

PARKING STANDARDS

MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

INTEND TO PUBLISH

[showing alterations and suggested/further suggested changes]

DECEMBER 2015

MAYOR OF LONDON

COPYRIGHT

Greater London Authority

Published by
Greater London Authority
City Hall
The Queen's Walk
More London
London SE1 2AA
www.london.gov.uk
enquiries 020 7983 4100
minicom 020 7983 4458

Copies of this report are available from
www.london.gov.uk

PARKING STANDARDS

MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN THE SPATIAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY FOR LONDON CONSOLIDATED WITH ALTERATIONS SINCE 2011

INTEND TO PUBLISH

This version shows the original consultation draft Minor Alterations published in May 2015 together with the August 2015 suggested changes, the October 2015 further suggested change and the EiP Inspector's recommendation December 2015.

The sources of the alterations are as follows:

- **MINOR ALTERATIONS TO THE LONDON PLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT 11 May 2015**
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MALP%20PARKING%20STANDARDS%20-%20CONSULTATION%20DRAFT%20May%202015web.pdf>
new or altered text is shown in **red bold**
deleted text is shown in ~~red~~
- **SUGGESTED CHANGES 21 August 2015**
<http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MALP%20PARKING%20STANDARDS%20-%20CONSULTATION%20DRAFT%20May%202015web.pdf>
new or altered text is shown in **green bold**
deleted text is shown in ~~green~~
- **FURTHER SUGGESTED CHANGE 28 October 2015**
http://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/MASC07_MALP_Parking_standards_%20further_suggested_change_PFSC1.pdf
new or altered text is shown in **blue bold**
changes listed by the MALP EiP Inspector in his recommendations are shown in **blue with yellow highlight**

DECEMBER 2015

PARKING POLICY

POLICY 6.13 PARKING

Strategic

- 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 the basis for considering planning applications (also see Policy 2.8), **informed by policy and guidance below on their application for housing in parts of Outer London with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1)**.
- D In addition, developments **in all parts of London** 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.

LDF preparation

- E
 - a the maximum standards set out in Table 6.2 in the Parking Addendum

should be used to set standards in DPDs

- b in locations with high public transport accessibility, car-free developments should be promoted (while still providing for disabled people)
- c in town centres where there are identified issues of vitality and viability, the need to regenerate such centres may require a more flexible approach to the provision of public car parking to serve the town centre as a whole
- d outer London boroughs wishing to promote a more generous standard for office developments would need to take into account in a DPD
 - a regeneration need
 - no significant adverse impact on congestion or air quality
 - a lack (now and in future) of public transport
 - a lack of existing on or off street parking
 - a commitment to provide space for electric and car club vehicles, bicycles and parking for disabled people above the minimum thresholds
 - a requirement, via Travel Plans, to reduce provision over time.
- e **outer London boroughs should promote demonstrate that they have actively considered more generous standards for housing development in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0 -1) and take into account current and projected pressures for on-street parking and their bearing on all road users, as well as the criteria set out in NPPF (Para 39).**

6.42 Parking policy, whether in terms of levels

of provision or regulation of on- or off-street parking, can have significant effects in influencing transport choices and addressing congestion. It can also affect patterns of development and play an important part in the economic success and liveability of places, particularly town centres (see Policy 2.8 for further detail on the outer London economy). The Mayor considers it is right to set car parking standards in the Plan given his direct operational responsibility for elements of London's road network, and the strategic planning importance of ensuring London's scarce resources of space are used efficiently. Boroughs wishing to develop their own standards should take the standards in this Plan as their policy context. But he also recognises that London is a diverse city that requires a flexible approach to identifying appropriate levels of car parking provision across boundaries. This means ensuring a level of accessibility by private car consistent with the overall balance of the transport system at the local level; for further advice refer to the Housing SPG. In line with the Duty to Cooperate boroughs adjoining other regions must also liaise with the relevant authorities to ensure a consistent approach to the level of parking provision. Transport assessments and travel plans for major developments should give details of proposed measures to improve non-car based access, reduce parking and mitigate adverse transport impacts. They will be a key factor in helping boroughs assess development proposals and resultant levels of car parking.

6.42i In developing their residential parking standards in the context of London Plan policy, outer London boroughs should take account of residents' dependency on the car in areas with low public transport accessibility (generally PTALs 0-1).

Where appropriate in these locations Boroughs should consider revised standards (which could include minima) and permitting higher levels of provision there than is indicated in Table 6.2, particularly to avoid generating unacceptable pressure for on-street parking. This may be especially important in 'suburban' areas and for areas with family housing.

6.42j In outer London a more flexible approach for applications may also be acceptable in some limited parts of areas within PTAL 2, in locations where the orientation or levels of public transport mean that a development is particularly dependent on car travel. In doing so, authorities should take account of the criteria set out in paragraph 39 of the NPPF. Further advice is provided in the draft Housing SPG and forthcoming TfL guidance on parking design.

6.42k In deciding whether or not more generous standards are to be applied, account should be taken of the extent to which public transport might be provided in the future. Consideration should also be given to the implications for air quality and the impact of on-street parking measures such as CPZs which may also help reduce the potential for overspill parking and congestion, and improve safety and amenity.

6.43 Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTALs) are used by TfL to produce a consistent London wide public transport access mapping facility to help boroughs with locational planning and assessment of appropriate parking provision by measuring broad public transport accessibility levels. There is evidence that car use reduces as access to public

transport (as measured by PTALs) increases. Given the need to avoid over-provision, car parking should reduce as public transport accessibility increases. TfL may refine how PTALs operate but would consult on any proposed changes to the methodology. At a neighbourhood level TfL would also recommend making use of the ATOS (access to opportunities and services) tool in order to better understand what services are accessible in a local catchment area, by both walking and cycling.

- 6.44 This policy recognises that developments should always include parking provision for disabled people. Despite improvements to public transport, some disabled people require the use of private cars. Suitably designed and located designated car parking and drop-off points are therefore required. Boroughs should take into account local issues and estimates of local demand in setting appropriate standards and should develop monitoring and enforcement strategies to prevent misuse of spaces. Applicants for planning permission should use their transport assessments and access statements to demonstrate how the needs of disabled people have been addressed¹.
- 6.45 The Outer London Commission² has found that developers view the lack of on-site car parking for offices in outer London, when compared to the more generous standards outside of London, as a disincentive to develop offices in London. The Mayor supports further office development in outer London, but would not want to see unacceptable levels of congestion and pollution – which could also be a disincentive to investment there.

Policy 6.13 enables flexibility in setting office parking standards; if outer London boroughs wish to adopt a more generous standard this should be done via a DPD to allow TfL and the GLA to assess the impact of such a change on the wider transport network (see Policy 6.3) and on air quality. Likewise, the policy takes a similar approach to outer London town centres, providing local authorities with the opportunity to implement a more flexible approach to town centre parking where there is a demonstrable need. Guidance on implementing parking policy for offices and town centres is set out in the Town Centres SPG, including the importance of improving the quality of provision. This also addresses the need for sensitively designed town centre parking management strategies which contribute to the Mayor's broader objectives for town centres and outer London. The Mayor continues to encourage a restraint based approach to parking across all land uses in Inner London and other locations which benefit from good access to public transport.

- 6.46 The Mayor, through TfL, and working with the London boroughs, car club operators, and other stakeholders, will support expansion of car clubs and encourage their use of ultra low carbon vehicles. More than 2,200 car club vehicles are used by 120,000 people in London, with vehicles including plug-in hybrids and electric vehicles. Each car club vehicle typically results in eight privately owned vehicles being sold, and members reducing their annual car mileage by more than 25 per cent.
- 6.47 Park and Ride schemes can help boost the attractiveness of outer London centres and as such are supported. They must be carefully sited to ensure they lead to overall reductions in congestion and do not worsen air quality. Further advice on Park and Ride is set out in the

¹ Mayor of London. *Accessible London: Achieving an Inclusive Environment Supplementary Planning Guidance*. GLA, April 2004.

² Outer London Commission.
<http://www.london.gov.uk/olc>

Land for Transport SPG.

the calculation of total parking supply.

- 6.48 Operational parking for maintenance, servicing and deliveries is required to enable a development to function. Some operational parking is likely to be required on site and should be included in

RESIDENTIAL CAR PARKING STANDARDS

Table 6.2 Car parking standards

Parking for residential development

	PTAL 0 to 1		PTAL 2 to 4		PTAL 5 to 6	
Suburban	150–200 hr/ha	Parking provision	150–250 hr/ha	Parking provision	200–350 hr/ha	Parking provision
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–55 u/ha	Up to 2 spaces per unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–90 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–65 u/ha		40–80 u/ha		55–115 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–75 u/ha		50–95 u/ha		70–130 u/ha	
Urban	150–250 hr/ha		200–450 hr/ha		200–700 hr/ha	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–65 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–120 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	45–185 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–80 u/ha		55–145 u/ha		55–225 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–95 u/ha		70–170 u/ha		70–260 u/ha	
Central	150–300 hr/ha		300–650 hr/ha		650–1100 hr/ha	
3.8–4.6 hr/unit	35–80 u/ha	Up to 1.5 spaces per unit	65–170 u/ha	Up to one space per unit	140–290 u/ha	Up to one space per unit
3.1–3.7 hr/unit	40–100 u/ha		80–210 u/ha		175–355 u/ha	
2.7–3.0 hr/unit	50–110 u/ha		100–240 u/ha		215–405 u/ha	

Maximum residential parking standards

number of beds	4 or more	3	1–2
parking spaces	up to 2 per unit	up to 1.5 per unit	less than 1 per unit

Notes:

All developments in areas of good public transport accessibility (**in all parts of London**) should aim for significantly less than 1 space per unit

Adequate parking spaces for disabled people must be provided preferably on-site³

20 per cent of all spaces must be for electric vehicles with an additional 20 per cent passive provision for electric vehicles in the future.

In outer London areas with low PTAL (generally PTALs 0–1), boroughs should consider higher levels of provision, especially to address ‘overspill’ parking pressures.

³ Mayor of London. Housing Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2012. Mayor of London. Accessible London. Supplementary Planning Guidance. GLA, 2014.

GLOSSARY

DEFINITIONS

The draft Parking Standards Minor Alterations to London Plan ANNEX SIX GLOSSARY comprise:

- *amendment to the 'PTAL' entry*
- *nb: unaltered text is included for context*

Public transport accessibility levels (PTALS)

are **a detailed and accurate** ~~detailed and accurate~~ measure of the accessibility of an **area point** to the public transport network, taking into account walk access time and service availability. PTALs reflect:

- walking time from **the area** ~~the point~~ of interest to the public transport access points;
- the reliability of the service modes available;
- the number of services available within the catchment; and
- the level of service at the public transport access points - i.e. average waiting time.

PTALs do not consider:

- the speed or utility of accessible services;
- crowding, including the ability to board services; or,
- ease of interchange.