

Matter 6: Policy ID11: Parking Standards

1 Question - Whether Policy ID11: Parking Standards is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with both national policy and the LPSS.

1.1 The Council considers Policy ID11: Parking Standards is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with both policy and the Local Plan Strategy and Sites (“LPSS”).

1.2 The NPPF at paragraph 35 defines the meaning of “positively prepared”, “justified”, “effective” and “consistent with national policy”. It states:

“Local plans and spatial development strategies are examined to assess whether they have been prepared in accordance with legal and procedural requirements, and whether they are sound. Plans are ‘sound’ if they are:

a) Positively prepared – providing a strategy which, as a minimum, seeks to meet the area’s objectively assessed needs; and is informed by agreements with other authorities, so that unmet need from neighbouring areas is accommodated where it is practical to do so and is consistent with achieving sustainable development;

b) Justified – an appropriate strategy, taking into account the reasonable alternatives, and based on proportionate evidence;

c) Effective – deliverable over the plan period, and based on effective joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters that have been dealt with rather than deferred, as evidenced by the statement of common ground; and

d) Consistent with national policy – enabling the delivery of sustainable development in accordance with the policies in this Framework and other statements of national planning policy, where relevant.

Positively prepared

1.3 The policy is positively prepared as it responds to the spatial strategy set out in the LPSS, helping the delivery of the objectively assessed need and the achievement of sustainable development.

Justified

1.4 The Council’s view is that the policy is justified. The approach sets out that parking standards contained within existing or future Neighbourhood Plans take precedence, except in relation to strategic sites. For the strategic sites, the policy direction and numerical standards are set out in the Local Plan Development Management Policies (“LPDMP”). For the non-strategic sites, the policy direction is set out in the LPDMP, with the numerical standards deferred to the Parking SPD. The rationale for this is explained in further detail in response to the supplementary questions, in particular in paragraphs 3.4 – 3.6 below. In formulating the approach to the residential car parking standards, which typically receive the most scrutiny, analysis was undertaken in relation to observed levels of car availability within Guildford borough, which

allowed for a tailored approach to the standards to reflect local evidence. This is explained further in paragraph 5.6 – 5.7 below and in detail in the Parking Standards Topic Paper, paragraph 4.22-4.52.

- 1.5 Reasonable alternatives have been considered. The Sustainability Appraisal (“SA”) considered both the approach in the submission version of the LPDMP to residential car parking standards as well as an alternative approach which was preferred at the Regulation 18 consultation stage. The SA shows that the approach taken forward in the submission version of the LPDMP scored higher in terms of air quality, climate change mitigation, flood risk, health, land and transport indicators.¹

Effective and consistent with both national policy and the LPSS

- 1.6 It is considered that the policy is effective in that it is deliverable over the plan period. The standards reflect a broad range of development types and locations and will be applicable to every development proposal coming forward, including those with no car parking spaces proposed. Surrey County Council (“SCC”), as the Local Transport Authority, and other Borough and District Councils took part in the Regulation 19 consultation. No issues were raised by these prescribed bodies in terms of the proposed approach.
- 1.7 The Council considers that the policy is consistent with both national policy and the LPSS. The National Planning Policy Framework (2021) (“NPPF”) states that:

“107. If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, policies should take into account:

a) the accessibility of the development;

b) the type, mix and use of development;

c) the availability of and opportunities for public transport;

d) local car ownership levels; and

e) the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles.

108. Maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport (in accordance with chapter 11 of this Framework). In town centres, local authorities should seek to improve the quality of parking so that it is convenient, safe and secure, alongside measures to promote accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists.”

¹ See page 17 of Sustainability Appraisal Report Local Plan Part 2 2021. Available at: [Sustainability Appraisal reports \(Part 2\) - Guildford Borough Council](#)

- 1.8 The Council considers that all aspects within paragraph 107 have been taken into account through the setting of tapered levels of residential car parking standards that respond to dwelling type and number of bedrooms in the dwelling as well as being geographically tapered, with the focus of restraint increasing towards Guildford town centre where opportunities for alternative forms of transport are greatest. Moreover, the evidence base that was collated in the development of the standards allowed the standards to be benchmarked against observed car availability levels across the borough. Likewise, the non-residential car parking standards and the residential and non-residential cycle parking standards respond to the type, mix and use of the development and in the case of the former, the accessibility and availability of opportunities for public transport. Similarly, the opportunities for low car and car free development respond to the aspects listed in paragraph 107, ensuring that this type of development is delivered in appropriate locations. With the reference to Part S of the Building Regulations (proposed as a minor modification with the Submission LPDMP), the standards allow for an adequate provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure.
- 1.9 It is considered that the policy is also consistent with paragraph 108 of the NPPF. There is a clear and compelling justification for maximum parking standards in the borough’s urban areas in order to manage the local road network – with its challenges particularly of congestion², local air quality³ and severance⁴ – and also for optimising the density of development in urban centres and other locations that are well served by public transport. Further, this policy approach also allows for new developments to shape travel demands in ways that are cognisant of national and local net-zero targets.
- 1.10 With reference to the LPSS, Policy ID3: Sustainable Transport for New Developments states that:
- “(2) New development will be required, in so far as its site’s size, characteristics and location allow, to maximise:*
- ...
- (b) the provision of secure, accessible and convenient cycle parking...”*
- and*
- “(4) In terms of vehicular parking for new developments:*

² “In 2019, Guildford was the 6th most congested town/city in the UK...(Inrix, 2019)” see: [\(Public Pack\)Agenda Item 8: Shaping Guildford’s Future \(formerly Guildford Economic Regeneration Programme Master Plan Strategy\) Agenda Supplement for Executive, 22/09/2022 19:30](#)). Congestion in the Ash and Tongham urban areas, as well as in the urban area of Guildford, can be observed at: [Local A Roads Speed and Delay 2021 \(arcgis.com\)](#).

³ See: ‘Guildford town centre Air Quality Detailed Assessment’ available at [Find out how we monitor air quality and pollution - Guildford Borough Council](#); for a whole borough assessment see: [Air Quality - Surrey Deliverables \(arcgis.com\)](#)

⁴ Severance in the urban areas is principally caused by the strategic road network, railway lines, rivers and the Wey navigation.

(a) Off-street vehicle parking for new developments should be provided such that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users.

(b) Consideration will be given to setting maximum parking standards for Guildford town centre in the Parking Supplementary Planning Document“

1.11 The setting of minimum cycle parking standards allows new development to maximise the provision of secure, accessible and convenient cycle parking, whilst maximum parking standards have been set for Guildford town centre.

2 Supplementary Question 6.1 - In relation to non-strategic sites, is it justified for the policy to require compliance with the standards set out in a Parking SPD that does not form part of the plan?

2.1 The Council considers that there is value in providing clarity with regard to parking standards in relation to non-strategic sites in the borough. However, the Council propose a more flexible approach than that set out for strategic sites, an approach which allows for timely adjustment of the numerical parking standards responding to future trends (without needing to undertake an update to the Local Plan), whilst ensuring that the principle of setting such standards has been tested through the examination and therefore attracts the weight of development plan policy. This balance is considered to be most appropriately achieved by including the policy direction in the LPDMP - by requiring compliance with inter alia maximum car parking standards – but including the numerical standards themselves in the draft Parking SPD, with this draft SPD referenced in Policy ID11.

2.2 The policy direction is set out in the LPDMP as the Council seeks to establish a cap on the level of car parking provided, in terms of residential development in urban areas and non-residential development across the borough, by setting maximum standards. This approach seeks to make sure the principle of setting maximum standards has the weight of development plan policy. In rural and village areas the expected residential car parking standards set out a firm intention of the level of parking to be provided. These were not set as maximums acknowledging there are differences in public transport accessibility and opportunities for active travel in rural and village locations. Similarly, for cycle parking standards, setting the policy direction as minimum standards in the plan gives development policy weight to this aspiration, aligning with modal shift and sustainability ambitions.

2.3 Setting out the numerical standards for non-strategic sites in the SPD is considered appropriate as this enables flexibility given a potentially changing policy context and reflecting changing trends e.g., the decarbonisation agenda, SCC's Local Transport Plan 4 traffic reduction/stabilisation scenario, growth in car sharing and observed changes in driver's licences amongst younger cohorts.

2.4 The numerical standards in the SPD provide clear and justified standards for areas that do not benefit from a Neighbourhood Plan (given the Council's approach to allow the parking standards in Neighbourhood Plans to take precedence over standards set by the Local Planning Authority in

the Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents for non-strategic sites) along with the opportunity for a Neighbourhood Plan to partially or wholly 'hook in' SPD standards within its policies.

- 2.5 The Council considers that the approach adopted in Policy ID11 to parking standards on non-strategic sites is justified. It ensures that the principle of setting such standards in development plan policy is tested at examination, whilst allowing flexibility to amend the particular standard, in order to more rapidly respond to future trends, through the SPD process. It should be recognised that that whilst SPDs are not subject to independent examination, they are required to be subject to public consultation.

3 Supplementary Question 6.2 - In relation to strategic sites, is it effective for standards and guidance to be included in both the DMP and SPD? Is the difference in approach to non-strategic sites justified?

In relation to strategic sites, is it effective for standards and guidance to be included in both the DMP and SPD?

- 3.1 The Council considers the proposed strategy is an effective one for the strategic sites. On the strategic sites, the parking policy direction and numerical car and cycle standards are set as policy within the LPDMP, namely residential car parking at (2(a)), unallocated parking at (2(c)), non-residential parking at (2(d)) and cycle parking (2(f)). These standards are only repeated in the SPD.
- 3.2 With respect to the minimum requirements for Electric Vehicle Charge Points, in the submission version of the LPDMP the policy refers to the numerical requirements set out in the Parking SPD; see (2(e)). At the time of publishing the Regulation 19 Plan, the forthcoming Building Regulations were not set out. Subsequently, the Council has proposed a minor modification related to (2(e)) (and also at (3e)) for non-strategic sites) which states, in both instances that, "the provision of electric vehicle charging will provide at least the minimum requirements set out in the [Building Regulations \(Part S\) Parking SPD](#)". Where this is repeated in the SPD, this reference will be amended to reflect the fact that this standard defers to the Building Regulations.
- 3.3 As stated, the numerical standards for the strategic sites are repeated in the SPD. Their repetition in the SPD is purely for completeness, to allow the suite of parking standards to be read in full and as a reference source. Further guidance, such as design aspects, are only contained in the SPD as it was felt these matters were beyond the reasonable scope of policy. In terms of joint working on cross-boundary strategic matters, SCC and other Borough and District Councils took part in the Regulation 19 consultation. No issues were raised by these parties in terms of the proposed approach.

Is the difference in approach to non-strategic sites justified?

- 3.4 The Council considers the difference in approach between strategic and non-strategic sites is justified. The parking standards for strategic sites are included in the LPDMP as there was a concern, specifically in relation to strategic sites, that Neighbourhood Plans may set car parking

standards (generally minimums) that could compromise the Council's objectives for sustainable development at these sites, which are especially important for achieving the spatial strategy set out in the plan. If the Council's parking standards were contained within an SPD, Neighbourhood Plans would, as DPDs, take precedence in all instances. There is a desire by the Council to address this circumstance, which it considers can most appropriately be achieved through setting parking policy direction and numerical parking standards for strategic sites as a strategic policy within the Local Plan owing to their strategic importance and their key role in the delivery of the plan to meet the borough's needs. By making it explicit that Neighbourhood plans have primacy except in relation to strategic sites, this also ensures that the standards set out in the LPDMP for strategic sites as strategic policies are not superseded by any subsequent Neighbourhood Plans or their review.⁵

- 3.5 Further, in terms of the residential car parking standards for the strategic sites, the Council does not envisage there will be a need to change these in the foreseeable future therefore they can be set firmly in the Development Plan. This sets out a clear standard to aid the developer in masterplanning strategic sites. The strategic sites, by their nature, hold strategic importance for the Council in the delivery of the LPSS and the firm setting of car parking standards for these sites with policy weight behind them helps support their quantum of development to be realised.
- 3.6 The same considerations do not apply to non-strategic sites, where it is appropriate for Neighbourhood Plans to establish relevant parking standards. However, in order to avoid a vacuum of policy on parking standards in areas not covered by Neighbourhood plans the Council considers that there is value in providing clarity with regard to parking standards in relation to non-strategic sites in the borough.

4 Supplementary Question 6.3 - Is the requirement for 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling where 50% or more spaces are allocated in Section 2c justified? Should there be more flexibility?

- 4.1 The Council considers the approach to visitor parking is justified including the requirement for an additional requirement of 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling in the circumstances outlined. The Council already includes flexibility in the policy by relaxing this requirement in instances where the majority of spaces are unallocated.
- 4.2 Influential research by Noble and Jenks (1996) indicated that no additional provision needs to be made for visitor parking where 50% or more of the total parking stock being provided is unallocated. Their argument was that, from their studies, most visits by non-residents in cars occurs during evenings and weekends, coinciding with periods where some residents were using their cars elsewhere. Therefore, if a majority of residents' parking is unallocated, this inflow balances with the outflow as spaces are available to both visitors and residents.

⁵ Neighbourhood Plans are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the Local Plan: Town and Country Planning Act 1990, Schedule 4B, para 8(2) as applied to neighbourhood plans by section 38A PCPA 2004.

- 4.3 Research into other authorities' visitor parking requirements shows there is no clear consensus or approach. However, it is common that where there is a standard visitor parking requirement, this is generally set at 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling. Other authorities recommend visitor parking is assessed on a case by case basis, where space permits, or only for flatted development.
- 4.4 Whilst it is advantageous that an appropriate level of visitor parking is required to mitigate against overspill or inconsiderate parking, based on the evidence above, the Council's approach considers that the visitor parking requirement is only engaged where 50% or more spaces are allocated. In cases where unallocated parking spaces are predominant, there is no need for additional visitor spaces and the land take this requires, due to a higher turnover of occupation of unallocated spaces.
- 4.5 There is no evidence of which the Council is aware that supports the idea that where 50% or more spaces are allocated there should be no visitor parking provided. Therefore, there is no basis to dispose of the requirement for visitor parking in these instances.
- 4.6 The Council considers there is merit in setting out an approach to visitor parking, which balances a number of policy elements. A higher proportion of unallocated parking could result in more efficient use of land and help reduce the visual dominance of parking, however in schemes where allocated parking is preferred, it is essential that an appropriate level of visitor parking is provided to allow for visitors, servicing and deliveries.

5 Supplementary Question 6.3 - Are the maximum vehicle parking standards for strategic sites in Appendix B justified? Could there be any undesirable side effects? Are they maximum requirements when justification is needed to provide fewer spaces (Section 4a)?

Are the maximum vehicle parking standards for strategic sites in Appendix B justified?

- 5.1 It is considered that the setting of maximum vehicle parking standards for the strategic sites is justified. The first NPPF, published in 2012, shifted the responsibility of determining vehicle parking standards towards local planning authorities. This required councils to take into account the individual characteristics of each development when setting standards. This includes the type, mix and use of the development, accessibility, availability and opportunities for public transport, local car ownership levels, and an overall need to reduce high-emission vehicles. A Ministerial statement in 2015 additionally required that Local Planning Authorities should only impose maximum parking standards for residential and non-residential development where there is clear and compelling justification that it is necessary to manage their local road network. This statement was incorporated into the second NPPF (2018) and is retained in the 2019 and 2021 versions, together with a further potential rationale that maximum parking standards could be set in order to optimise the density of development in city and town centres and other locations that are well served by public transport.
- 5.2 Therefore, in terms of the policy direction, it is considered that the urban areas of Guildford borough meet these criteria to allow maximum standards to be set. Maximum parking standards are appropriate in the borough's urban areas in order to manage the local road network – with its

challenges particularly of congestion, local air quality and severance – and also for optimising the density of development in urban centres and other locations that are well served by public transport.

- 5.3 In addition, the large strategic sites which were taken out of the green belt in the adoption of the LPSS are required to be masterplanned from the outset and deliver, and are able to fund, a range of sustainable transport measures to enable modal shift. These measures are set out in the respective site policies in the LPSS. Maximum parking standards set at levels observed for the urban area will complement these measures, allowing their potential to be maximised whilst also making more efficient use of land. Likewise, it is important to maximise the use of the sites to add population density to support public transport viability. The setting of maximum standards on the strategic sites avoids the potential for overprovision which could have been required by Neighbourhood Plans or provided by the developer.
- 5.4 SCC, as the Local Highway Authority, is responsible for local roads and transport policy and has published non-statutory Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance (2018). Within the guidance SCC state that it is recognised that the county ‘exhibits a wide range of social and economic circumstances that necessitate a flexible approach to identifying appropriate levels of car parking provision’. The guidance is ‘commended’ to Surrey’s Local Planning Authorities for use in their Development Plans as it is within the competency of the Plan maker to set off-street parking standards. In setting the Council’s parking standards, SCC’s 2018 guidance has been taken into account. This guidance document has now, since the drafting of the policy, been superseded by Vehicle, Cycle and Electric Vehicle Parking Guidance for New Development (2021), however with this update there has been no change in the standards for car parking spaces.
- 5.5 The SCC guidance proposes a series of maximum standards for residential developments, a tapering down of the maxima from village/ rural locations with the lowest maxima in town centre locations. The maxima are justified on the basis of seeking ‘to try and get the balance right, by providing an appropriate level and type of parking, protecting highway safety and promoting transport sustainability’. Likewise, the non-residential car parking standards are set out as maximum standards, with a variety of uses considered.
- 5.6 Whilst holding the status of guidance, GBC sought to take account of the document in the development of the Council’s numerical parking standards as it is a sound basis to develop parking standards. However, for residential development it was considered important to obtain and analyse car availability rates within Guildford borough to understand car parking demand and how this might compare to SCC’s country-wide standards. An analysis of car availability was undertaken using 2011 Census data and local mapping, which is described in detail in the Parking Standards Topic Paper, paragraph 4.22-4.52.
- 5.7 As such, the resultant residential car parking standards broadly follow the approach advocated by SCC, in that tapered standards respond to the various geographies of the borough, dwelling type and number of bedrooms in the dwelling. A number of aspects diverge from the SCC guidance, such as an increase in the number of categories of dwelling size and type as well as the removal of the edge of centre geographical category as a result of the evidence analysed. The numerical

standards themselves are broadly similar to the SCC standards, with slight variation based on observed average car availability levels for some typologies.

- 5.8 Likewise, the non-residential car parking standards follow those set out by SCC with the aim to limit parking at the destination in order to influence modal choice. For some land use types where transport patterns are difficult to generalise parking provision will be approved on merit, on the basis of a transport assessment.

Could there be any undesirable side effects?

- 5.9 The Council considers that the risk of undesirable side effects, including overspill parking, is low as in reference to residential car parking the numerical car parking standards are set according to observed car ownership rates, which in turn should provide sufficient parking. For many non-residential development types, the use of a transport assessment could aid mitigation of undesirable side effects where there is the potential for this. Despite this, the Council is aware that, with any development, there is a risk of overspill parking or the parking of vehicles in places where this may cause an obstruction.
- 5.10 Therefore, Policy ID11 seeks to address this through 5) d) which states “development proposals will be required to demonstrate that the level of any resulting parking on the public highway does not adversely impact road safety or the movement of other road users.”
- 5.11 Further, the Council believes that through good design and policy alignment, the potential undesirable side effects can be mitigated. Design decisions regarding the width of the streets and also any lines, signs and parking restrictions can be used to design out opportunities for inconsiderate parking.

Are they maximum requirements when justification is needed to provide fewer spaces (Section 4a)?

- 5.12 Whilst justification is needed to provide fewer car parking spaces where the level of car parking provision is intended to be ‘lower than the defined maximum standards’ it should be noted that this will be ‘proportionate to the level of reduction sought.’ Therefore, in cases where the level of car parking provision is proposed to be slightly below the maximum standards (a traditional development in terms of car parking provision) there is unlikely to be any significant justification required as this would not be proportionate. To make this clear a minor modification is proposed to the reasoned justification at paragraph 6.134 as follows:

Policy ID11 Reasoned Justification, paragraph 6.134:

“Where the level of car parking provision is proposed to be slightly below the maximum standards (a traditional development in terms of car parking provision) there is unlikely to be any significant justification required as this would not be proportionate. However, in instances where significantly lower car use...”

- 5.13 However, it is considered that ‘low car’ development is substantially different from a development which delivers a level of parking provision slightly lower than the maximum levels permitted.

There is likely to be a clear distinction between development proposals which seek to achieve 'low car' living - as these would be actively designed for low car living and marketed as such - and those who are proposing a more traditional development which accommodates the car, albeit at levels which may be marginally below the maximum standards.

- 5.14 Therefore, for 'low car' development, a justification would be required to ensure potential negative effects are mitigated. This is not intended to restrict 'low car' development but rather enable this type of development to be successful, by ensuring it is situated in appropriate locations, where a coherent package of sustainable transport measures, as alternatives to the private car, can be well thought out, designed and implemented. Whilst there are a number of benefits to a denser development as the result of providing a lower number of car parking spaces, this must not be at the detriment to travel and accessibility. Alternatives to car travel must be well provided for and promoted to ensure occupants can live a low car lifestyle in that location or travel to that destination in a sustainable manner, and do not have to purchase a car due to the lack of alternatives available, which could then lead to overspill parking on neighbouring streets.
- 5.15 A minor modification is proposed to footnote 294 to clarify the meaning of 'low-car' development. The amendment is as follows:

Policy ID11, footnote 294:

"This ~~refers to may include~~ 'low car' development which ~~are those which~~ offers a limited amount of parking and ~~are is~~ designed to facilitate and encourage travel by sustainable modes and marketed as such"

- 5.16 As such, the Council considers that the maximum car parking standards for residential and non-residential development as set out in the LPDMP for strategic sites and the draft SPD for non-strategic sites are viewed as maximums. The justification is distinctly required for 'low car' development to ensure this type of development is located in an accessible location, where a coherent package of sustainable transport measures can be accessed, improved or provided.

6 Supplementary Question 6.4 - Are the space and garage sizes in Section 5 justified?

Space dimensions

- 6.1 The previously recommended approach, used throughout the UK and stated in Manual for Streets (2007) is for a standard bay dimension of 4.8m length by 2.4m width. Whilst not a legal minimum, these dimensions appear to have been in use since specified by the Government in PPG 13, 1994.
- 6.2 However, commentators such as the RAC Foundation (2021) report that dimensions averaged across the top five selling car models has increased from 1.5m by 3.9m in 1965 to 1.8m by 4.3m in 2020.⁶ However, this is an average and the Table below shows dimensions of popular car

⁶ Available at: [69684 RACF – Standing Still AW.3.pdf \(racfoundation.org\)](#)

models, many larger than this average.⁷

Dimensions of modern cars

Car model and Year	Width	Length
Ford Focus (2018)	1.825m	4.378m
Nissan Qashqai (2021)	1.838m	4.425m
BMW 3 Series (2019)	1.827m	4.709m
Land Rover Discovery (2021)	1.990m	4.956m

- 6.3 Using the previous dimensions of 4.8m by 2.4m, it is considered that a pedestrian may not be able to comfortably walk between two vehicles parked next to each other in parallel and it is likely to be difficult to get in and out of the vehicles. Whilst most vehicles are slightly narrower in width, it should not be assumed that vehicles will be parked centrally within spaces. In terms of length, many modern vehicles will overshoot this standard.
- 6.4 As such, the Council believes the space sizes are justified and positively respond to the increase in sizes of modern vehicles and the need to allow for safe access and egress.

Garage dimensions

- 6.5 It is considered that the strategy in relation to garage sizes is justified. The policy provides options in relation to the size of garage which could be provided by the developer in order for that garage to be counted as a car parking space, with the differentiation in sizing stemming from the level of cycle parking to be provided.
- 6.6 Where there is opportunity for cycles to be accommodated in a standalone structure (i.e. separate from a garage), a garage would follow the dimensions of 6m x 3m, as indicated in Manual for Streets.
- 6.7 However, to allow for the cycle parking provision (standards are set as a minimum of one cycle per bedroom) to be met within a garage and to align with the dimensions of standard cycles set out in Local Transport Note 1/20 Cycling Infrastructure Design, the Council believes garages have to be of a larger size than that set out in Manual for Streets.
- 6.8 As such, the sizes 7m x 3.3m and 7m x 4m as set out in policy reflect appropriate sizes for 2 or 5 standard cycles to be parked in the garage respectively. There is a need for cycles to be easily accessed, without having to manoeuvre around parked cars and general household storage, to

⁷ Taken from Parking Standards Topic paper, para 4.133

promote modal shift. These garage sizes reflect those provided as best practice guidance in the Cambridge City Council Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Development (2010).⁸

- 6.9 The policy also allows, at 5) b), that “Alternate layouts for garages which can be demonstrated to provide equivalent or better space provision and access for a vehicle and cycles may be acceptable”
- 6.10 Linked to the car parking space dimensions above, the average car size in the UK is generally increasing, providing justification for well thought out dimensions which cater for both cycle and car parking.
- 6.11 Research into garage size and usage in the UK is sparse. A report by URBED (2013) notes that the proportion of residents using garages to park a vehicle can be observed at around 40-50%.⁹ However, it is important to note that the datasets used in this study did not specify the size of garage provided within the developments assessed, which is a main contributing factor to usage as many modern cars cannot physically fit into older style garages. Therefore, the Council considers it necessary to stipulate the appropriate size of garage to be provided by developers to ensure that if garages are to be built, they are of an appropriate size in order to be counted as a car parking space.
- 6.12 Garages which do not meet these minimum dimensions can be delivered but would not count as a car parking space.

⁸ Available at: [CycleParkingGuide_split.qxp \(cambridge.gov.uk\)](#)

⁹ Available at: [Space to Park: Welcome to Space to Park](#)