

**TONBRIDGE & MALLING BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**PLANNING and TRANSPORTATION ADVISORY BOARD**

**18 November 2014**

**Report of the Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health**

**Part 1- Public**

**Matters for Recommendation to Cabinet - Non-Key Decision (Decision may be taken by the Cabinet Member)**

**1 USE OF INTERIM GUIDANCE NOTE 3 (IGN3) STANDARDS IN ASSESSING PARKING PROVISION IN RESIDENTIAL SCHEMES**

**To recommend a slightly revised approach to the use of IGN 3 when dealing with residential planning applications**

**1.1 IGN 3 – its genesis**

- 1.1.1 Following the adoption of an earlier version of the Kent Design document and in light of emerging changes in Government policy towards residential parking KCC carried-out a number of user/site surveys especially in respect of the adequacy of parking provision.
- 1.1.2 Following this IGN 3 was adopted by KCC and subsequently this Board adopted IGN 3 for local purposes. A degree of flexibility was anticipated in using IGN 3 locally because of the intention of KCC to discount the use of garages as part of the parking calculation (in suburban and rural locations) and the size of some spaces sought. Both of these elements in KCC's thinking were felt at the time to move too far away from previous levels of parking.
- 1.1.3 Over the last few years the Council has applied the numerical standards in IGN 3 but has normally continued to accept standard sized garages as part of the calculation.
- 1.1.4 Experience on larger housing schemes especially Kings Hill Phase2 and Holborough Valley (both initially permitted by the Secretary of State who applied the 1.5 spaces per dwelling formula) has indicated that the Council was right to adopt IGN3 as a more appropriate set of standards but it has nevertheless become increasingly obvious, not least because of on-street parking, sometimes in positions where road widths are restricted on design grounds, that including garages in the calculation whilst not being able to realistically resist those garages being used for storage, failed to ensure adequate parking.

- 1.1.5 In light of the experience the developer in Kings Hill Phase 3 has sensibly decided to plan for parking standards to exclude garages in the calculated requirement of parking spaces. So, in effect garages can be provided, but would not be considered in assessing compliance with the parking standards.

## **1.2 What to do now**

- 1.2.1 The time is right to adopt this approach widely as a way of guarding against unnecessary and undesirable on-street parking or practical under provision. This would be a short-term expedient in the period running up to the adoption of the emerging Local Plan. It is therefore intended that normally garages (and car barns unless the right to enclose them for use as storage is simultaneously removed by condition) would not form part of the supply-side in any parking provision calculation.
- 1.2.2 In parallel it is important that the production of a new Local Plan provides the opportunity for reviewing in a more detailed way how parking standards can be updated for the future. As part of current plan-making we have begun the research the limited detail of how others have reviewed IGN 3. We will also be looking closely at how the impact of parking may vary between dense urban areas, suburban locations and village locations both generally and specifically in the way garage provision can potentially distort the position.
- 1.2.3 However, what will not be possible in plan-making is to unlock the conundrum that we do know that gives rise to concern for some members - the Council is bound to take into account the historic "parking need" for a site when comparing it with the parking need of any proposed alternative use. The Council's considerations must take into account the realistic fall-back position for the site and it won't be possible to change this.

## **1.3 Legal Implications**

- 1.3.1 None provided this approach is appropriately applied on a case by case basis.

## **1.4 Financial and Value for Money Considerations**

- 1.4.1 None provided this approach is appropriately applied on a case by case basis.

## **1.5 Risk Assessment**

- 1.5.1 None provided this approach is appropriately applied on a case by case basis.

## **1.6 Equality Impact Assessment**

- 1.6.1 The decisions recommended through this paper have a remote or low relevance to the substance of the Equality Act. There is no perceived impact on end users.

## **1.7 Recommendations**

- 1.7.1 The proposals set out in paragraphs 1.2.1 – 1.2.3 **BE ADOPTED** and applied henceforth and until such time as any alternative Standards are adopted in a new Local Plan.

The Director of Planning Housing and Environmental Health confirms that the proposals contained in the recommendation(s), if approved, will fall within the Council's Budget and Policy Framework.

Background papers:

contact: Lindsay Pearson

Nil

Steve Humphrey

Director of Planning, Housing and Environmental Health