

**Committee:** Cabinet

**Agenda Item**

**Date:** 19 February 2013

**14**

**Title:** Uttlesford Local Parking Standards

**Portfolio Holder:** Cllr Barker

Key decision: **No**

---

## Summary

1. The LDF Working Group considered a paper at its meeting on 22 November 2012 regarding the introduction of Uttlesford Local Parking Standards following a request from an earlier meeting.
2. Uttlesford District Council has adopted the 'Parking Standards Design and Good Practice September 2009' produced by Essex County Council in partnership with the Essex Planning Officers Association. Work has just commenced on reviewing these and officers will attend these meetings.
3. In the short term therefore it is important to consider the adoption of supplementary standards to those set out in the Essex design Guide to ensure the quality and robustness of developments we approve.

## Recommendations

4. To adopt the Uttlesford Local Parking Standards as a material planning consideration.

## Financial Implications

5. None

## Background Papers

6. Comments received

## Impact

- 7.

Communication/Consultation	The adopted document will be placed on the website.
Community Safety	No impact.
Equalities	The duty will effect all equally.
Health and Safety	No impact.

Human Rights/Legal Implications	No impact.
Sustainability	No impact.
Ward-specific impacts	Affects all wards
Workforce/Workplace	To consider as part of planning application process.

## Situation

8. The LDF Working Group considered a paper at its meeting on 22 November 2012 regarding the introduction of Uttlesford Local Parking Standards. This was agreed for consultation which took place from 22 November 2012 to 11 January 2013.

9. A total of 9 consultation responses have been received from Parish Councils and developers:

Takeley Parish Council - supports the Local Standards

Newport Parish Council - welcomes the standards but suggests they should be policies.

Persimmon Homes (two reps) – object, lack of evidence, would create car dominant development

Taylor Wimpey – object, suggest that 3 spaces for 4 or more dwellings could be justified.

Pelham Structures – general support for standards

Hibbs and Walsh – Need to consider tight town centre sites

Ernie Spencer – Ridiculous proposal

Andrew Frostick – object, would lead to dominance of car and reduction in green space

10. The comments made were very useful to allow the document to be finessed. Specifically the document has been amended to note the high quality of Uttlesford's built environment and the need to balance competing demands which could lead to a reduction in parking provision required in certain circumstances. The number of bedrooms has also been changed from 3 to 4 before 3 spaces will be required.

## Conclusion

11. The Council has considered the need for local parking standards, and after a consultation, considers that there is a justifiable need to enhance the Essex wide standards.

## Risk Analysis

12.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Lack of consideration for comments received resulting to complaints.	1 – Some comments may be overlooked	1 – People who made comments could complain resulting in the new document being undermined.	Carefully considered the replies received and adjusted the document accordingly.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.