

To:	Oluwaseyi Enirayetan
From:	[REDACTED] (Transport Planning)
Date:	30 July 2015
Re:	Flat A 156 Goldhurst Terrace London NW6 3HP
Proposal:	<i>Alterations to front garden involving dropped curb and front boundary wall to accommodate a single parking space and other associated works.</i>
Reference:	2015/2962/P

I have reviewed the plans and documents submitted with the planning application 2015/2962/P.

Background

The site is located in the South Hampstead conservation area and the Swiss Cottage (West End Lane) controlled parking zone (CA-R) which operates between 0830 and 1830 hours on Monday to Saturday. Our records indicate that the CPZ suffers from parking stress with a ratio of parking permits to parking spaces of 1.10 (i.e. 110 parking permits issued per 100 parking spaces). In addition, the site has a PTAL rating of 5 (excellent) which means it is highly accessible by public transport. The proposal would require the loss of at least 1 on-street parking space.

Assessment Criteria

We assess planning applications against our Local Development Framework (our Development Plan). This includes our Core Strategies, Development Policies, and Planning Guidance. The transport implications of the proposal are assessed against the following:

- Core Strategy CS11 - Promoting sustainable and efficient travel
- Development Policy DP18 - Parking standards and limiting the availability of car parking
- Development Policy DP19 – Managing the impact of parking
- Development Policy DP21 - Development connecting to the highway network

We have also assessed the proposal against the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).

Assessment of the Transport Implications

The NPPF states that at its heart is a presumption in favour of sustainable development. For decision taking this means approving development proposals

that accord with the Development Plan without delay. The proposal would not constitute sustainable development as it would involve the loss of on-street parking spaces. It would also promote private car ownership and use in an area which is easily accessible by public transport.

Core Strategy CS11 amongst other things seeks to make private transport more sustainable, which includes minimising provision for private parking in new developments. This is reinforced by CS11 paragraph 11.17 of the supporting text which states that the Council will continue to limit the amount of parking available for private cars, which represents a key part of its approach to addressing congestion and promoting sustainable transport choices. CS11 paragraph 11.21 states that demand for movement, deliveries and car parking on Camden's roads already exceeds the space available, meaning that effective management of Camden's road network is essential.

Development Policy DP18 supports CS11 and states that the Council will seek to ensure that developments provide the minimum necessary car parking provision and will expect development to be car-free in, amongst other things, areas within Controlled Parking Zones that are easily accessible by public transport. Again, this sentiment is reinforced by the supporting text of DP18, particularly paragraphs 18.2 to 18.4.

Development Policy DP19 builds on the approach set out in DP18 by addressing the potential impacts of parking associated with development in terms of on-street parking conditions and wider environmental considerations. DP19 states that the Council will resist development that would:

- add to on-street parking demand where on-street parking spaces cannot meet existing demand, or otherwise harm existing on-street parking conditions;
- require detrimental amendment to existing or proposed Controlled Parking Zones;
- create a shortfall of public car parking, operational business parking or residents' parking.

The above points are reinforced by the supporting text of DP19, particularly paragraphs 19.3 to 19.9.

Paragraph 19.3 of DP19 states that on-street car parking spaces are a limited resource, and demand exceeds supply in much of the borough. They cater for residents who do not have off-street spaces at home as well as for people visiting businesses and services. The Council manages on-street parking on the basis of designated Controlled Parking Zones, in which regulations control how parking may be used on different sections of the street and at different times. There is a particularly high demand for on-street parking by residents in areas with a low availability of drives or garages.

Paragraph 19.4 of DP19 states that development that will reduce the amount of on-street parking or add to on-street parking demand will be resisted where it would cause unacceptable parking pressure, particularly in areas of identified parking stress. Our records indicate that the site is located in a controlled

parking zone which suffers from parking stress. The proposal would exacerbate this problem.

Development Policy DP21 builds on CS11 which states that the Council will ensure that growth and development has regard to Camden's road hierarchy and does not cause harm to the management of the road network. DP21 states that the Council will expect works affecting highways to:

- avoid disruption to the highway network and its function (this includes the provision of on-street car parking facilities);
- avoid harm to on-street parking conditions or require detrimental amendment to Controlled Parking Zones.

Paragraph 21.9 of DP21 states that given the high level of parking stress experienced in much of Camden, the creation of new links to access development should not involve overall loss of one or more on-street parking spaces, particularly in areas of parking stress.

Conclusion

The proposal would clearly be unacceptable in transport terms based on the above points as it would be contrary to the NPPF, CS11, DP18, DP19 and DP21. This planning application involves the provision of off-street car parking facilities and should therefore be refused.

It is worth noting that the Council has recently refused similar planning applications at 3 Fellows Road and 36 Hemstal Road. Both applicants subsequently appealed these decisions. However, the Planning Inspectorate found in the Council's favour and dismissed both appeals on the grounds that the proposals did not constitute sustainable development. The applicant could of course appeal any refusal. However, the Planning Inspector would use the aforementioned decisions for 3 Fellows Road and 36 Hemstal Road as precedents.