

Princes Parade, NW11

Parking Impacts Assessment - Addendum to Transport Statement

Background

This note has been prepared as an addendum to the Transport Statement (dated March 2018) prepared by Transport Planning & Highway Solutions Limited, submitted as part of the application material to London Borough of Barnet (LBB) in support of the redevelopment of the site comprising 1-5 Princes Parade and 1A, 1-3 Heather Gardens in Golders Green, NW11.

The scheme considered within the submitted Transport Statement report comprised thirty-one (31) residential apartments and 1,069sqm. gross floor area (GFA) of retail space (including basement and storage space), coming forward primarily as a car-free scheme other than three on-site parking spaces allocated to residents with registered disabilities and a single off-street servicing space.

Through discussions with LBB during the lifetime of the application determination period the total number of residential units within the proposed redevelopment scheme has reduced from the thirty-one (31) considered within the submitted Transport Statement to twenty-nine (29) – with these comprising thirteen (13) one-bed units, thirteen (13) two-bed units and three (3) three-bed units.

The redevelopment scheme would be replacing the previous retail floorspace and ancillary storage, which totalled 767sqm. GFA, and the residential units previously provided across the full extent of the site, which totalled twenty-six and primarily being provided as studio units.

The purpose of this addendum is to provide an update to the parking impacts assessment presented in the submitted Transport Statement report, which had been underpinned by survey work undertaken during November 2017, by means of a further survey series undertaken in October 2018 and also to reflect the reduction in the number of proposed residential units within the scheme.

Existing Parking Environment

A series of updated parking beat surveys has been undertaken, primarily in accordance with the standard Lambeth residential parking survey methodology which is widely used across London boroughs. These surveys act as a tool to support an objective demonstration of the scope for reductions in providing car parking below maximum levels on development sites, notwithstanding the overall level of provision and how this relates to local car ownership and travel trends.

The methodology uses peak stress times of residential parking (overnight) to calculate the availability of spare spaces on-street, which provides the appropriate benchmark given the scheme proposals coming forward with residential units with accessible parking only. As a general requirement, levels of on-street parking that are at or exceed 90% of the total available parking spaces would it is argued cause or lead to undue pressures on the local area.

The following provides a summary of the approach adopted for the updated surveys undertaken in relation to the site, which replicates the methodology for the original November 2017 surveys:

- the area surveyed generally covers a 200m walking distance around the site, but with minor omissions and extensions to reflect logical cut-off points in the study area;
- the surveys have been undertaken during school term-time and not within either public or school holidays, with two weekday surveys undertaken between the hours of 00:30 and 05:30 (Monday / Tuesday to Thursday / Friday);
- an inventory sheet has been prepared to confirm the lengths of stretches available for parking and also the kerbside characteristics (such as yellow lining and dropped kerbs);
- any cars parked within the first 7.5m of a junction have been referenced as inappropriate, irrespective of the restrictions, to reflect the standard survey approach;
- available spaces on-street have been based typically on no less than 5m-length, but with shorter spaces considered where these are formally demarcated as individual spaces.

The updated parking stress surveys were carried out overnight in the early hours of Thursday 18th October 2018 and Friday 19th October 2018, between 01:40 and 02:20 and between 02:20 and 03:00 respectively, so within the days and hours set out within the Lambeth Methodology.

The study area adopted for the survey is shown in **Appendix 1**, which illustrates that the network comprises stretches of Golders Green Road, Heather Gardens, Sinclair Grove, Highfield Road, Highfield Gardens, Princes Park Avenue and Golders Manor Drive. The full results of the updated parking beat surveys in the form of the tabulated inventory records are attached at **Appendix 2**. Table A1 below presents a summary of the results from the October 2018 surveys.

	SURVEY 1 18 th Oct. 2018	SURVEY 2 19 th Oct. 2018	SURVEY AVERAGE
Vehicles Parked ⁽¹⁾	105	98	102
Spare Spaces ⁽¹⁾	52	60	56
<i>Study Area Capacity</i>	<i>157</i>	<i>158</i>	<i>158</i>
RESULTANT STRESS	66.9%	62.0%	64.6%
<i>1. Vehicles parked include small number of vehicles parked 'inappropriately' on each night; accordingly, number of spare spaces referenced reduced to offset these.</i>			

Table A1: Summary of Updated Overnight Parking Stress Surveys

The results of the updated series of parking stress surveys identify firstly an average observed on-street capacity of 158 spaces, which matches that identified through the November 2017 surveys.

Analysis of the results of the updated surveys indicates between around 100 and 105 vehicles parked overnight on-street within the study area, with a resultant parking stress level averaged across the two survey days of 65%. This compares with around 90 vehicles parked and a resultant stress level of around 58% identified from the original November 2017 surveys.

Notwithstanding the observed changes in the existing on-street parking environment, the primary conclusion from the updated survey of parking stress is that there continues to be considerable spare capacity of on-street parking spaces during the overnight period within the vicinity of the site, based not only on the average of the two survey days but on each of the two survey days.

Against the background of the busiest of the two survey days within the updated series, there would continue to be the scope to accommodate thirty-six (36) additional vehicles on-street without exceeding the 90% threshold corresponding with material parking stress, with this increasing to forty (40) vehicles when considering the average on-street demand over the two survey days.

Further review of the updated survey data identifies the majority of vehicles (92 vehicles on each day) parked amongst the permit holder (including shared) spaces, with an average stress level over the two survey days amongst these spaces being 72% and with scope to accommodate twenty-three (23) additional vehicles on-street within these spaces without exceeding the 90% material stress threshold.

From the results of the updated surveys it continues to be evident that as a residential area the level of on-street parking stress within the vicinity of the site can cope with additional parking on-street from similar residential developments without causing undue or significant additional harm to the area or impacting negatively upon existing residents in terms of parking.

Car Parking Strategy

The development would come forward primarily as a car-free scheme, with the parking strategy being to provide three on-site car parking spaces only to be allocated to those residents with registered disabilities. This level of on-site provision is commensurate with the number of wheelchair-accessible units (three) which would be forthcoming within the proposed redevelopment scheme.

As referenced within the submitted Transport Statement, the starting point for the considerations of general car parking for the residential units within the scheme could be argued to be the difference between the theoretical car parking requirements of the extant residential units and the theoretical car parking requirements of the proposed residential units, since the demand associated with the former could continue to come forward without any further planning considerations.

Based on the current LBB standards, the extant residential units could have a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 28 spaces, whilst the proposed residential units could have a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 37 spaces – a net increase of 9 spaces.

In contrast, based on the current London Plan standards, the extant residential units could have a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 27 spaces, whilst the proposed residential units could have a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 31 spaces – a net increase of 4 spaces.

Indeed, it should be noted also against the background of the draft London Plan, published in December 2017 by the Mayor of London but not yet adopted policy, that with the guiding standards put forward based on PTAL only a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 20 spaces could be associated with the extant residential units, compared with a theoretical car parking requirement of up to 22 spaces associated with the proposed residential units – a lesser net increase of 2 spaces only.

The worst-case scenario, however, would continue to be to appraise the residential part of the scheme as a stand-alone development against each of LBB's and the London Plan's current policy and guidance, which as identified would represent a maximum provision requirement of up to 37 car parking spaces based on the local standards and a lesser maximum provision requirement of up to 31 car parking spaces based on the London-wide standards.

Car ownership amongst households within the local area, as identified through the 2011 census data, sits at around two-thirds (68%), with this being lower specifically amongst flatted households where car ownership sits at around a half (53%).

Taking into consideration local car ownership level amongst flatted households, this would suggest fifteen units with a potential parking requirement. For robustness, assuming that those units without a car would come from the one-bed units initially and one of the two-bed units, applying LBB standards this would suggest a reduced maximum provision requirement of up to 23 car parking spaces, whilst applying London Plan standards would suggest up to 17 car parking spaces.

As with the assessment presented in the submitted Transport Statement, again it will be these theoretical potential residential car parking requirements which will be appraised subsequently in terms of their corresponding impacts upon the updated existing parking environment, to demonstrate the appropriateness of retaining a car-free strategy for the residential units at the site but not necessarily to preclude residents from accessing permits to park within the controlled zone.

Parking Impacts Assessment

As referenced, the proposed development would bring forward a total of twenty-nine residential units, supported by three accessible car parking spaces for use by those with registered disabilities.

Given that use of these spaces would be assigned to this specific user group, for the purpose of appraising the potential impacts of the proposed scheme upon parking within the local area the scheme is considered as car-free with no car parking, as undertaken with the original assessment.

Whilst not providing on-site car parking to support the scheme represents a measure to discourage car-based travel, it is acknowledged that some residents may choose to seek to own a car and it is the potential impact of this which can be appraised against the background of the results of the updated parking stress surveys presented earlier in this addendum note.

The results of the updated parking stress survey reported earlier within this addendum identifies an existing parking stress of 65% on the local highway network within 200m or so of the site, with the number of spare spaces during the peak overnight period being forty (40) of the fifty-six (56), when considering the full range of on-street parking opportunities available to residents and whilst maintaining a level of on-street parking below the 90% threshold.

These updated survey results also identified specifically amongst the demarcated permit holder (including shared) spaces an existing parking stress of 72% and scope to accommodate an additional twenty-three (23) vehicles on-street within these spaces without reaching the 90% threshold.

The parking strategy commentary identified that without consideration of local car ownership characteristics the LBB car parking standards suggested a theoretical car parking requirement for the residential scheme of thirty-seven spaces and the London Plan standards a lesser thirty-one spaces.

Adding these theoretical parking demands to the observed existing stress would increase this to 88% based on the LBB car parking standards and to 84% based on the London Plan standards, an average of the two being 86% and again without any due consideration of local car ownership characteristics. Both of these resultant stress levels would continue to sit below the acceptable 90% threshold.

Considering the local car ownership recorded amongst flatted households and applying this to the proposed residential apartments, which is considered to represent an objective approach, this would suggest a lesser theoretical requirement of twenty-three spaces based on the LBB standards and a lesser theoretical requirement of seventeen spaces based on the current London Plan standards.

Adding these alternative theoretical parking demands, which would be more so reflective of local car ownership trends, to the updated observed existing stress would increase this to 79% based on the LBB car parking standards and to 75% based on the London Plan standards, an average of the two being 77%, and so also continuing to sit objectively below the 90% threshold of manageable impact.

Indeed, adding these alternative theoretical parking demands to the updated observed existing stress amongst spaces available to permit holders during the periods of restriction, for a robust assessment, would increase this to around 90% (89.8%) based on the LBB car parking standards and to 85% based on the London Plan standards, so with both of these resultant stress levels and the corresponding average of the two (87.5%) similarly sitting below the 90% threshold of manageable impact.

Summary

Notwithstanding that the scheme would be coming forward primarily as car-free, should some residents choose to have a car it has been identified that the corresponding additional demand on the existing on-street parking demand would continue to be manageable and the stress level would not reach or exceed the 90% threshold of manageable stress, when considering firstly solely guiding standards and secondly with the current level of car ownership amongst flats within the local area.

Against this background, it is considered additionally that there should be no preclusion to LBB to agree to allow parking permits to be provided, at no more than one per unit, firstly given that there had been no preclusion for residents of the extant residential units to seek access of a permit to park on-street, and against which the net changes in potential parking demand could be no more than nine spaces, and secondly by demonstration of the available spare on-street parking capacity.



APPENDICES



APPENDIX 1

APPENDIX 1 – PARKING BEAT SURVEY STUDY AREA



STUDY AREA



APPENDIX 2

PARKING BEAT SURVEY

DATE : October 17th / 18th and October 18th / 19th 2018

DAY : Wednesday / Thursday and Thursday / Friday

LOCATION : Golders Green Road

ROAD NAME	AREA	RESTRICTION	METRES	NOTES REF.	Thursday 18/10/2018		Friday 19/10/2018	
					PARKED	SPACES	02:20 - 03:00	
							PARKED	SPACES
Golders Green Road	From Highfield Avenue - West Side	Highfield Avenue						
		Double Yellow Line	9.2					
		Disabled Bay	5.7	1	0	1	0	1
		Double Yellow Line / Access	10.9					
		Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30	5.6	2				
		Double Yellow Line / Access	13.4					
		Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30	4.8	3	0	1	0	1
		Double Yellow Line / Access	8.9					
		Resident permit / Pay by phone 09:00 - 17:30	36.2		4	2	5	1
		Double Yellow Line	6.2					
		Highfield Gardens	10.4					
		Double Yellow Line	4.7					
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	39.6		6	0	6	0
		Double Yellow Line / Access	11.0					
		Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30	16.8		1	2	0	3
		Double Yellow Line	11.3					
		Heather Gardens	15.5					
		Double Yellow Line / No loading at any time	11.1					
		Bus stop / No stopping at any time	22.9					
		Double Yellow Line	5.7					
	Golders Manor Drive	14.2						
	Double Yellow Line	8.0						
	Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	12.3		0	2	1	1	
	Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	6.5						
	Single Yellow Line	5.4	5	0	1	0	1	
	Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	6.0						
	Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	20.0		3	1	2	2	
	Double Yellow Line	17.8						
	Sinclair Grove	14.6						
	Double Yellow Line	27.2						
	Red Route	40.0						
	North Circular Road							
	Woodlands							
	Double Yellow Line	106.0						
	Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30 Max 1hr 30min	42.7		0	7	0	7	
	Double Yellow Line / Access	10.5						
	Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30 Max 1hr 30min	16.7		0	3	0	3	
	Double Yellow Line / Access	17.7						
	Princes Park Avenue	13.8						
	Double Yellow Line	4.0						
Resident permit / Pay by phone 09:00 - 17:30	26.1		2	2	1	3		
Double Yellow Line / Access	10.2							
Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	44.8		7	1	7	1		
Single Yellow Line Mon - Sat 08:00 - 18:30	8.4							
Highfield Road	9.4							
Single Yellow Line Mon - Sat 08:00 - 18:30	8.4							
Bus stop / No stopping at any time	32.5	4						
Loading bay Mon-Sat 08:00-10:00,16:00-18:30	8.9		1	0	0	1		
Parking Mon -Sat 10:00 - 16:00 Max 15min NRW 1 hr								
Alba Gardens								
SUB-TOTAL					24	22	22	24

Heather Gardens	From Golders Green Road - South Side	Golders Green Road						
		Double Yellow Line	11.8					
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	5.5		1	0	1	0
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	40.1		1	-1	1	-1
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	16.0		3	0	3	0
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	4.7					
	From Golders Manor Drive - North Side	Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	4.8	3	0	1	1	0
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	8.2					
		Golders Manor Drive						
		Golders Manor Drive						
		Single Yellow Line	15.0	5	1	-1	0	0
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	27.2		3	2	3	2
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	15.1		1	-1		
		Loading Bay Mon-Sat 08:00-18:30 Max 1hr NRW 2hrs	11.2		0	2	0	2
		Double Yellow Line	10.8					
Golders Green Road								
SUB-TOTAL					10	2	9	3

		<i>Golders Green Road</i>							
Golders Manor Drive	From Golders Green Road - South Side	Double Yellow Line	9.4						
		Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30 Max 1hr 30min	12.5		0	2		0	2
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	15.6						
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	17.3		1	2		1	2
		Single Yellow Line	10.6						
		Heather Gardens	12.8						
		Single Yellow Line	8.2		1	-1		0	0
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	8.0						
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	15.3		2	0		3	0
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	7.7						
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	11.0		1	1		0	2
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	9.3						
		Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	11.3		1	1		1	1
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	8.2						
	Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00	11.6		2	0		1	1	
	<i>Outside house no 11</i>								
	From Golders Green Road - North Side	<i>Golders Green Road</i>							
		Double Yellow Line	19.8						
		Pay by phone bay 09:00 - 17:30 Max 1hr 30min	17.5		1	2		1	2
		Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb	24.6						
Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00		24.3		2	2		2	2	
Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb		8.5							
Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00		49.8		7	1		6	2	
Single Yellow / Dropped Kerb		5.1							
Resident Permit Mon-Fri 11:00 - 12:00		40.2		5	2		5	2	
<i>Outside house no 48</i>									
				23	12		20	16	

1. Whilst vehicles parked and spare spaces within these dedicated user spaces have been recorded, these are not included within parking stress.
2. Parking space not available during time of survey, due to suspension, thus loss of one space from capacity.
3. Whilst bay length below typical 5m minimum, as demarcated on-street as legitimate parking space included in assessment.
4. Minor amendments to on-street bus cage has led to loss of two on-street spaces since November 2017 survey.
5. Capacity referenced for these particular stretches based on stretch-by stretch assessment of scope to accommodate parking in practical manner.
6. Overall capacity reflective of maximum number of vehicles observed parking within facility and recorded 5m spaces between parked vehicles.

Parked	Spaces
105	52
Cap.	157
Stress	66.9%

Parked	Spaces
98	60
Cap.	158
Stress	62.0%