the potential to increase sustainable forms of travel. This is in line with Strategic Policy 5: Sustainable Travel in the New Southwark Plan and the draft Cycling Strategy.
30. The proposed cycle parking standards and residential car parking standards will be consulted on and any feedback received will be considered.
31. N.B. Disabled parking and car clubs are already considered within the draft New Southwark Plan. This is found in the specific policy criteria of DM18 (at DM18.1.1) and DM19 (at DM19.1.1) respectively.

## **Community impact statement**

32. The publication of the proposed car and cycle parking standards sits alongside the informal stage of consultation on the New Southwark Plan Issues and Options. In principle, the approach to promote increased cycle provision and less car parking, will help to prioritise non-car uses and help maximise opportunities to use public transport, promoting inclusivity and equality of access to jobs and services. This should benefit all members of the community. It should be noted however that there are certain groups with protected equality characteristics who may rely on using a car which might include the elderly, disabled people and parents with young children. It will be very important that a reduction in car parking and promotion of increased cycle provision are undertaken in tandem with improvements in public transport and the public realm. Continued prioritisation of car parking for people with disabilities, even within what are otherwise in some cases "car free" developments, will be part of the proposed approach.

33. While in theory promoting cycling is beneficial to all users, but if routes out of developments are poorly lit, secluded and at risk from conflicts with road vehicles, a reduction in car parking may discourage people from going out and make people feel more isolated. This could particularly apply to vulnerable groups such as the elderly and young. An equalities analysis will be prepared at the preferred options formal stage of consultation in Autumn 2015 to fully consider whether there are any impacts on any groups with protected characteristics and also impacts on human rights.

### **Financial implications**

34. The publication of the proposed parking standards as a leaflet alongside the New Southwark Plan Issues and Options paper has no immediate resource implications. All work will be carried out by the relevant policy team staff and contained in the existing departmental budget without a call on additional funding. However financial advice has been sought for confirmation, included below.

### **SUPPLEMENTARY ADVICE FROM OTHER OFFICERS**

#### **Director of Legal Services**

35. There are no legal issues arising from the proposed changes to the parking standards and the publication of the leaflet for consultation purposes.

#### **Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services**

36. This report is seeking approval from the Cabinet member for Planning, Transport and Regeneration for the publication of the proposed car and cycle parking standards leaflet for consultation purposes alongside the New Southwark Plan: Options Version - Draft Policies and Area Visions October 2014.
37. The Departmental Finance Manager notes there are no immediate financial implications arising from the publication of the proposed car and cycle parking standards for consultation purposes and that any additional work necessary to complete the work will be contained within existing budgets.

### **BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS**

<b>Background Papers</b>	<b>Held At</b>	<b>Contact</b>
New Southwark Plan Options Version: Draft Policies and Area Visions (October 2014)	Chief Executives Department - Planning Policy	0207 525 3126
Saved Southwark Plan (2007)	Chief Executives Department - Planning Policy	0207 525 3126

## APPENDICES

No.	Title
Appendix A	Parking Standards consultation leaflet (October 2014)

## AUDIT TRAIL

<b>Lead Officer</b>	Tim Cutts, Team Leader, Planning Policy	
<b>Report Author</b>	Tom Weaver, Planning Support Officer	
<b>Version</b>	Final	
<b>Dated</b>	6 January 2015	
<b>Key Decision?</b>	No	
<b>CONSULTATION WITH OTHER OFFICERS / DIRECTORATES / CABINET MEMBER</b>		
<b>Officer Title</b>	<b>Comments Sought</b>	<b>Comments included</b>
Director of Legal Services	Yes	Yes
Strategic Director of Finance and Corporate Services	Yes	Yes
<b>Cabinet Member</b>	Yes	No
<b>Date final report sent to Constitutional Support</b>	6 January 2015	