

Fourth Session: Outer London Commission Minutes – Brent Civic Centre 3rd March 2015

Attendance:

OLC Members

Will Mckee	Chair	WM
Corrairie Swaine	Arup	CS
Keith Mitchell	Peter Brett	KM
Sue Wilcox	Quod	SW

Non – OLC Members

John Lett	GLA	JL
Rachael Rooney	GLA	RR
Josephine Vos	TfL	JV
Lucinda Turner	TfL	LT
Stephen Weeks	Brent	SW
Tony Kenndy	Brent	TK
Rachel Best	Brent	RB
Tim Forrester	West Trans	TF
Nick Bole	Hammersmith & Fulham	NB
David Knowles	Hillingdon	DK
James Gleaves	Hillingdon	JG

1. Welcome and Introductions

WM welcomed everyone

2. Process for Fourth round of OLC

WM explained that the fourth round would be split into 2 sessions, one initially focussing on residential parking which would immediately inform a Minor Alteration to the London Plan (MALP), and the second session exploring a range of other issues that JL would go through later in the meeting.

For the first session on parking, following on from the first Commission's meeting which was held in December 2014, there is now a series of meetings being held around London, which this is the first, to gain the views of wider outer London stakeholders. There will be a final Commission meeting in mid / late March and report setting out the Commission's recommendations published in May to coincide with consultation on MALP.

3. Specific Discussion Point: Parking Review

TfL presented the issues arising from the parking review – see attachment for slides.

The Chair explained that in discussions in the other sub regional meetings, it has become apparent that there were identifiable typologies beginning to emerge – and that outer London is clearly not homogenous.

One attendee suggested that though PTALs have limitations, they are currently what is used in London Plan parking policy. Typologies might be more nuanced and are worth exploring.

One borough stated that minimum standards are difficult to consider as they would need to be assessed against a set of complex factors including land values and characteristics of various places.

The boroughs asked whether there was any rationale behind the Secretary of State's statement of 'clogged up streets' – where is the evidence?

The Commission noted that it would also be useful to know where low parking provision is made, whether there are any overspill issues and what corollaries there are, i.e. tenure, size of units, etc.

A borough noted that people are reluctant to walk any distance. Also even if they have an allocated space, they will choose to park as close to their front door as possible.

Any changes need to be aligned with other mechanisms such as CPZs.

It was asked whether some practical guidance is needed on how to design parking spaces within/ near to schemes. It was felt that parking spaces should be in opposite direction to the destinations most wish to go so that it discourages the use of the car for very short distances.

It was suggested that there were examples of developments where selling parking spaces does not work. People will not pay for a space if they can park on the street for free, which results in overspill.

It was also suggested that Councillors don't take a strategic view of CPZ – it is more resident led. The trigger is overspill. CPZs happen by osmosis.

The boroughs all agreed there are a variety of areas in their boroughs and that it would be possible to identify a number of typologies to reflect that. However simply using PTALs, doesn't reflect reality. There is therefore a case for setting guidance in typologies rather than using PTALs. Typologies also allow for variety – some may have aspirations for change, whereas others may wish to stay the same therefore need to understand the impacts of the various approaches.

It was highlighted that even in places of very low PTALs – there is still a desire to discourage car use as much as is practical – although there is a recognition of the dependency of car in these areas.

A borough noted that provision of road space increases demand and parking would likely follow the same rule. It was asked whether it was the Mayor's view that there is capacity in the road network to accommodate increased ownership of vehicles. The borough understands that there is not capacity so why encourage more car use?

TfL said they are looking at supply issues both in public transport and road capacity.

It was highlighted that there needs to be a balance between market led provision and reasonableness.

The boroughs stressed that rather than provide more car parking spaces in areas of low PTALs, it would be preferable to provide choice through improvements to public transport. TfL investing on day 1 of development has much more influence on modal shift than trying to change behaviour once patterns are established. Pump priming investment is needed.

In outer London – radial journeys are the easiest by public transport. Orbital routes are very difficult and therefore people are much more dependent on the use of car due to lack of alternatives, particularly for journeys going out of London.

TfL explained that there are still significant opportunities for modal shift, especially for shorter journeys.

It was asked whether the policy could be tailored to reflect dependency verses choice.

A Commissioner suggested that efforts should be focused where public transport improvements can make a difference and not at PTAL 0-1 because an additional one or two bus services won't change travel behaviour. Additionally, demand must be managed for short trips.

It was also suggested that it would be helpful if there was more guidance in SPG to reflect variations in places, which would help to make distinctions between how the policies should apply in different circumstances.

There was a difference in opinion between the boroughs in whether to delete or retain the reference to maximum standards. It was argued that keeping maximum is important in managing the network and helps provide more opportunities for modal shifts, especially to the bike.

The boroughs emphasised that developers don't often provide the maximum allowed by current standards and stressed that it is actually when boroughs request a minimum provision that causes the most problems. The boroughs felt the case for applications of minimums is best dealt with at the local level.

One borough stated a preference for the Plan to remain silent on the issue of minimums. It was also stated that current residents are the main cause of undesirable parking and the problem won't be addressed through making changes to new developments. Car clubs, CPZs, EV charging points should be on street and provide for the entire community.

The Chair asked if attendees preferred a prescriptive or permissive policy option and it was agreed that permissive is preferred.

The issue of visitor spaces was mentioned. It was felt that CPZs allow for control over this, with visitor bays on street. It was also felt that some boroughs would like to cap the number of visitor permits for residents and making reference to visitor parking in the Plan would be unduly restrictive.

It was felt that the existing policy gives enough flexibility but the real problem lies with who take responsibility for management, monitoring or enforcement of that site. The policy can say what it likes but if they are unable to enforce or monitor then pointless.

It was asked whether demand management issues could be put into the criteria of a policy, recognising that if CPZs are not implemented people will park wherever they want and on-street parking and/or overspill will not be managed.

The issue of CPZs was raised again. Boroughs don't have the money for CPZs, it needs to come via S106 from developers. Problem is that residents are asked whether or not they want a CPZ and they say no as they can park for free on street. CPZs get turned down and S106 monies go back to the developer. 12 – 18 months down the line, parking on street becomes a problem, residents complain as they can't park near to their homes and ask for a CPZ to be implemented, however there is no funding to implement one. There was a divergence of opinion on whether PTAL 2 should be included in the policy. It was also highlighted that whilst some areas have relatively good PTALs this doesn't necessarily reflect the travel patterns of homes to jobs.

On street parking was discussed. Parking enforcement is an essential tool in any urban area. Need to look at the range of implementation tools available to manage congestion.

It was suggested by the Commission that part of the evidence base must look to the future, with the huge growth in the population expected and consequent pressure on the road network.

The amenity of schemes was then discussed. It was felt amenity space is moving up the agenda for developers rather than spaces for car parking; it was discussed whether there are particular design solutions to help avoid the littering of sites with parking. This could potentially form part of future guidance and should take account of the likely conversion of garages, car ports, etc. to extensions of the home.

The use of shared parking in town centres should also be explored. However it's often people's perception of security –they like to see their car from their own window.

4. Outline of other issues for discussion in 2015

JL explained that later in 2015 the OLC would meet again to discuss a range of other issues of importance to outer London – the outcome of which would feed into the full review of the London Plan. These are summarised as follows:

Removing Barriers to Housing Delivery

Distinct outer London dimension e.g

- Density
- Viability
- Affordable rent / intermediate housing
- New built forms, existing character
- PTAL
- Local policy constraints

Crossrail and Land Release

Crossrail 1

- What other station related development potential could be realised?
- Ongoing work to be made available to the Commission

Crossrail 2

- What are the alignment options?
- Where could the stations be?
- What is the land use / density patterns around the stations?
- What is the potential for capacity uplift in terms of housing, town centre uses, businesses?
- What are the negative implications for such changes?

Land use priorities: Economy versus Housing

Emerging “Big Issue” – what is the right balance for a post industrial city?

- Offices to Residential / Industrial to Residential /
- Town Centres to Residential
- Eg industrial release C3 times 37 ha per annum benchmark
- New supply research to inform the Commission / Demand side assessment to follow
- What are the implications for this in terms of services for the city, output, productivity, employment?

Release of land for town centre intensification

Building on previous recommendations eg FALP policy 2.15

- Are there “volunteers” for town centre renewal?
- Are these geographically representative?
- How can they be developed as exemplars for wider applications?
- What sort of projects are required for these?

New approaches to regional co-ordination

Major EiP issue for London and wider South East

- Wider South East perspective - regional summit, wider south east Commission?
- Initial thoughts – 2050 Infrastructure Plan
- MDAG – Design responses
- OLC – London perspective - cross border arrangements - eg industrial and retail provision, parking, logistics, waste, migration flows, SMHAs, Duty to Co-operate
- OLC, MDAG, Wider SE Commission all to report by end of 2015 on more effective arrangements for coordinating strategic policy and investment across the wider SE

5. Next steps

There was 1 sub regional meeting left to be held which is scheduled for 10th March.

A final Commission meeting would be held at the end of March to discuss the sub regional meetings and prepare recommendations for the final report to the Mayor.

The final report would then be published alongside the consultation of any minor alteration of the London Plan post the general election.

6. Any Other Business

7. Date of next meeting

The next meeting is on Tuesday 10th March at Croydon Town Hall.