



Dermot McCaffery MIHE MIRSO
Highways & Transportation Consultant

**THE OLD SCHOOL,
PARK LANE,
RICHMOND,
TW9 2RA**

**HALEBOURNE LAND AND PLANNING
LTD**

TRANSPORT STATEMENT

AUGUST 2014

34A West Street, Marlow, Bucks, SL7 2NB

Tel 01628 488444 – 07752 913058

E-mail dermot@highwayplanning.co.uk



1.0 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 My name is Dermot McCaffery. I am a highway and transportation consultant. I have 26 years experience in local authority and private consultancies in dealing with the highway development control aspects of development proposals. I am a Member of the Institute of Highway Engineers and the Institute of Road Safety Officers.
- 1.2 I have been appointed by Halebourne Land & Planning Ltd to provide highway advice in respect of the redevelopment of The Old School, Park Lane, Richmond.
- 1.3 The site has been the subject of previous planning submissions. The most recent application (ref: 12/2968) was refused for various reasons including a concern relating to car parking provisions.

2.0 SITE LOCATION AND PROPOSED DEVELOPMENT

- 2.1 The site is located on the north side of Park Lane approximately 35m west of the junction with Parkshot. The site is within Richmond town centre.
- 2.2 Richmond station (Tube and overground) is approximately 100m walk distance from the site via a pedestrian link between Parkshot and Kew Road. High frequency bus services are located at the station and at other stops on Kew Road. The high level of accessibility to public transport gives the site a PTAL rating of 6a (excellent).
- 2.3 The proposed development comprises demolition of some parts of the Old School building, the retention of three existing main facades, the conversion of and addition to the retained structure to form 5no residential apartments, and retain 90square metres of B1a Office



space, and the erection of 3no terraced townhouses with basement accommodation, at the rear, with car parking, landscaping, and use of the existing vehicular access.

3.0 HIGHWAY AND TRANSPORTATION CONSIDERATIONS

- 3.1 As part of the Council's consideration of the previous application for the development of the site, the transport officer raised concerns relating to the level of car parking being proposed and the potential loss of on-street parking across the site frontage that would be required in order to implement the proposed access arrangements. The current scheme relies on the reuse of the existing access only and will not therefore impact upon existing on-street parking facilities. As such, the primary highway consideration for the current scheme is the level of car parking proposed and whether this complies with Local and London Plan policies.
- 3.2 The Council's Development Management Plan 2011 (DMP) sets out the policies by which development proposals will be judged. Section 5.4 of the DMP relates to the transport implications of development. Core Strategy Policy CP5 seeks to promote sustainable travel by means of appropriate location and the encouragement to use sustainable travel modes. The location of a development has a direct bearing on the opportunities for residents and employees to travel by non-car modes. As such, the PTAL rating for a site is the starting point for the assessment of the transport implications of its development (para 5.4.5 of the DMP).
- 3.3 Encouraging development in town centres ensures that residents can easily reach the facilities they need without travelling long distances (para 5.4.18). Town centres by their nature are the focus for public transport and key day-to-day facilities. The "need" to own a car is



significantly reduced for sites within town centres as the opportunity for travel by non car modes is wide.

3.4 Policy DM TP 8 requires that all developments should comply with the adopted parking standards. Although the standards are expressed as maxima the Council expects that the maximum parking provision should be met unless there are exceptional circumstances that justify a relaxation in the required provision. In this respect the advice in paragraph 5.4.29 is relevant. In locations where access to public transport is particularly good, i.e. those locations with PTAL ratings of 5 or 6 such as Richmond and Twickenham town centres, lower parking provision may be appropriate.

3.5 The adopted parking standards are contained in Appendix 4 to the DMP. The maximum requirement for 1 & 2 bedrooomed units is 1 space per unit. For 3 bedrooomed units the maximum requirement is 1.5 spaces and for 4 bedrooomed units the maximum requirement is 2 spaces. For B1 offices the maximum requirement is 1 space per 300m² or a minimum of 1 space.

3.6 Within the **London Plan** Policy 6.1 states,

“The Mayor will work with all relevant partners to encourage the closer integration of transport and development through the schemes and proposals shown in Table 6.1 and by:

a) encouraging patterns and nodes of development that reduce the need to travel, especially by car – boroughs should use the standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum to this chapter to set maximum car parking standards in DPDs

b) seeking to improve the capacity and accessibility of public transport, walking and cycling, particularly in areas of greatest demand –



boroughs should use the standards set out in Table 6.3 in the Parking Addendum to set minimum cycle parking standards in DPDs

c) supporting development that generates high levels of trips at locations with high public transport accessibility and/or capacity, either currently or via committed, funded improvements including, where appropriate, those provided by developers through the use of planning obligations”

3.7 Policy 6.13 states,

“A The Mayor wishes to see an appropriate balance being struck between promoting new development and preventing excessive car parking provision that can undermine cycling, walking and public transport use.

B The Mayor supports park and ride schemes in outer London where it can be demonstrated they will lead to overall reductions in congestion, journey times and vehicle kilometres.

Planning decisions

C The maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum to this chapter should be applied to planning applications.

D In addition, developments must:

- a) ensure that 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) provide an electrical charging point to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles*
- b) provide parking for disabled people in line with Table 6.2*
- c) meet the minimum cycle parking standards set out in Table 6.3*
- d) provide for the needs of businesses for delivery and servicing.”*



3.8 Table 6.2 sets out the Mayor's maximum parking standards. The following details are relevant to the development:

Residential	1 – 1.5 spaces for 3 bed units	20% electric
	>1 spaces for 1 & 2 bed units	

NOTE: All developments in areas of good public transport accessibility should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit.

3.9 The clear objective in the London Plan is therefore to minimise car parking as an aid to encouraging non-car travel where the opportunities exist and are convenient alternatives to using a car.

3.10 This approach is underlined by the Mayor of London's Housing SPG (November 2012). Annex 3 to the SPG sets out the clear advice that the need for car parking must be balanced against other key planning requirements with the same over-arching policy objective of reducing the use of high-emission vehicles. The availability of access to day to day facilities by walking, cycling and public transport is a key determinant in assessing whether there is the **need** for parking. In high accessibility locations the provision of car parking must be restrained in order to maximise the use of non-car modes of travel.

3.11 There is no doubt that the proposed level of car parking at 1 space per residential unit and 1 space for the office element complies with the London Plan standards and with the maximum standards set out in the Council's DMP. The applicant is willing to waive the ability of future occupiers to apply for parking permits which will avoid the potential increase in demand for on-street parking in the vicinity.

3.12 In support of the sustainability objectives of the Local Plan and the London Plan the site layout shows the provision of cycle racks for all units.



3.13 The access to the car parking area will be 4.0m wide for the first 12m from Park Lane and will then widen out into the parking and turning area. It is intended to demark a pedestrian route within the carriageway.

3.14 Refuse storage facilities are shown within 15m of the Park Lane carriageway and less than 25m from the furthest dwelling. This arrangement means that refuse collection can be from the Park Lane carriageway in the same fashion as other existing dwellings.

4.0 CONCLUSIONS

4.1 The site is in the defined town centre of Richmond has been used previously for various non-residential purposes. The proximity to the facilities and public transport within the town centre result in the site having a PTAL rating of 6a which is classed as “excellent”.

4.2 The level of car parking proposed complies with the Council’s DMP which acknowledges that car parking can and should be lower in areas with high public transport accessibility, such as Richmond town centre. This is an approach advocated by the London Plan.

4.3 The proposed development will rely on the existing access to Park Lane and will not impact upon the existing on-street parking spaces. The applicant is willing for future residents to be restricted from applying for residents’ parking permits which will ensure that no further pressure is placed on the available on-street parking within the CPZ.

4.4 The proposed site layout is suitable to serve the low generation of traffic movements. Pedestrian safety will not be compromised. Refuse storage and collection arrangements comply with the maximum carry distances and will not require a refuse collection vehicle to enter into the site.