



PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION NOTICE

INDIVIDUAL DECISION BY THE PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR PLANNING & ACCESS

TOPIC – DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – WINCHESTER RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

PROCEDURAL INFORMATION

The Access to Information Procedure Rules – Part 4, Section 22 of the Council's Constitution provides for a decision to be made by an individual member of Cabinet.

In accordance with the Procedure Rules, the Corporate Director (Governance), the Chief Executive and the Head of Finance are consulted together with Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Principal Scrutiny Committee and all Members of the relevant Scrutiny Panel (individual Ward Members are consulted separately where appropriate). In addition, all Members are notified.

Five or more of these consulted Members can require that the matter be referred to Cabinet for determination.

Contact Officers:

Case Officer:

Dan Massey. Tel: 01962 848534. Email: dmassey@winchester.gov.uk

Committee Administrator:

Ellie Hogston. Tel: 01962 848155. Email: ehogston@winchester.gov.uk

SUMMARY

A draft Supplementary Planning Document has been produced for Winchester City Council's Residential Parking Standards. In order for this document to carry weight in the planning decision-making process it needs to be adopted by the City Council as a 'Supplementary Planning Document'. The procedures for adoption require formal consultation on draft Supplementary Planning Documents and this decision relates to the approval of the draft Winchester City Council's Residential Parking Standards SPD for consultation.

DECISION

That the Portfolio Holder for Planning & Access authorises the publication of the draft Supplementary Planning Document for public consultation, such consultation to accord with the relevant requirements of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

REASON FOR THE DECISION AND OTHER ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

This draft Supplementary Planning Document, Winchester City Council Residential Parking Standards 2009, sets out the Council's standards in respect of residential parking for the District.

The requirement for revised residential standards arises from Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3) and the consequent withdrawal of that element from the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2002 by Hampshire County Council.

PPS3 puts the responsibility for developing residential parking standards with the Local Planning Authority, who are expected to take into account expected levels of car ownership, the importance of promoting good design and the need to use land efficiently.

The revised residential standards have been developed taking into account statistical data from the 2001 Census, and recent Government research into residential car parking. It should be noted that the non-residential parking standards remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and are contained within the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards 2002.

An alternative to formal adoption as SPD would be for the Council to informally adopt or endorse the Residential Parking Standards Document. However, an informally adopted document will be a less weighty material consideration in determining planning applications and appeals, as the formal adoption processes required of SPD would not have been followed. As such it would not confer sufficient weight to a document such as the Residential Parking Standards which aims to influence planning applications and decisions by others, and to be a robust source of guidance for use, where necessary, in planning appeals. The option of informal adoption or endorsement is, therefore, not considered appropriate for the Residential Parking Standards SPD.

FURTHER ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED FOLLOWING PUBLICATION OF THE DRAFT PORTFOLIO HOLDER DECISION NOTICE

None

DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY THE DECISION MAKER OR A MEMBER OR OFFICER CONSULTED

n/a

DISPENSATION GRANTED BY THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE / CABINET

n/a

Approved by: (signature)

**Date of Decision:
28.01.09**

Councillor Keith Wood – Portfolio Holder for Planning & Access

(Appendix 1 – Draft Supplementary Planning Document)

Winchester City Council

Draft Supplementary Planning Document

RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

January 2009

DRAFT FOR CONSULTATION

CONTENTS

POLICY SUMMARY	2
1.0 INTRODUCTION & GENERAL PRINCIPLES	3
2.0 THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT	4
3.0 THE NEW PARKING STANDARDS	5
Sub-divisions of residential properties	7
Visitor Parking	7
Garages	8
Developments in Controlled Parking Zones	8
Winchester Town Centre	9
Cycle Parking	9
4.0 DESIGN AND LAYOUT CONSIDERATIONS	10

TABLES

Table 1	Measured and anticipated Car Ownership per Household
Table 2	Car Parking Standards for Residential Developments
Table 3	Cycle Parking Standards for Residential Development

APPENDICES

Appendix 1:	Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2001)
Appendix 2:	Predicted Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2016)

DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

RESIDENTIAL PARKING STANDARDS

POLICY SUMMARY

Policy 1: Parking is to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in this document.

Policy 2: Where a development does not provide for the anticipated level of car ownership, the developers are expected to demonstrate that this is an exceptional and legitimate consequence of other material considerations.

Policy 3: Where a development results in the sub-division of existing properties, car parking is to be provided to meet the demands of all of the units.

Policy 4: A development will be expected to safely accommodate the parking needs of visitors to the site.

Policy 5: Where garages are included within a development, due consideration will be made on a site by site basis whether they will count towards the overall parking requirement of the site.

Policy 6: When any development takes place within a controlled parking zone, no additional parking permits will be available.

Policy 7: In Winchester Town, as an area of high accessibility, car parking may be provided to a lower standard than elsewhere in the district. Each development will be negotiated on an individual basis

Policy 8: All new developments must provide appropriately designed and located cycle parking that meets the required standards.

Policy 9: All new developments must consider a number of design issues in the provision of parking on the site. Parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment.

1.0 INTRODUCTION AND GENERAL PRINCIPLES

- 1.1 This draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) is published for consultation and sets out the parking standards for residential development.
- 1.2 The requirement for revised residential parking standards arises from the Government's publication of Planning Policy Statement 3 (PPS3)¹ in 2006 and the consequent withdrawal in March 2008 of that element from the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards (2002) by Hampshire County Council. PPS3 puts the responsibility for developing residential parking standards with the Local Planning Authority. PPS3 rescinded in part PPG13 Transport (1994) which required local planning authorities to set maximum parking standards and now gives flexibility for levels of parking provision to be determined at a local level to reflect local circumstances.
- 1.3 On adoption these will supplement the Winchester District Local Plan Review's (Adopted 2006) Policy T4, and will apply to new residential development, and redevelopment and changes of use for residential purposes. It should be noted that the non-residential parking standards remain the responsibility of Hampshire County Council and are contained within the Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards.
- 1.4 Car parking and its location has an impact upon the quality of the urban environment – how it looks, how it functions and safety. The availability and convenience of parking at the destination of the trip can have a real effect on the choices people make regarding travel. Policies within the current Local Plan seek to use parking restraint to manage the demand for car travel and encourage the use of more sustainable forms of travel, particularly public transport, walking and cycling, but whilst much of the urban area Winchester is well served by public transport and is easily accessible by walking or cycling, the same does not apply across the remainder of the District.
- 1.5 The publication of Manual for Streets² in 2007 highlighted how accommodating parked vehicles is a key function of many streets, especially in residential areas. The level of provision of parking and its location has influences on the appearance and form of a development. Manual for Streets advises providing car parking at residential developments at realistic, but not excessive levels, including parking on-street where appropriate.
- 1.6 Recent research by CABE³ has found that car parking remains a significant issue for residents and house buyers; many feel that designs for new developments should accommodate anticipated levels of parking. Attempts to curb car ownership through restricting parking were considered unrealistic, and had little impact on the number of cars a household would require and acquire.
- 1.7 The experience in residential areas has been that rather than encouraging modal shift away from car ownership, restrictive parking standards have simply intensified the demand for any available on-street parking.
- 1.8 Research carried out by consultants WSP on behalf of Department of Communities and Local Government on Residential Car Parking⁴ concluded that dwelling size and type are major factors in determining the levels of car ownership. The research also showed that the allocation of spaces to

individual dwellings rather than shared or communal provision can have an adverse impact upon the efficiency of car parking provision and use.

- 1.9 The revised residential standards in this document have been developed taking into account statistical data from the 2001 Census, and recent Government research into residential car parking.

2.0 THE WINCHESTER DISTRICT

- 2.1 The geography of Winchester District shows a classic contrast between urban town and rural areas.
- 2.2 In Winchester town the existing street layout in some respects dictates the format and provision of car parking. Much of the town centre is based around a dense network of terraced streets built before the rise of mass private car ownership. With little or no parking on-site residents are forced to park on-street. This further narrows the street scene, especially with parking on both sides of the road. In many areas there is a mismatch between the desire to own a car and the ability to park it close to the place of residence. To manage parking, resident parking zones have been introduced in parts of the city, but several of these are over subscribed for the capacity of the roads.
- 2.3 In contrast much of the remainder of the District is very rural without the space constraints on car parking, but also lacking the public transport and sustainable travel infrastructure that would offer alternative travel modes. In addition, few of the towns and villages in the District can offer a sufficiently diverse range of retail, employment, health and leisure facilities to encourage more 'local' trips that could avoid the need to travel by car.
- 2.4 The 2001 census⁵ reveals that for all of Winchester District there were 61,868 vehicles and 43,132 households, giving an average of 1.43 cars per household, which is well above the national average of 1.11 cars per household. At that time 16% of households in the Winchester District did not have access to a car.
- 2.5 Further analysis of the 2001 Census data, as detailed in Appendix 1: Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2001) does show that car ownership in some areas is lower than in others. This level of low car ownership is confined to the six Winchester Town Wards, where the average ownership is just over one car per household.
- 2.6 To reflect the measured differences in car ownership the car parking standards have been weighted to create average required standards across the district, excluding the Winchester Town wards. Apart from that factor the variations across the non-town wards are not considered significant to the extent as to suggest that different parking standards should be developed for the different wards outside of Winchester Town.
- 2.7 Accessibility to public transport is not considered to be a factor in establishing appropriate parking provision in future residential development, though where high levels of accessibility are available it may be acceptable to provide reduced levels of parking from the standards set, but the developer will be expected to demonstrate that a lesser standard is appropriate in each case.

3.0 THE NEW PARKING STANDARDS

Policy 1: Parking is to be provided in accordance with the standards set out in this document.

- 3.1 The standards seek to provide a balance between reasonable expectations of car ownership and the need to encourage a more sustainable approach to meeting future transport needs. Parking provision in accordance with the standards will generally meet the day-to-day needs of the occupiers but without over-provision.
- 3.2 If parking is not provided to meet the likely levels of car ownership for new developments it is probable that cars will be parked in areas not designed for such purposes, such as grass verges and landscaped areas. There is evidence of these effects in newer housing developments where some occupiers and visitors are frustrated by an apparent shortage of parking spaces. Such situations can impact on surrounding areas and adjoining roads as new residents seek alternative parking spaces, potentially leading to road safety issues caused by obstructive and inconsiderate parking.
- 3.3 The parking standards have been developed to reflect and cater for anticipated levels of car ownership. The base point is the known level of car ownership across the District as measured in the 2001 Census and shown in relation to dwelling size. It is important to make some allowance for anticipated increases in car ownership, using nationally developed TEMPRO⁶ growth factors we can anticipate that car ownership is likely to increase by 12% between 2001 and 2016. This measured and anticipated level of car ownership shown on Table 1.

Table 1: Measured and anticipated Car Ownership per Household

	Measured and anticipated Car Ownership per Household			
	2001		2016 allowing for growth	
Dwelling Size	Car ownership for all households	Car ownership for all car-owning households	Car ownership for all households	Car ownership for all car-owning households
1 Bed ^a	0.6	1.2	0.8	1.5
2 Bed	1.0	1.3	1.2	1.6
3 Bed	1.4	1.6	1.7	1.9
4+ Bed	1.9	2.0	2.4	2.4

- 3.4 If a development is to provide parking that is allocated to individual dwellings, then we need to assume that each of those dwellings could attain the higher levels of car ownership indicated, whereas if parking is largely to

^a In Winchester District only 50% of small (1-4 habitable rooms) households are car owning households –the overall level of car ownership for small households was 0.6 cars per household.

be available on a shared or communal basis we can allow for the fact that a proportion of households will not have a car, therefore the overall provision of parking for a development can be reduced and the lower standards used. Therefore, from the anticipated car ownership levels shown in the last two columns of Table 1, the required parking standards to accommodate those levels of ownership are determined, and are shown on Table 2.

Table 2: Car Parking Standards for Residential Developments

Dwelling Size	Parking spaces required per dwelling	
	Shared / Communal Parking spaces	Allocated Parking spaces
1 Bed	0.8	1.5 ^b
2 Bed	1.2	2
3 Bed	1.7	2
4+ Bed	2.4	3

- 3.5 Table 2 shows the required parking standards in Winchester District according to dwelling size and whether the parking is provided on an allocated or shared basis. As research referred to earlier has indicated, shared parking facilities are a more flexible and efficient use of available space and accordingly enable a reduced number of spaces to be provided to meet the same demand.
- 3.6 Developers are expected to demonstrate that the parking provided is sufficient to meet the needs of the occupiers; developers are expected to calculate the relevant parking provision required for their development using Table 2 and then compare this result against the Predicted Car Ownership level for the relevant ward in Winchester District (2016) as shown in Appendix 2. Developers must demonstrate that the provided level of car parking is sufficient to meet the anticipated needs of the site. Where the required parking is calculated as a non-whole number then the required provision must be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

Policy 2: Where a development does not provide for the anticipated level of car ownership, the developers are expected to demonstrate that this is an exceptional and legitimate consequence of other material considerations.

- 3.7 Where it is proposed that a development provide a significantly different level of parking than the anticipated level of car ownership would indicate (whether higher or lower), it would need to be demonstrated that this is a legitimate consequence of other material considerations. These might include the need to maintain an active ground floor frontage, conservation

^b One allocated parking space to each unit and 1 parking space per two units for use flexibly.

area considerations, the availability of alternative parking facilities or urban design issues, including the physical constraints of the site. However, it would not be acceptable to provide parking below the appropriate standard where this would be likely to be prejudicial to highway safety.

- 3.8 Furthermore, development with less than the expected level of parking provision may be acceptable if accompanied by suitable evidence which justifies the level of parking provided. Factors might include proximity to bus and train services, cycle routes, availability of on-street or off-street public parking close by, tenure of prospective residents, proximity to local services and/or exceptional provision within the development to facilitate and encourage more sustainable transport choices e.g. car clubs.

3.9 Sub-divisions of residential properties

Policy 3: Where a development results in the sub-division of existing properties, car parking is to be provided to meet the demands of all of the units.

- 3.10 Conversions of dwellings into flats generally intensify the use of the property and can increase demand for parking because of the greater number of adult occupants living in the property. There may also be a greater demand for visitor parking than if it were in single household occupation. For sub-divisions of houses into flats the standards will be as per the Residential Parking Standards set out in Table 2 of this document. Due consideration should be made if the development is located within a controlled parking zone (see Section 3.18).

3.11 Visitor Parking

Policy 4: A development will be expected to safely accommodate the parking needs of visitors to the site.

- 3.12 Additional provision will normally be required for visitor parking; such spaces are in addition to the requirements for residents parking. Manual for Streets recommends that visitors parking generally be provided on-street or in additional capacity in unallocated parking areas. Where it can be demonstrated that there is available space in public off-street parking and on-street facilities the need for additional visitor parking can be ignored.
- 3.13 Whilst there are times, such as evenings and weekends, when residents are likely to receive significant numbers of visitors in cars, this demand can to some degree be offset by other residents being away at the same time. This balancing effect is most significant when a high proportion of parking spaces are unallocated (and so be available to both visitors and residents). Research^{4,7,8} suggests that no special provision need be made for visitors where at least half of the parking provision associated with a development is unallocated, in all other circumstances an extra 0.2 spaces per dwelling (or 20% overall) are needed to cope with additional demand generated by visitors.

3.14 Garages

Policy 5: Where garages are included within a development, due consideration will be made on a site by site basis whether they will count towards the overall parking requirement of the site.

3.15 Research² has demonstrated that Garages are used for many purposes and less than one half of all garages are used to park a car, many others are used for storage or have been converted to provide additional accommodation.

3.16 If garages are to be incorporated within the design of a residential development then Manual for Streets recommends that the following is taken into account to determine whether they count towards the parking requirement for a development:

- the availability of other spaces, including on-street parking – where this is limited, residents are more likely to park in their garages;
- the availability of separate cycle parking and general storage capacity – garages are often used for storing bicycles and other household items; and
- the size of the garage – larger garages can be used for both storage and car parking, a minimum size of 6m by 3 m is required.

3.17 The assessment of whether garages will count towards the overall parking requirement of a development will be done on a scheme-by-scheme basis. Car ports are unlikely to be used for storage and will therefore count towards parking provision. Where garages are counted towards the provision of car parking, then planning conditions will be applied to retain their use for the intended purpose.

3.18 Developments in Controlled Parking Zones

Policy 6: When any development takes place within a controlled parking zone, no additional parking permits will be available.

3.19 The Council has already adopted the policy that when new and redevelopment for housing take place in one of the Districts controlled Parking Zones (CPZ's), the number of permits available for the new occupiers of the development will not exceed the allocation permitted for the site prior to the redevelopment of the site. (*E.g. If one dwelling that could have had four permits is replaced by six dwellings, then four permits would be available for the new occupiers*)

3.20 In all such circumstances occupiers will not be prevented from purchasing season tickets for the Council's off-street car parks at the standard prices.

3.21 Winchester Town Centre

Policy 7: In Winchester Town, as an area of high accessibility, car parking may be provided to a lower standard than elsewhere in the district. Each development will be negotiated on an individual basis

3.22 Winchester town centre is the most accessible area in the District with regard to public transport services and local facilities. It has the lowest car ownership in the District, it is well serviced by public off-street parking provision and most of the streets are controlled by waiting restrictions and controlled parking zones. It is therefore considered that, within Winchester town centre, parking can be provided to a lower standard than specified in Table 2. Such standards are to be negotiated on a scheme by scheme basis and such flexibility will allow creative schemes to come forward as part of a development. The developer will still be required to demonstrate why their proposed level of parking will be acceptable and to take into account all other sections within this document.

3.23 Cycle Parking

Policy 8: All new developments must provide appropriately designed and located cycle parking that meets the required standards.

3.24 All new development must make sure that adequate secure and accessible cycle parking is provided to meet the following minimum standards for long and short stay cycle parking. These have been adopted from the Hampshire County Council Parking Strategy and Standards 2002.

Table 2: Cycle Parking Standards for Residential Development

Dwelling Size	Long Stay	Short Stay
1 Bed	1 space per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
2 Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
3 Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit
4+ Bed	2 spaces per unit	1 loop / hoop per unit

3.25 The provision of long stay cycle parking should be in the form of secure, weatherproof facilities. For flats and similar developments the provision of individual cycle stores or lockers that are integral to the building should be the aim. For houses, the provision of a suitable size garage (6m x 3m) can provide sufficient space for a vehicle and cycle parking. Houses without garages should provide a garden shed, which should be constructed so that a cycle hoop or security anchor can be secured to the wall. Facilities in all cases should provide security for the whole bicycle, including accessories.

3.26 It is recommended that cycle stores serving blocks of flats, are located within the building and accessed from the entrance foyer. External cycle stores

should be as close to a building entrance as possible. It is essential that communal cycle stores be fitted from the outset with cycle lockers. In the case of the smallest stores 'security anchors' or hoops can be fixed to the walls. In the case of communal stores each cycle will require a 1m² of space.

- 3.27 Short stay parking needs to accommodate cycle parking for periods of up to half a day. Security is required for the cycle frame and at least one wheel. Weather protection is desirable. Parking should be located as close to the trip destination as possible. It should be overlooked by adjacent development or on well used pedestrian routes to minimise risks of theft or vandalism.

4.0 DESIGN AND LAYOUT CONSIDERATIONS

Policy 9: All new developments must consider a number of design issues in the provision of parking on the site. Parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment.

- 4.1 PPS3¹ advocates 'a design led approach to the provision of car-parking space, which is well-integrated with a high quality public realm and streets that are pedestrian, cycle and vehicle friendly.'
- 4.2 The design and provision of parking spaces in some developments has not in the past made best use of the level of on-site parking provided. This is apparent in some higher density housing schemes where parking is located in areas away from the street frontage, such as rear courtyard parking, and appears to lead to indiscriminate on-street parking and no obvious parking areas for visitors, raising issues of highway safety and residents' amenity.
- 4.3 The parking proposals should be justified within the developer's Design and Access Statement, or the Transport Assessment ¹¹, as appropriate to the scale of the development. The allocation of car parking spaces must be detailed and clearly indicated on submitted plans. Shared parking facilities must remain un-allocated to maintain flexibility and efficiency.
- 4.4 A range of documents ^{9,10} including 'Manual for Streets²' and 'Car Parking – What Works Where⁷', provide considerable information on the provision, design and layout of parking spaces. Developers are encouraged to consider such publications and incorporate their findings and ideas in their developments. Transport and Access statements submitted in support of residential developments should detail how such considerations have been incorporated into the design. In some circumstances the need for good design may influence the provision and layout of parking spaces.
- 4.5 The following key principles, adapted from 'Car Parking: 'What Works Where'', should be followed when designing housing layouts and provision of car parking:
- The quality and design of the street is paramount

- There is no single best solution to parking provision. A combination of on plot, off plot and on street may be the best solution according to location, topography and the market.
 - on-street parking is efficient in land use terms, easily understandable and can increase vitality, activity and safety in the street, if properly designed into a development scheme
 - Parking should not be placed within a block to the rear of properties, until on street and frontage parking has been fully considered – rear courtyards should support on-street parking, not replace it.
 - car parking needs to be designed with security in mind;
 - consider the needs of visitor and disabled parking;
 - Provide secure and desirable cycle parking as part of all parking solutions.
- 4.6 When parking courts are proposed they should be overlooked by and easily accessible from dwellings. Particular care should be taken in the design of boundaries between garage courts and garden areas. A good design principle is that they should be visually permeable.
- 4.7 The layout of car parking is important to the quality of a housing development. Recommended parking bay dimensions are 2.4 by 4.8m for perpendicular parking and 2.0m by 6.0m for parallel parking. Where a parking bay is provided in front of a garage an additional 1.0m bay length is required to avoid overhang of footpaths and footways.

Bibliography

1. PPS3 Housing November 2006
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/pps3housing>
2. Manual for Streets: Department for Transport March 2007
<http://www.manualforstreets.org.uk/>
3. CABE – <http://www.cabe.org.uk>
4. Residential Car Parking Research: DCLG May 2007
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/residentialcarparking>
5. <http://www.statistics.gov.uk/census2001/census2001.asp>
6. TEMPRO: Department of Transport forecasting programme
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/economics/software/tempro/>
7. Car Parking: What Works Where: English Partnerships 2006
<http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk/publications.htm#bestpractice>
8. Noble and Jenks (1996) Parking: Demand and Provision in Private Sector Housing Development published by Oxford School of Architecture, Oxford Brookes University
9. Better Place to Live: DTLR and CABE 2000
<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/betterplaces>
10. Urban Design Compendium: English Partnerships 2000
<http://www.englishpartnerships.co.uk/urbandesign.htm>
11. Guidance on Transport Assessment: Department for Transport 3/2007
<http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/regional/transportassessments/guidanceonta>
12. Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards: Hampshire County Council 2002
<http://www.hants.gov.uk/carparking/standards.html>

Appendix 1: Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2001)

Ward	Average No. of cars per Household	Percentage of Households			
		With no cars	With one car	With two cars	with three or more cars
Bishops Waltham	1.52	13%	38%	37%	12%
Boarhunt and Southwick	1.63	10%	37%	40%	13%
Cheriton and Bishops Sutton	1.78	6%	34%	42%	18%
Colden Common and Twyford	1.51	11%	40%	39%	10%
Compton and Otterbourne	1.74	8%	32%	43%	16%
Denmead	1.60	10%	35%	43%	12%
Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon	1.73	9%	32%	44%	15%
Itchen Valley	1.75	6%	37%	41%	16%
Kings Worthy	1.48	12%	40%	38%	10%
Littleton and Harestock	1.48	10%	43%	37%	9%
Olivers Battery and Badger Farm	1.41	10%	50%	32%	8%
Owslebury and Curdrige	1.82	9%	30%	42%	19%
Shedfield	1.76	7%	32%	44%	16%
Sparsholt	1.70	8%	37%	38%	16%
St Barnabas	1.26	20%	43%	29%	8%
St Bartholomew	0.89	36%	43%	18%	4%
St John and All Saints	0.97	31%	45%	19%	4%
St Luke	1.06	29%	42%	23%	6%
St Michael	1.10	26%	45%	24%	5%
St Paul	1.27	17%	46%	30%	6%
Swanmore and Newtown	1.88	7%	26%	48%	19%
The Alresfords	1.49	14%	39%	36%	11%
Upper Meon Valley	1.69	9%	34%	41%	15%
Whiteley	1.68	2%	39%	50%	9%
Wickham	1.44	17%	40%	31%	12%
Wonston and Micheldever	1.65	8%	36%	43%	13%

Appendix 2: Car Ownership by Household for all wards in Winchester District (2016)

Ward	Expected number of cars per Household
Bishops Waltham	1.70
Boarhunt and Southwick	1.83
Cheriton and Bishops Sutton	1.99
Colden Common and Twyford	1.69
Compton and Otterbourne	1.94
Denmead	1.79
Droxford, Soberton and Hambledon	1.94
Itchen Valley	1.96
Kings Worthy	1.65
Littleton and Harestock	1.66
Olivers Battery and Badger Farm	1.58
Owslebury and Curdridge	2.03
Shedfield	1.97
Sparsholt	1.90
St Barnabas	1.41
St Bartholomew	1.00
St John and All Saints	1.09
St Luke	1.19
St Michael	1.23
St Paul	1.43
Swanmore and Newtown	2.11
The Alresfords	1.66
Upper Meon Valley	1.89
Whiteley	1.89
Wickham	1.62
Wonston and Micheldever	1.85