

Charlotte Goff <cgoff@hillington.gov.uk>

FW: 70766/APP/2016/677 Bentinck Road

1 message

Alexandra Webster <alexandra@andmoreplanning.com>

4 April 2016 at 17:35

To: cgoff@hillington.gov.ukCc: Stephen Birrell <stephen@andmoreplanning.com>

Hi Charlotte,

Hope you had a good weekend.

I spoke to the applicant's highways consultant on Friday following our conversation re highways input. I wasn't expecting quite so much information to come back from him, but thought it would be worthwhile sending you the below, as I think it helps to bridge the gap between transport-speak and planning. Hopefully it may be some use for your discussions when Syed is back next week.

Let me know if you could do with any clarification or further info on any of the below.

Best wishes,

Alex

Alexandra Webster | Director



andmore planning

m: 07920 427 197

w: www.andmoreplanning.com

Follow us on Twitter! @AndmorePlanning

From: Paul Crosby [<mailto:paul@crosbytp.com>]

Sent: 04 April 2016 12:12
To: 'Alexandra Webster' <alexandra@andmoreplanning.com>
Subject: RE: Pre-app Bentinck Road

Alex,

Not great news but similarly not unexpected. I think it is worth highlighting a few points to the planning officer so that she can be prepared for last-minute discussions with the highways officer regarding the impact of cars beyond the parking zone.

First, the Lambeth methodology applies a 200m walk distance from the site which is based on how far a resident would reasonably leave their vehicle from home. I am not aware of any guidance which states that residents would reasonably and regularly be willing to park further from their home. Therefore it is unreasonable to assume that residents would be prepared to regularly park in streets that are further than 200m away from the site, which itself is located quite centrally within the CPZ.

The only section of street that is located within a 200m walk distance and is not included within the CPZ is a 50m stretch of Heathcote Way. However, the majority of this length of street consists of dropped kerbs restricting the availability of spaces to no greater than 6/7 vehicles. During the two night time surveys and one daytime survey, there was little or no spare capacity along this stretch. Therefore it would be unreasonable to assume that a resident would be living on site and would be assuming that they could regularly park along this stretch.

Secondly, the parking stress surveys have indicated that there would be capacity within the CPZ to accommodate the likely demand from residents. Therefore, should the highways officer be so concerned about the effect of the development beyond the CPZ, then this can easily be resolved by not restricting residents from applying for parking permits. Any potential impact on parking beyond the CPZ would clearly be of the Council's own making if they prevent residents from applying for permits.

Thirdly, even if the highway officer is concerned about the potential impact of parking beyond the CPZ, it is difficult to see how this could be considered a "severe" impact and conflict with Government policy. We would wish to see evidence that the highways officer has fully considered the findings of the two Transport Technical Notes and has given weight to the positive aspects of the scheme, including:

- The change of use will result in a net reduction in traffic flows to and from the site; and
- Cycle parking will be introduced on site in accordance with local standards.

Also and quite significantly, the Lambeth methodology states that for commercial uses, occupants are prepared to walk up to 500m from the site. Therefore, the existing commercial use is actually more likely to result in an impact on parking levels beyond the site than the proposed residential use. Indeed, the existing occupier has advised that many staff drive to work (more than the number of spaces available), as the use of a car is essential for undertaking their day-to-day duties. The regular use of the car by

In light of the evidence put forward within the application, I fail to see how the clear positive aspects of the scheme can be outweighed, to the extent that the highways officer could reasonably justify a recommendation for refusal on highways grounds. It should simply be a case of whether the Council approves the application with or without the restriction on parking permits.

Paul



T: 01932 220464 | M: 07741 282560 | E: paul@crosbytp.com