

Local Plan Panel – 25th July 2019

Swale Parking SPD Comments

No.	Comment	Response
1	The need to encourage use of bicycles in residential areas not just non-residential, and to ensure that bicycles would be easily accessible for use	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraphs 125-127
2	The need to consider provision of charging points for electric vehicles	Table 2 outlines the EV provision which has been increased in light of discussions with Members. A visitor parking standard has also been outlined.
3	Why the suggested width of 2.5 metres was proposed, when an example of what worked well was 3 metres	An enhanced width should be provided where spaces are bound by walls/fences/hedges, to allow for ease of access to/from vehicles. The example of tandem parking shown was located between two walls, hence an enhanced width was recommended. The enhanced width for bays bound by walls etc. is universal and should be applied to all parking types, both residential and non-residential.
4	How to encourage people to use their garages for parking and making them accessible when a car was parked on the drive, without overhanging on the pavement	Garages are often underutilised in rural/suburban areas where no on-street controls are in place. As such, it is proposed that they will not count towards the parking provision in these areas. In town centre locations where parking controls are in place, garages will count but only when developed to the correct size. Guidance with regard to driveways and garages is provided in paragraphs 68-70 and 50-60, which encompasses the

		required dimensions. Further guidance with regard to dimensions is included in Table 6.
5	The need to consider parking requirements where there was business and residential use	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraphs 80-84
6	The need to provide solar panels on structures such as car ports/garages	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraph 60
7	The need to consider environmental damage and have greener walkways and encourage biodiversity	A section on public realm considerations has been added – please see page 12 and 13
8	Appendix A - many Members considered that the number of spaces proposed per house was inadequate; there was some support for a ratio of one parking space per bedroom	Appendix A has been updated to reflect the discussions
9	The need to ensure that there was not a limit on maximum parking and to reconsider the proposed standards	Appendix A has been updated to reflect the discussions
10	The need for proper design rather than just a minimum standard	Design principles have been outlined within the document
11	Levels of car ownership and how realistic the averages set out on page 18 of the report were, which had been compiled from census data	These figures have been derived from official 2011 Census data
12	The need to increase provision for charging of electric vehicles and to future proof developments	The EV standard has been updated – please see page 24
13	Whilst on-street parking could be controlled by permits, the need to ensure that the number of permits issued was not more than the number of spaces	It is understood from Swale Borough Council’s Parking Manager that parking permits for new developments within resident parking zones are excluded from the permit scheme. This will continue going forward and a footnote has been added in Appendix A which acknowledges this.
14	Developers should consider using roller-shutter garages to maximise space, and provide a disabled access pathway from the car to the building	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraph 56
15	The need to be realistic about how many car spaces were needed, given that children were staying at home for longer and were also likely to have a car	Appendix A has been updated to reflect the discussions

16	The need to consider the conflict between business and residential use and to set a standard for this	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraphs 80-84 for mixed-use developments
17	The need for a definition of edge of town centre	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraph 48
18	The need to consider coach commuter points and the consequences for local residents parking if commuters parked on the street	Commuter coach parking and its related issues are an existing problem that should be reported to the Council’s Parking Department. It is considered that this falls outside of the scope of the SPD
19	The need to consider innovative ideas particularly in town centres, such as car lifts	Car lifts and underground parking are very costly and unlikely to be viable in the majority of cases. Innovative parking solutions in Town Centre locations are nevertheless encouraged within the SPD – please see paragraph 27
20	A separate design guide was needed for parking, for example more guidance should be given as to what was expected for barns and ports, including landscaping	Design principles have been outlined within the document, with an additional section provided on landscaping and the public realm – please see page 12 and 13
21	The need to consider visitor parking which often caused conflict and whether it should be referred to as ‘auxiliary parking’	On-street provision is generally provided for the needs of visitors with residents being provided with their own allocated parking. It is not proposed that the name of this be changed.
22	Larger and clearer maps should be provided (Appendix B)	The document has been provided at A3 size so the plans should be printable at A3
23	The need to consider how parking was enforced, for example, there were issues where commuters caused parking issues, and to consider the parking restrictions that could be applied	Commuter parking and its related issues are an existing problem that should be reviewed by the Council’s Parking Department. It is considered that this falls outside of the scope of the SPD.

24	Whether developers would consider widening roads to offer more on-street parking	KCC provide guidance with regard to highway design standards for new roads. It is considered that this falls outside of the scope of the SPD.
----	--	---

Parish Council Comments (which are not covered above)

No.	Comment	Response
1	Parking bay dimensions	The recommended parking bay dimensions have been outlined in detail in the SPD
2	Increasing propensity of children to stay at home longer therefore requiring more parking	Appendix A has been updated to reflect these issues
3	Visitor parking	The provision of visitor parking has been retained at 0.2 spaces for areas outside of the Town Centre. The standards outlined in Appendix A will allow for appropriate on-plot provisions which should reduce the need for visitor parking to be utilised routinely by residents.
4	Garage dimensions and provision of sheds	Garages will only be counted in Town Centre locations where on-street controls are continuous. They will also only be counted when provided to the correct, enlarged standard to allow for ease of access to the vehicle and the potential for an element of storage to take place also. It is therefore not considered that a shed would be required in addition to this provision.
5	Insurance premiums and on-street parking	In the main, on-plot and communal parking areas are encouraged in the SPD.

		Therefore, the requirement for residents to house their vehicles on-street should be limited.
6	SEN provision at all schools	Additional detail has been provided – please see paragraph 95
7	Disabled parking	The disabled parking outlined is considered to be proportionate to the uses outlined. It is also noted that the generally accepted guidelines have been taken from the Government’s ‘Inclusive Mobility’ document.
8	Electric Bicycles	It is not proposed that charging facilities are provided for electric bicycles. These can easily be charged at home and are still usable without charge. Moreover, some electric bicycles can be recharged by pedalling.
9	Cycle parking – doctors and primary schools	<p>For doctors’ surgeries, given the nature of the use we would consider that the majority of people are unlikely to cycle. Looking at TRICS for all doctors’ surgeries only 0.9% mode share is found for cycling.</p> <p>For primary schools, by virtue of the age of pupils, they are less likely to cycle. In our experience, the cycle parking at primary schools it suitable for their needs an can be monitored through the Travel Plan should greater provision be required.</p>