

Old Oak and Park Royal Local Plan examination

Agenda Session 8: Parking

Participants: Inspector, Corporation, Grand Union Alliance, HGH consulting (QPR FC and Stadium Capital Developments)

Summary of issues

- 1 Whether the Plan's policies towards the provision of vehicle parking are justified (derived from the twenty-third Key Issue of table 5 of Key document 5 identified at Regulation 19(1) stage and representation 2/SP7/21 from Aberdeen Standard Investments amongst others) in the light of the following points (summarised from representations at Regulation 19(1) and 19(2) stages);
 - (a) An apparent lack of parking.
 - (b) The suggestion that Policy T4 on mode shift and parking should be included in SP7 as they are strategic policy matters.
 - (c) The need to recognise the parking needs of businesses and industry and that parking restrictions may not be appropriate to apply to this activity. Car parking limits are not appropriate in the context of industrial development. Some flexibility is required for commercial car parking. There are problems with car parking. Business parking overflows onto residential streets. Loss of parking and/or increased pressure on road space may result in increased parking displacement to the Wesley Estate. Policy should differentiate between commuters and freight/customer parking. Concern about insufficient car parking for healthcare and school staff.
 - (d) The need to recognise parking need for servicing and deliveries. Parking and loading should be on site.
 - (e) The lack of information about on-street electric car charging points and disabled parking. Supporting text and Table 6.1 should be amended to require electric vehicle charging points for all parking spaces, including for servicing and deliveries. 20% active provision of electric vehicle charging parking spaces is different to LBHF's Local Plan policy of 25%
 - (f) When providing car parking, development proposals should include appropriate provision for zero tailpipe emission car club vehicles and facilities to cater for anticipated demand for coaches and zero emission taxis
 - (g) There is no policy on blue badge/disabled parking. Where wheelchair accessible housing is provided, there needs to be a consideration for parking spaces. Parking needs to be accessible to discourage the current congestion issues.

- (h) New and or improved continuous walking and cycling routes need to be supported by having secure, visually acceptable cycle banks / hubs / racks at appropriate sites within the town centre. The need to ensure adequate secure cycle parking at all destinations, split across all floors and not just focused at ground level. The need for Cycle parking to be covered by CCTV. If the OPDC is seeking to exceed London Plan Cycle parking standards, what is being proposed?
- (i) The need for Old Oak Common Station to be carefully designed to provide ample cycle parking.
- (j) The suggestion that it may not be possible to rationalise, minimise or remove on street parking because Park Royal has always relied on vehicle movement and is a hostile environment for pedestrians. Car dependency and congestion in Park Royal cannot be tackled only through controlled parking. CPZs should target all day parking. No new day-long parking should be provided and the removal of existing provisions where possible should be carried out in Park Royal.
- (k) Potential for parking levies in OPDC should be explored. Alternatives to car use in SIL should be encouraged and provided, and new development in SIL should be car-free.
- (l) Provision of only 0.2 spaces per new home being very challenging and may affect successful marketing of housing developments. The OPDC should publish evidence on existing similarly scaled schemes that successfully function with such very low parking standards

The Corporation's response (summarised from responses made at Regulation 19(1) and 19(2) stages)

Whilst apply parking restrictions will be challenging, the policy and supporting text recognise that in Park Royal, planning applications will be managed on a case by case basis. OPDC is limiting parking to a maximum of 0.2 spaces for residential and zero for non-residential (excluding disabled parking) unless business needs justify otherwise. This is required through Policy T4, but it recognises that for non-residential development in SIL, this will be challenging and that the appropriate level of car parking should be considered on a case by case basis. This is to reduce congestion and encourage a shift to more sustainable modes. Congestion is being addressed by reducing car dependency. This is achieved by capping car ownership and developing car sharing schemes to restrict the on-street demand for long-stay and short-stay parking. OPDC is limiting parking to a maximum of 0.2 spaces for residential and zero for non-residential (excluding disabled parking) unless business needs justify otherwise. OPDC undertook a Car parking study which is provided as a supporting study to this local plan. The purpose of the study was to provide a critical review of the proposed parking policy in the Local Plan from a market and viability perspective, including a desktop study of precedents. This concluded that 0.2 spaces per residential unit was appropriate.

SP7 already covers the need to minimise journeys by private car and to encourage walking, cycling and public transport use which will lead to modal shift. Specific car parking standards are considered a development management issue and not appropriate for inclusion in a strategic policy. Policies SP7, T4 and T7 note the importance of servicing needs. Policy T7 outlines that developments should provide off street servicing, where possible.

Policy T4 indicates that commercial parking in Park Royal will be assessed on a case by case basis. Strong justification for parking will need to be demonstrated by developers

OPDC's Local Plan requires disabled car parking to accord with mayoral policy. The new draft London Plan 2017 states that disabled residential parking should be provided in new developments (for both M4(2) and M4(3) dwellings) but that this should count towards the maximum parking provision for the development. Policy T4 requires developers to "securing appropriate blue badge provision for both residential and non residential uses". Appropriate blue badge parking will be required for all residential and non residential uses.

Policy T4 (Parking) requires any proposals delivering car parking to incorporate 20% active provision and 80% passive provision electric charging points for electric vehicles at all new parking spaces. This approach reflects requirements set out in draft new London Plan and is supported by Transport for London. OPDC intends to require all parking spaces to have either passive or active provision at a ratio of 80:20.

Development proposals will be required to provide high quality, secure, well located, convenient and accessible cycle parking facilities in accordance with Policy T3. This policy will apply across the OPDC area. Policy T3 encourages developers to plan cycle parking in line with the LCDS. T3 e) states that all cycle parking should be secure, convenient and well located. OPDC will work closely with HS2 to ensure sufficient provision of cycle parking.

OPDC will work with the local highway authorities to investigate, consult on and implement CPZs. Controlled parking is not the only way OPDC plans to tackle congestion. Modal shift to more sustainable modes is also important, using new technologies and encouraging Car Free development. This is indicated in the transport chapter, SP7 and the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. OPDC will continue to work with stakeholders to explore the use of tools to reduce private car parking.

Matters for discussion

- 1)** Have I correctly understood the thrust of the representations?

- 2)** Are the Plan's policies towards the provision of vehicle parking justified?
- 3)** Ditto cycle parking
- 4)** Ditto disabled parking
- 5)** Ditto electric vehicle charging points

P. W. Clark

Inspector

12.02.19