

Wheat Quarter, Broadwater Road, Welwyn Garden City TECHNICAL NOTE 4

**Parking Strategy** 

### 1. Introduction

- 1.1. Entran prepared a Transport Assessment (TA) dated January 2018 in support of a planning application for the regeneration of the former Shredded Wheat Factory, known as the Wheat Quarter. Section 7 of the TA set out the proposed parking provision and Section 11 provided an outline Car Parking Management Plan. The methodology for deriving the appropriate level of parking was based on Technical Note 13D prepared by Transport Planning Associates (TPA) (March 2016). That methodology formed the basis on which planning permission was granted in August 2017 for a mixed-use development on this site. This Technical Note should be read in conjunction with the January 2018 TA (including TPA's Technical Note 13D which was included as Appendix E).
- 1.2. Welwyn Hatfield Borough Council (WHBC) has requested further information and clarification on the source data, methodology and proposed implementation strategy. This Technical Note (TN4) has been prepared to provide that information.

### 2. Function of unallocated parking spaces.

- 2.1. WHBC has queried whether the proposed residential parking provision will be sufficient to accommodate the anticipated parking demand. In doing so they have cited recent developments which have provided a higher ratio of parking spaces per dwelling, but which appear to have insufficient parking provision. Paragraph's 7.6-7.10 of the TA refer to the 2007 DCLG research paper 'Residential Car Parking Research' which explains the need for more parking if spaces are allocated to individual dwellings. The provision of unallocated parking is far more efficient and results in a lower parking demand. This principle is explained further below.
- 2.2. If the evidence were to show a parking demand of (say) 0.7 vehicles per particular dwelling type, then a block of 10 of those dwellings would be expected to have 7 vehicles. By providing 7 unallocated spaces, associated with and in close proximity to those dwellings, we can ensure sufficient parking is provided. For the purpose of this explanation we will assume that the figure of 0.7 vehicles was derived from (4x0 cars) + (5x1 car) + (1x2 cars). If we were to allocate 1 space per dwelling then we would provide 10 spaces rather than 7; however, the four households with no vehicle would have a space that they don't need and the household with two vehicles would have to park one on-street. There would still only be 7 cars but now we have 10 allocated parking spaces plus a vehicle displaced onto the road. This is illustrated in two sketches included hare as **Appendix A**. It is therefore likely that other recent developments that relied on allocated parking spaces would have provided more spaces overall, but ultimately had insufficient parking to meet demand. The proposed parking for the Wheat Quarter has been designed to meet the predicted demand, and the parking management strategy makes the most efficient use of land to as required by NPPF.
- 2.3. For clarity, the unallocated residential parking spaces would only be available to resident permit holders, but spaces would not be allocated to individual residents or dwellings. Separate spaces would be available for visitors, Car Club vehicles and commercial parking.

### 3. Source data

3.1. Paragraph 7.7 of the TA refers to an analysis of Census data for the Peartree ward in respect of vehicle ownership per household (flats and maisonettes). The data was derived from Nomisweb [LC4415EW] "Accommodation type by car or van availability" (ONS Crown Copyright Reserved). It should be noted that a full assessment was carried out for both Peartree and Handside wards and the *higher* figures used. In addition, growth in vehicle ownership was applied up to 2026 based on the growth observed between 2001 and 2011 (0.8% increase per annum).



- 3.2. However, it is important to note that the proposed parking provision is *not* based on the average vehicle ownership derived from the Census data. That information was simply used as a sense check to establish an appropriate reduction from the WHBC maximum parking standards. Paragraph 7.7 states that a 40% reduction has been applied to the WHBC maximum standards, reflecting the location of the site in Zone 2; however, the visitor parking and Car Club spaces have then been applied in addition to those residents permit holder spaces.
- 3.3. WHBC have queried whether the 2011 Census data is the most up to date information for this cross-checking exercise. Entran has conducted a thorough review of publicly available information from the Office for National Statistics (ONS) and information used to inform the WHBC Development Plan and HCC Local Transport Plan. In each case, whereas there appears to be more up to date references to vehicle ownership, our review has identified that the source data is the 2011 Census data. There has not been any more recent survey conducted in the County or Borough to inform predicted vehicle ownership levels. There is also no available data to identify any changes in vehicle ownership (growth or reduction) since 2011. Therefore the analysis undertaken in the TA is based on the most robust evidence base. However, as stated above, the proposed parking provision is based on figures derived from the WHBC parking standards, just cross referenced to the Census vehicle ownership details.

### 4. Proposed provision

4.1. Pre-application discussions with officers suggested that the TPA (TN13D) parking provision explanation was not entirely clear. Section 7 of the TA was therefore presented in a more 'conversational' style to explain the rationale and proposed provision. However, WHBC and HCC have both said that that this approach was also unclear. Further clarification is therefore provided below in a tabular form. As stated, the residents' permit spaces are based on a 40% reduction from the WHBC max standards, and then visitor (10%) and Car Club (6%) spaces have been added. Table 4.1 illustrates the level of provision by unit type.

	Max (std)	Permit spaces	Car Club	Visitor	Total provision
1-bed	0.75	0.45	0.06	0.1	0.61
2-bed	1.00	0.60	0.06	0.1	0.76
3-bed	1.50	0.90	0.06	0.1	1.06
4-bed	2.00	1.20	0.06	0.1	1.36

### Table 4.1 – Parking provision by unit type

4.2. The North site and South site parking demand calculations have been derived separately. These are as set out below.

### South Site

4.3. The TA states that the south site is purely residential, comprising 643 flats. Parking provision comprises residents' permit spaces, visitor spaces and Car Club spaces. For the proposed mix this equates to 369 permit spaces, 64 visitor spaces and 39 Car Club vehicles. The total provision is 472 parking spaces (equating to 0.73 spaces per dwelling). This is shown in Table 4.2 below.

	Units	Permit spaces	Car Club	Visitor	Total provision
1-bed	239	108	14	24	146
2-bed	340	204	20	34	258
3-bed	64	58	4	6	68
TOTAL	643	369	39	64	472

Table 4.2 – South site residential	parking	provision
------------------------------------	---------	-----------

4.4. The TA also explains that each Car Club space replaces the need for 6 residents' parking spaces. When this is taken into account, the 472 spaces, including Car Club vehicles, would be equivalent to providing 665 spaces (equating to an average of 1.03 spaces per dwelling). Further details of the Car Club are provided later in this note.

North Site

4.5. The TA states that the north site comprises residential and non-residential development. The residential component comprises 811 flats. Residential parking provision comprises residents permit spaces, visitor spaces and Car Club spaces. For the proposed mix this equates to 426 permit spaces, 81 visitor spaces and 49 Car Club vehicles. The total provision is 556 parking spaces (equating to 0.69 spaces per dwelling). This is shown in Table 4.3 below.

	Units	Permit spaces	Car Club	Visitor	Total provision
1-bed	490	221	29	49	299
2-bed	288	173	17	29	219
3-bed	32	29	2	3	34
TOTAL	810	422	49	81	552

### Table 4.3 – North site residential parking provision

- 4.6. If each Car Club space replaces the need for 6 residents' parking spaces the 556 spaces, including Car Club vehicles, would be equivalent to providing 799 spaces (equating to an average of 0.99 spaces per dwelling).
- 4.7. As the northern site is a mix of residential and non-residential uses, an additional 35 dual-use spaces are available which would be available for residents' visitors outside peak commercial hours.

### Use class C2 residential care

4.8. The parking calculations in the TA were based on parking demand associated with a total of 1453 residential flats (Use class C3). It should be noted, however, that of those, 142 units have been designed as Extra Care dwellings (Use class C2). Parking demand for C2 uses is lower than for C3 so it is expected that the parking demand will be lower than the proposed provision in respect of the 142 units. The total parking provision should therefore be comfortably above the level required.

### **Commercial**

4.9. In addition to the residential parking provision a further 142 car spaces are provided across the North site. Of these 107 are dedicated commercial/community use parking spaces and 35 are dualuse spaces available for residential visitors outside peak commercial operating hours (as mentioned above). This complies with the principles established for the approved development scheme and as set out in TPA's TN13D.

- 4.10. Whereas the B1 employment uses and arts centre will require dedicated parking provision (at 25-50% of WHDC maximum), other uses (such as convenience retail and crèche) are ancillary to the main development. The primary users of retail units such as convenience stores, sandwich shops, coffee shops, salons etc. will be residents living in the development or employees and visitors associated with the B1 and D2 uses. For this reason the non-residential parking demand is not simply a sum of the parts. The total peak demand for the B1 office, D1 health and community, D2 leisure and D2 arts equates to 142 parking spaces (at 25% of maximum)
- 4.11. The majority of parking across the north site is provided in the form of basement or undercroft parking. The large basement beneath blocks 6 and 7 dramatically reduces the need to provide onstreet or open plan parking. In addition, the car park beneath blocks 2 and 3 is masked from the public squares by landscape structures such as tiered landscaping, steps and ramps. This is a common approach in major cities throughout the UK and Europe and ensures high quality parking provision but minimises the dominance of parking on the public realm. This is in accordance with the SPD requirement for parking to be provided sensitively.

### 5. Car Club

- 5.1. The proposed Car Club provision was originally based on the agreed parking strategy as set out in TPA's TN13D. However, pre-application discussions with a number pf Car Club operators confirmed that this approach would be viable and feasible. Paragraphs 7.13-7.16 of the submitted TA set out the heads of terms for any Car Club to be provided on this site, the obligation on the developer and the means by which such provision could be secured as part of any planning permission.
- 5.2. Since the application was submitted further discussions have been held with E-Car, the UK's leading low-emission car club. We understand that E-Car are approved by HCC. They have reviewed the development proposals and the proposed Car Club arrangements as set out in the TA. They have confirmed that the number of Car Club spaces as set out in Tables 4.2 and 4.3 above are appropriate for the scale of development. They are keen to work with the developer, WHBC and HCC to deliver a workable electric vehicle car club as part of the Wheat Quarter regeneration project, but with vehicles available to the wider community.
- 5.3. E-Car has confirmed that in their experience each Car Club vehicle will replace the need for 6-8 privately owned cars, supporting the 'equivalent provision' calculations referred to in the TA. The source for the figure of 6 spaces was the CarPlus website; however, that charitable organisation has not been replaced by CoMoUK. Their website is still under development and does not at present have access to the previous CarPlus research data. However, joint research by CarPlus and University of the West of England (UWE) is included hare as **Appendix B**, together with a planning obligations Fact Sheet produced by LB Tower Hamlets which refers to each Car Club vehicle replacing 5-10 private cars.
- 5.4. As an experienced Car Club provider E-Car has suggested that Car Club spaces are provided in blocks of 5-10 for enhanced visibility and ease of providing electric charging infrastructure. They have also requested that any Car Club spaces provided in the basement parking areas are provided with a wireless booster to ensure a strong signal for residents/customers booking their vehicle using a smart phone. Full details of the simple booking procedure are shown on the E-car website www.ecarclub.co.uk
- 5.5. HCC has suggested that an initial provision of 3% Car Club spaces is made available with the ability to provide a further 3% subject to observed take-up rates. E-Car fully supports this approach. The residual 3% would initially be provided as additional unallocated spaces, available to resident permit holders, but could be converted to a Car Club space to meet demand. The usage of Car Club vehicles will be monitored by the Car Club operator, but will also form part of the Travel Plan monitoring and reporting regime.
- 5.6. The refined parking provision will therefore be as follows. The main figures represent the initial provision (i.e. 3% CC); the figures in brackets are with a full 6% Car Club provision.

	Units	Permit spaces	Car Club	Visitor	Total provision
1-bed	239	115 (108)	7 (14)	24	146
2-bed	340	214 (204)	10 (20)	34	258
3-bed	64	60 (58)	2 (4)	6	68
TOTAL	643	389 (369)	20 (39)	64	472

### Table 5.1 – South site residential parking provision (flexible Car Club provision)

### Table 5.2 – North site residential parking provision (flexible Car Club provision)

	Units	Permit spaces	Car Club	Visitor	Total provision
1-bed	490	234 (221)	15 (29)	49	299
2-bed	288	182 (173)	9 (17)	29	219
3-bed	32	30 (29)	1 (2)	3	34
TOTAL	810	447 (422)	25 (49)	81	552

- 5.7. The obligation to provide the Car Club will fall to the developer who will be required to let a contract with a commercial operator which would be expected to include.
  - Free 3 year membership for new residents providing access to cars on site, the rest of Hertfordshire and the UK;
  - First car to be delivered by first occupation;
  - Bespoke marketing material and membership certificates;
  - Briefing of sales staff at the development on the car club and attendance at promotional events;
  - 24/7 customer service team;
  - 24/7 booking system including mobile booking site (IOS and Android) and iPhone app;
  - Vehicle insurance;
  - Vehicle maintenance;
  - Creation of reports and statistics for the developer and Council;
- 5.8. E-Car's current fleet includes a range of vehicle sizes and manufacturers, including small vans. This would be very attractive for new residents, allowing them to have a choice of vehicle types depending on their journey. Many households living on the Wheat Quarter, such as those who commute into London, would have no need for a private vehicle, parked on site as they would have easy access to a range of vehicles as and when they need one, and could choose a vehicle appropriate to their journey.



5.9. Those households who choose to own a private vehicle could make use of the Car Club vehicles rather than own a second car which would sit unused for up to 90% of the time. This is an important consideration, particularly when the Census data shows that 40% of households living in this ward, close to the station, have no vehicle even without access to a Car Club.



- 5.10. The introduction of the Car Club would be fully funded by the developer at no expense to the new occupiers. Importantly, the Car Club would also be available to local residents in the area thereby reducing parking demand beyond the development site itself.
- 5.11. A proposal from E-Car Club is included as **Appendix C.**
- 5.12. The provisional locations of the Car Club and visitor spaces are illustrated in **Appendix D**. The final space allocations will be agreed in partnership with the Car Club operator, WHBC and ECC and included in the final Car Parking Management Plan, to be agreed prior to occupation.

### 6. Car Parking Management Plan

- 6.1. In line with the previously approved scheme, a Car Parking Management Plan will be prepared and implemented to ensure that only permitted vehicles are able to park within the residential car parks. The main principles of the plan will be:
  - All residents' vehicles will need to be registered with the Management Company;
  - Any unregistered vehicles will only be permitted to park within visitor spaces for a limited time period before being fined, unless booked in by a resident;
  - Car Club parking spaces will be provided as part of the development and managed by a private operator. All Car Club spaces will have electric charging points and be marked as Car Club vehicles only;
  - All eligible residents will be provided with free Car Club membership for a minimum period of three years;
  - Car Club usage will be continually monitored by the operator and reported to the management company quarterly. Car Club spaces will be provided at 3% initially with the ability to be increased, up to 6% depending on demand;
  - Commercial parking spaces will be marked as such and not available to residents (other than dual-use spaces);
  - Hydeway will be remodelled to include 16 short-stay spaces (max 15 minute waiting time) to allow for dropping off and picking up for the station, as well as short stay parking for any convenience store.
- 6.2. The undercroft and basement parking areas will have gates at their entrances. These will be set back from the access routes. The entire Wheat Quarter will be permeable and accessible to pedestrians and cyclists so there will be no perception of any gated communities, but the parking areas will be secure and only accessible by those authorized to do so.
- 6.3. Parking permits will be allocated to households on request. Priority will be given to family units. Residents who require an accessible space will be allocated one. Surplus accessible spaces will be available to non-disabled residents on a short-term lease only. A draft allocations protocol is included in the TA (Figure 11.1). The final protocol will be agreed with HCC and WHBC as part of the approved Car Parking Management Plan prior to first occupation.
- 6.4. All commercial parking spaces will be managed by the Management Company. It is anticipated that employment spaces will be permit-holder only spaces with an allocations protocol; however, as a proportion of the commercial spaces will be required for visitor parking a system of automatic number plate recognition (ANPR) is being considered, subject to viability. This system would be ideal to allow short-stay free parking (such as Hydeway) where a levy is then imposed for overstaying the maximum period. None of the roads within the site will be public highway and none of the parking areas will be managed by the local authority. The most appropriate means for operating such a system would therefore be to utilise a company such as ParkingEye who manage car parks using ANPR across a range of sectors throughout the UK.
- 6.5. The final Car Parking Management Plan will be secured by condition and agreed with WHBC and HCC prior to first occupation.



### 7. Off-site parking

- 7.1. The TA demonstrated that all roads within 200m of the site were either privately maintained or covered by comprehensive waiting restrictions. The public roads within 200m only serve commercial premises and therefore have waiting restrictions that reflect that. There are double yellow lines denoting no waiting at any time, or single vellow lines denoting limited waiting, generally preventing parking Mon-Fri 9am-5pm. WHBC have raised concerns about the potential for the development to displace parking onto those roads. All the evidence demonstrates that the proposed parking provision will be sufficient to meet the predicted parking demand; however, of residents or their visitors were to park on the public highway between 5pm and 9am it would be perfectly legal and unlikely to have any effect on the operation of those industrial/commercial access roads. The figure of 200m walking distance was derived from the London Borough of Lambeth Parking Survey Guidance Note. It may seem unusual to apply LB Lambeth guidance to Welwyn Garden City but that note has been adopted by every London Borough for the purpose of determining appropriate catchments for residential and non-residential parking surveys. It is based on detailed empirical research data and states that an appropriate study area for residential parking is 200m and for commercial development is 500m. Neither WHBC nor HCC has any alternative guidance on this subject.
- 7.2. Notwithstanding the above, WHBC considers that there remains a potential for car parking to be displaced onto the highway, that the study area should be greater than 200m and that any form of displaced on-street parking would be unacceptable even if it were legal and had no effect on capacity or safety.
- 7.3. For this reason, the walk-in catchment has been re-assessed based on a 500m catchment. Any S106 contribution towards parking stress surveys, traffic regulation orders or public consultation on parking, should therefore be based on the wider 500m catchment as shown below.





### 8. Summary and conclusion

8.1. It is clear that on-site parking provision has been determined using the best available information to meet predicted demand. The provision of additional visitor parking limits the potential for any off-site displaced parking. The proposed Car Club is likely to have a significant effect on vehicle ownership levels, allowing households to live at the Wheat Quarter without owning a vehicle but having access to one as and when they need it. Any concerns about parking being displaced onto the public highway can be addressed by a S106 contribution towards appropriate parking controls within the study area. On-site parking will be managed by the private management company, in accordance with details that have first been submitted to and agreed by the Council.



# Appendix A Allocated/unallocated parking provision

# **Unallocated Parking**

Average vehicle ownership 0.7 vehicles per dwelling Vehicle ownership 7 vehicles Parking demand 7 spaces for 10 dwellings



Parking for units 1-10



## Allocated Parking

Average vehicle ownership 0.7 vehicles per dwelling Parking provision 10 spaces for 10 dwellings Vehicle ownership 7 vehicles Parking demand, 11 spaces









# Appendix B UWE/CarPlus - Car Club research



# Car Clubs in New Developments

A review of experience and good practice in low car and car free developments (2003-2014)

**APRIL 2016** 



University of the West of England









# Contents

### Section

### Page

Exe	cutive Summary	3
1.	Introduction	7
2.	Purpose of this report	9
3.	Research methodology	11
4.	Context and benefits of car clubs	
5.	Car club policy in the UK	17
6.	Car clubs in new developments – identifying success factors	19
7.	Specific design issues	29
8.	Conclusions	
9.	Recommendations	
10.	Appendices	35

### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank all of the individuals and organisations who agreed to be interviewed and offered supplementary data and information to help us develop the case studies as part of this report. Thanks particularly to the Local Authority officers who gave up their time to be interviewed and to answer follow up questions.

Thanks also to the car club operators who offered their perspectives on the development of car clubs in Britain and detailed information about the cities and development case studies in which they were involved.

We would also like to thank the organisations that funded this research: Transport Scotland, CIHT Foundation, Rees Jeffries Road Fund and Redrow Homes.









# **Executive Summary**

This report provides a review of good practice and the experiences of key local authorities in implementing car free and low car developments over the ten-year period 2003-2014.

### Summary of policy benefits of car clubs

The policy benefits of car clubs fall within five main areas:

- Reducing traffic impacts
- Reducing parking pressure
- Promoting modal shift and supporting broader transport objectives
- Enabling more intensive (and profitable) developments
- Improving the urban environment.

### **Key findings**

### Success factors

Car clubs are more likely to be successfully established within a development (or in a neighbourhood adjacent to a development) if consideration is given early enough in the planning process to its viability as a location. In evaluating this, there are several key factors which help to identify where car clubs might be successfully established in new developments. These include: population density, PTAL rating and availability of public transport, parking constraints, car ownership levels and other cultural and socioeconomic/demographic characteristics.

### Roles of different actors in achieving success: developers, local authorities and operators

Generally, developers only consider including or funding car clubs where required to by a planning authority – however exceptions occur in cases where having a car club has been viewed as beneficial by a developer (even though it has not been mandated by the local authority). Firstly, it may be seen as beneficial because it increases the likelihood of gaining planning permission, with the given level of off-street parking. The second benefit arises from an assumption that the car club makes the development more saleable - because the target occupants are perceived to hold driving licenses but do not necessarily own cars.

Local authorities have been fundamental in the transition from 'third sector' pioneer car clubs to the involvement of both commercial organisations and social enterprises in expansion of the car club (or car sharing) sector. Local authorities have several key roles with respect to car clubs in developments:

- Creating the regulatory framework that requires a car club as part of S106 (S75 Scotland) agreement;
- Ensuring that the details of specific planning agreements are negotiated and delivered;
- Raising awareness and promotion of car clubs through sustainable travel awareness campaigns (in partnership with car club operators); and
- Enabling or facilitating any works to be undertaken on the public highway, notably the provision of on-street parking bays.

The attitudes and behaviour of operators show broadly similar approaches to judging commercial viability of locations and target groups, but not identical. As in all organisations, attitudes are likely





to reflect specific personnel as well as the developing experience of the organisation. However, in some cases operators have been willing to move into locations which another operator has vacated. Operators are a source of expertise and where local authorities have limited experience, working in partnership with operators can help to avoid basic errors (see case study of Cheswick Village, South Gloucestershire).

# Role of planning and highway management tools: CPZs, residents' permits and graduated car club provision

A key factor in ensuring that car clubs are an appropriate addition, as well as attracting to a development the kind of occupants that are likely to use the car club, will be the local policy on parking provision and how it is delivered. In some cases, particular planning conditions can minimise the likelihood of more intensive car ownership than planned. Whether a new development is associated with greater parking problems is often a subjective debate: national or neighbourhood level statistics may or may not have relevance for specific sites, and it may only need a small number of vehicles to 'tip' a street from having adequate to inadequate parking capacity for the demand. Therefore, planning agreements may seek to control the future car ownership and parking behaviour of residents.

Many developments involving car clubs are delivered within Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs) or Residents Parking Areas (RPAs). The CPZ will generally exist in order to balance parking supply and demand, or restrain demand for traffic management reasons, or some combination of the two. However, some car clubs operate outside CPZs. Therefore, providing that the demand for car use without ownership is present and there are not problems with agreements being undermined due to occupants owning more cars than was intended, then a CPZ is not essential.

Planning agreements involving car clubs need, by design and communication, to be as resilient to future scrutiny as possible. There are examples in which actors may seek to have planning conditions removed. For example, the eligibility of residents of a development in New Church Road, Brighton and Hove for residents' parking permits was questioned, alongside a desire to see on-development car club bays removed<sup>1</sup>. Similar concerns were raised in Ealing. A specific debate about the availability of parking permits for residents has been seen in Brighton and elsewhere. Restricting on-street permits to residents of new developments often arises as a result of a perceived parking shortfall in the area of the planned development. This issue is explored further in the case studies presented as part of this report.

As in the case of those factors that make car clubs relevant for new developments, there is no one set of regulations and conditions that are associated with successful car club operation. Some level of demand-over-supply parking pressure is likely to pre-exist in the locality or a car club is unlikely to be under consideration as part of the development. Sometimes unintended consequences (such as vehicles being acquired and parked in neighbouring streets) will emerge as the occupation of a development grows. Given the scale of future occupants and changing local conditions, it is not always possible for the car club to attract enough recruits to avoid this happening.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Initially residents of the development were not able to apply for parking permits, however, after lobbying by residents, this condition was relaxed in 2015.





### Role of incentive tools

In negotiating directly with developers or through conditions laid down in planning agreements, there is often the need for incentives to ensure early take-up of car club cars located on site – particularly in a development with very few residents. The measures used as incentives are designed to encourage residents to try out the car club and are usually in the form of free membership or drive time. The use of incentives may generate levels of demand which are not sustained beyond the timespan of the incentive. There is a risk that sudden withdrawal of incentives will leave a car club operator with an abrupt change in commercial viability. Ideally incentives should be designed to be withdrawn gradually, enabling a transitional management, for example, with efforts being put into signing up members beyond a development boundary in order to make the location sustainable.

### **Summary of conclusions**

1. Car clubs can help to expand opportunities for developers to bring forward land in cities which otherwise might not have been commercially viable by:

- a) Facilitating planning permission in high density developments that have insufficient land for parking or would need to build underground parking at high cost; and/or
- b) Helping to achieve planning permission for developments with limited off street space for car parking in high/medium density urban areas.

2. With the growth of the sharing economy and introduction of one-way car sharing (DriveNow and GoDrive in London), developers plan for future consumers who do not aspire to or cannot afford car ownership. Car clubs will have an important role to play in offering a package of mobility options to new residents that do not already own a car and help them to maintain/continue to lead a car ownership free lifestyle.

3. Car clubs can help to fulfil local authority policies on congestion/traffic reduction, air quality and carbon reduction by tackling car dependency and ownership.

4. Promoting car clubs in development sites can help operators to expand the network in areas where the car club already exists and development is within or close to their existing area of coverage. In some circumstances car clubs in development sites on the edge of areas considered viable by car club operators, may over time help to expand the area of viable car club operation.

5. Introducing car club bays into development sites can free up space within the site that can then be used as additional amenity or play space.









# 1. Introduction

### **Overview of developer research**

Low car or car free developments have secured planning approval in some locations through being allowed to offset the lack of parking with complimentary travel alternatives. As part of a strategy to improve access to public transport and encourage walking and cycling, residents and neighbours are provided access to shared cars (car clubs) recognizing that use of a car "from time to time" has become a part of urban living for many people. This report sets out an assessment of this approach.

As well as reviewing literature on this topic, we have researched and assessed experience from over a decade of delivering car clubs in 7 local planning authorities (LPAs) and in more detail in 11 new developments. These are developed as 18 case studies, which form the appendices to this report. The structure of this document is as follows:

- Chapter 2 outlines the purpose of this report.
- Our methodology is described in **Chapter 3**.
- We have examined the extent to which car clubs in new developments deliver sustainable transport policies and the lessons to be learned from that experience. The evidence of car club's contribution to sustainable transport is outlined in **Chapter 4.**
- Chapter 5 outlines the policy benefits of car clubs.
- As a result of the discussion in chapters 5 and 6 we suggest how these lessons can be applied in the future to secure successful "low-car" development in **Chapter 6.**
- Chapter 7 identifies specific design issues.
- The policy impacts of car clubs in new developments are discussed in **Chapter 8**.
- **Chapter 9** presents the conclusions of this report and makes recommendations for further research.

By providing access to a range of transport options as an alternative to on-site parking this policy attempts to influence the travel choices of residents and, in a few mixed developments, of employees. In some developments and in some cities we found examples where this appeared to be working well but it was not the aim of this study to quantify the impact on travel behaviour.

From the standpoint of developers, the placing of car club cars in (or on-street close to) property developments has reduced pressures for car parking spaces, permitted developments in high density areas with limited land for parking and in some cases increased the density of developments in the use of the available land. These issues are discussed in further detail in **Chapter 7**.

We do not know the level of cost savings resulting from the inclusion of car clubs in new developments (e.g. using land that would otherwise have been used for car parking) although in some cases the reduced parking requirement has been used to provide additional units of accommodation and/or amenity space, which is a valuable addition for either the developer or for residents.





We have reviewed the factors that affect the feasibility and success of such developments. These include the nature, scale, density and location of development (e.g. in relation to a range of transport options and availability of local services) where providing access to a car club car or cars will be viable once occupied.

We have also looked at the respective roles of the developer, the Local Authority (LA) and the car club operator in delivering successful car club and have discussed the policy implications in **Chapter 8**.

We have identified the planning tools, especially planning conditions, supplementary planning guidance (SPG) and planning agreements that have been used by LPAs. In the implementation of S106 (and S75 Scotland) agreements, we have looked at good practice in respect of financial arrangements and tariffs set by LPAs to fund the key elements of successful schemes. We have also identified the elements that contribute to the establishment of a successful implementation plan.

Finally, we are aware from research undertaken by Carplus of the potential benefits of carbon reduction and improved air quality from replacing private cars with car club cars. This is an important policy benefit that has only been calculated on a city basis. The policy benefits of car clubs are discussed in **Chapter 5**.

### Why is this research important?

We need to maximise the potential of new development to reduce car dependency in the future. There is some evidence<sup>2</sup> from past practice that car clubs can reduce the traffic generation of new developments and increase the use of sustainable modes of travel by their occupants, as well as improving the use of land for development.

There is also some evidence that failures in the local application of policy and detailed implementation have led to the car club (where a car club is part of the "low-car" solution) not realising its potential and/or not helping to popularise the concept in the immediate locality.

Carplus produced a good practice guide in 2001, which was updated in 2010 and 2015<sup>3</sup>. In 2016 it will be further updated with the recent, independently researched case studies included in this study to provide evidence of what has worked in practice.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Ball, C., Best, W., Ray, A., Seasman, A. (2001). *Achieving low car housing: the role of car clubs. A good practice guide for planners and developers.* Produced for the Regional Assembly for Yorkshire and Humberside

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Carplus Trust (2010) Car Clubs in Property Developments: A Practical Guide to Car Club Development, Carplus Trust, Leeds, November, 2010 and Carplus Trust (2015) Car Clubs in Property Developments, Carplus Good Practice Guidance.





# 2. Purpose of this report

This report has been prepared primarily for those involved in the development process, to provide good practice as well as lessons learned from past developments. It also identifies some of the pitfalls to avoid and how these can be avoided.

The report aims to establish:

- The actions and factors that are needed to secure the potential advantages of including a car club in the development;
- Where a car club will be viable; and
- How the inclusion of a car club has benefitted key stakeholders.

In addition, this research demonstrates:

- What factors affect the viability and success of car clubs in new developments, including the nature and scale of development, its location in relation to other available transport means, access to local services etc.;
- The respective roles of the developer, the LA and the car club operator in delivering successful car clubs; and
- The planning tools, especially planning conditions, supplementary planning guidance and planning agreements, financial measures and steps that lead to successful implementation and help developers to meet planning obligations.

This project also aims to identify the benefits to stakeholders resulting from the successful inclusion of a car club within a new development, through:

- Amenity benefits, such as increased open or communal space;
- Increasing density/intensity of use of the site and any resulting increase in yields/profits;
- Reduced costs of providing car parking space and any additional profit on units (especially where there is a reduction in underground of multi-storey parking);
- Reduction in the need for off-site infrastructure improvements by reducing traffic impact of the development;
- Avoidance of other traffic management measures;
- Increased value of units with the car club service included in the sales particulars; and
- Providing access to car club cars for other local residents.

Following the publication of this report, existing Carplus guidance on car clubs in property developments will be updated. This will be available at <u>http://www.carplus.org.uk/tools-and-resources/guidance-briefings/</u>.









# 3. Research methodology

The main research method was semi-structured interviews with:

- local authority officers (and some councillors)
- developers (and some site managers)
- car club operators

These were mostly conducted in person; a few were by telephone. The topic guides, which set out the objectives and general areas of questioning for the interviews are included as Appendix B. These were not exhaustive; specific questions were also asked in each case; some of these were prompted by documentary analysis or by comments made in earlier interviews. The interviews were recorded, transcribed and the draft case studies were sent to the interviewees to give them the opportunity to make changes. In some cases, follow-up questions were sent by email or discussed by telephone; this occurred on some occasions where one interviewee raised an issue which prompted a response from another.

In addition, the development case study sites were visited, to take photographs and make observations about the local context, particularly with respect to parking in the vicinity. Documentary evidence was collected and analysed for each of the case studies; this typically included: council policies, records of past developments, relevant elements of planning applications, particularly Section 106 agreements, transport plans and site plans. The car club operators also supplied information about the usage of vehicles in or near to the case study developments.

Final versions of these case studies are presented in **Appendix A**.

### Local Authority and developer case studies

Case study location (bold) and development details	Interviews conducted by	Names of all interviewees
<b>City of Edinburgh Council</b> Quartermile development Millar Crescent development	Chas Ball	Keith Stark, Andrew McBride, Gavin Brown
Bristol City Council Robinson Building Cheswick Village	Steve Melia	Phil Wright, Jerry Humphrys, Phil Woodhouse, Richard Clarke, Jane Woodhouse, David Burton, Alice Jennings, Richard Drew
Brighton and Hove New Church Road	Steve Melia	Peter Tolson, Deborah May, Cllr. Ian Davey
London Borough of Wandsworth Griffon Studios	Steve Melia	Andy Flood, Corey Russell, Julie Piesse
London Borough of Islington	Andy Wild	Eric Manners, Jonathan Hampson, Sabine Mosner
London Borough of Sutton BedZED	Andy Wild	Alex Forrest, Jo Taylor
London Borough of Ealing Grand Union Village development	Andy Wild	John Bowman, Keith Kelly, Richard Armitage, Tim Blackwell
London Borough of Haringey	Andy Wild	Edwin Leigh, Robert Henderson,





Case study location (bold) and	Interviews conducted by	Names of all interviewees
development details		
New River Village		Sabine Mosner
London Borough of Bromley	Andy Wild	Stephen Heeley, Alexander Baldwin-
Trinity Village		Smith, Kyle Fennell, Tim Blackwell
City of York Council	Andy Wild	Owen Daggett, Sara Costello, Andrew
Derwenthorpe		Bradley, James Williams

In addition, the following representatives of car club operators were interviewed about the general context for car clubs in Britain and about the cities and development case studies in which they were involved:

Car Club	Representative
City Car Club	Keith Kelly
Zipcar	Jonathan Hampson, James Haywood and Adam Williams
Hertz 24/7	Tim Blackwell

Other car clubs were initially approached, but only those that had provided vehicles through S106 agreements in the case study areas were interviewed.





# 4. Context and benefits of car clubs

### Car clubs: history and data

Car sharing clubs in the UK started in 1998 in Leeds and Edinburgh with schemes inspired by examples from Switzerland and Germany. They have been described as having experienced 'exponential growth' (Cairns, 2011, p11) so that today the models have diversified and the numbers involved have increased.

Carplus data show that there were around 32,000 members of car sharing schemes (car clubs) in 2007 in the UK and by 2010 the figure had risen to 146,000 members. By the end of 2015 there are 206,650 members and 3,600 vehicles operated in UK. Whilst the majority of car clubs today are run by commercial operators offering a back to base round trip service there are a growing minority of schemes that are different. Some are offering one-way (Drive Now), some are run by co-ops (Co cars) or community enterprises (Co-Wheels). There are also electric cars clubs and rural car clubs – and all these different models are likely to grow in the second decade of car clubs.

However, whilst the UK has a well-established sector, car sharing has been a phenomenon across the industrialised democracies, and the UK is best described as an early adopter rather than a pioneer.

The policy benefits of promoting car clubs in new development sites fall under five main areas:

- Reducing traffic impacts
- Reducing parking pressure
- Promoting modal shift and supporting broader transport objectives
- Enabling more intensive (and profitable) development
- Improving the urban environment

All of the benefits below depend upon a reduction in either car ownership or car use or both. In some cases, other factors such as parking restrictions may be the main factor reducing car ownership. In those cases, a car club vehicle may be viewed as a necessary service to support a low-car lifestyle in that area. It may be vital in order to gain acceptance of new development in those circumstances.

Evidence from the Carplus Annual Survey<sup>4</sup> suggests that around a third of car club members have deferred a planned vehicle purchase since joining the car club and for every car club vehicle, members have sold approximately four vehicles. This equates to a reduction of approximately 23,700 vehicles removed from the streets across the UK. Whether this means car clubs *cause* lower car ownership, or whether they simply provide a facility for people who would have reduced their car ownership anyway, is difficult to prove but some of the international literature suggests that there is indeed a causal link.<sup>5</sup> Obviously this will be stronger where there are other factors (e.g. parking restrictions, frequent public transport) limiting car ownership in the area.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Carplus Annual Survey of car clubs 2014/15, 2015 (England and Wales), Steer Davies Gleave (available on Carplus website <a href="http://www.carplus.org.uk/tools-and-resources/annual-survey-of-car-clubs/">http://www.carplus.org.uk/tools-and-resources/annual-survey-of-car-clubs/</a>)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Cervero, R., Golub, A. and Nee, B. (2007) City CarShare: longer-term travel demand and car ownership impacts. Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board. (1992), pp. 70-80.





### **Reducing traffic impacts**

Car clubs can help manage traffic levels in new developments through encouraging new occupants to the site to use car clubs and public transport as alternatives to purchasing a car. In some cases, vehicles provided through a S106 agreement have also helped to reduce car ownership in the surrounding area, which may be just as important for developers and local authorities trying to minimise the traffic impact of a new development.

### **Reducing parking pressures**

Relieving parking pressure, or enabling development to occur in areas of parking pressure, are two key advantages of car club provision, often mentioned in the case studies. They can also help to address the concerns of local residents about the parking impacts of proposed new developments. Both Transport for London and Transport Scotland recognise the role that car clubs can play in reducing parking pressure and also in reducing private car ownership. TfL also recognise that 'Car clubs are one solution in providing for Londoners' urban mobility needs, compatible with public transport, walking and cycling.<sup>6</sup>

### Promoting modal shift and supporting broader transport objectives

In addition to car club members being less likely to own a car, they are also more likely to use public transport, and walk and cycle. Train travel amongst car club members is more than double the averages across the UK, with bus use around a third higher than average. Car club members are also around three times more likely than the average person across the UK to be a regular cyclist.

In Edinburgh, Bristol and other cities, car clubs are promoted as part of a portfolio of mobility options that includes public transport, walking, cycling and increasingly cycle sharing schemes<sup>7</sup>.

### Enabling more intensive (and profitable) development<sup>8</sup>

Car club provision as part of a planning condition can help to support lower parking ratios, which would otherwise act as a constraint on the number of dwellings on a site. On some sites, this may be essential to permit development, which would otherwise be impossible. They can therefore play an important part in achieving the aims of national and local government to provide more housing and they can also help to make brownfield urban sites more profitable for residential development.

### Improving the urban environment

The pressure on local authorities to increase the building of housing in their areas will increase the density of dwellings and people within urban areas. If this is done on a 'business as usual' basis it will also increase the density of parked cars, traffic, pollution and congestion. If these changes make towns and cities less attractive places to live, this will undermine their efforts to increase housing. Strategies to reduce concentrations of cars and traffic, and to improve the environment of urban

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> A Car Club Strategy for London, TfL and partners, 2015 (available at <u>https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/car-</u>

clubs/how-car-clubs-work#on-this-page-1) <sup>7</sup> Bristol City Council (2010) <u>Cabinet minutes</u>. New Approach to Car Clubs in Bristol. Report of Strategic Director - City Development to the City Cabinet. Agenda Item 6, September 30<sup>th</sup>.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Proposal talks about "cost savings and amenity benefits of including car clubs in new developments". It is not clear what was meant by cost-savings. We do cover amenity benefits to some extent. Yes it's about viability of development with car club helping to secure planning consent and make best use of land.





areas undergoing housing growth, will be vital to supporting housing growth and car clubs will be a vital part of those strategies.

"Carfree" developments in continental Europe provide traffic-free semi-private space, play areas and green areas on land which would otherwise be used for parking. All of those developments offer car club vehicles as part of their mobility plans.<sup>9</sup> Slateford Green in Edinburgh is a rare example of this approach in Britain. As pressures for more housing in urban areas intensify, this type of approach may become more relevant to British conditions.

### Summary of evidence from Europe

The evidence reveals positive trends regarding the effect of car sharing (car clubs) on total distances travelled in cars, car ownership, numbers of cars being effectively removed from the streets, mode use of car sharers and reductions of drivers driving alone.

Very few dis-benefits of car sharing schemes are revealed in the studies reviewed. One logical disbenefit is that whilst car sharing is more environmentally beneficial than private vehicle ownership, it is less beneficial, from environmental, street ambience, road safety and public health perspectives than walking and cycling, which it may in some instances replace.

Other issues are mentioned in relation to small scale rural car sharing schemes. These include the difficulties of finding staff to administer the scheme who have the prerequisite skill sets and also making the scheme financially viable (Integrated Transport Planning Ltd, 2004). However, evidence suggests that financial viability in urban areas is less problematic. A key factor for the economic sustainability of a station-based scheme is that each car should be patronised by a sufficient number of householders in its vicinity.

Finally, the evidence suggests a number of clear benefits to the global environment ( $CO_2$  and other emissions), neighbourhoods (reductions in numbers of vehicles driving and parked in the city) and the individual member (avoiding the complexity, administration and expense of owning a motor vehicle.)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>9</sup> Melia, S., Parkhurst, G. and Barton, H. (2010) <u>Carfree, Low Car - What's the Difference?</u> World Transport Policy & Practice. 16 (2), pp. 24-32.









# 5. Car club policy in the UK

Car club policy in the UK has generally been devolved to a local level. In most cases policy is set out in local planning documents (local development frameworks and supplementary planning documents) and local transport plans. The policy framework does however vary across authorities – some English unitary authorities have collaborated on planning and transport policies. In the future, areas covering several planning authorities but which have a combined transport authority with overarching transport policies covering several metropolitan authorities.

In Scotland, City of Edinburgh Council (CEC) has pioneered use of planning agreements to facilitate development in high-density areas and use developer funding to expand the car club network. CEC adopted formal planning guidance on car clubs in 2004 and it is now an integral part of its development planning policy. More recently other cities like Aberdeen have followed this approach.

In London, overarching planning and transport policy is set out in the London Plan (and Mayor's Transport Strategy) and then at a borough level in Local Implementation Plans (LIPs). In London, the development of the Car Club Strategy for London (2014)<sup>10</sup> will guide the expansion of car clubs in the capital over the next ten years. The Strategy has been developed by the London Car Club Coalition, which includes Transport for London (TfL), the car club operators, Carplus, London Councils and the BVRLA.

From the research undertaken in this study, it has become clear that some local authorities do not have a formal written policy on car clubs in new developments. In Bristol, for example, there is no written policy on car clubs, only a mention in the Core Strategy. In York, there is a similar situation with no formal policies on car clubs in statutory documents but the planning team actively use S106 agreements and planning conditions to ensure that car club provision is negotiated as part of new development sites.

Some London boroughs have more formal policies that promote car clubs in new developments than others. Ealing have a formal policy included within their UDP that states that low car housing is suitable if, amongst other things, a developer agrees to contribute to a car club.

Where this research has uncovered examples of best practice in car club policy, we have identified these within this report.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>10</sup> <u>https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/car-clubs/how-car-clubs-work</u>









# 6. Car clubs in new developments – identifying success factors

Car clubs are more likely to be successfully established within a development (or in the neighbourhood adjacent to a development) if consideration is given early enough in the planning process to its viability as a location. Early consideration enables a thorough assessment of the development's potential characteristics, such as density and parking ratios and allows the car club to be promoted to prospective occupants, prior to completion.

Other key factors relate to the context within which the development is proposed. These are outlined below. Some of them are what car club operators would call "essential" rather than "desirable". Above all, high density areas with parking constraints are the most likely to support successful car club operations – assuming the area is well connected to services and employment areas.

There are several key factors which help to identify where car clubs might be successful in new developments. These are as follows:

- Population density
- PTAL rating/availability of public transport
- Parking constraints
- Car ownership levels
- Socioeconomic/demographic characteristics
- Cultural factors

Most of these individual factors are correlated with other factors in the list. It is hard to rank them in order of priority, as much will depend on local situations.

The proximity of good public transport supply, generally quantified in London using PTAL ratings, is often seen as the most important factor. For example, Brighton and Hove's Local Plan refers to car clubs being most suitable "in locations with good access to public transport and local services where there are complementary on-street parking controls". In the case of Ealing, the development of Crossrail through the Borough was seen as a factor potentially changing the socio-demography, as well as the long-distance connectivity, and hence potentially increasing car club potential.

However, some successful examples (Sutton) do not have high PTAL ratings. One reason for this is a technical one: that the spatial analysis (e.g. at electoral ward level) may not be at a sufficiently fine scale, and a site is actually more accessible than implied by the PTAL rating of its wider area. Another reason is that public transport may not be the main mode used by car club members: the case for public transport supply being very important is dependent on assumptions about the target group combining public transport use with car club membership, rather than walking and/or cycling with car club membership. In the case of the Derwenthorpe development in York, along with the car club, the initial phases of the development have good walking and cycling accessibility (ten minutes by bike to the city centre on a traffic-free path). York has one of the most developed cycling cultures in the UK. So in this context, providing residents with good cycle provision (and promotion) may be as important, if not more so, than the public transport improvements included in the S106 agreement.





Population density may be even more important, in providing sufficient absolute demand, given that membership rates in a given spatial population are likely to be low, even at neighbourhood level. However, this may be taken for granted in contexts such as London, where population density is rarely anything other than high, except for areas within the outer boroughs. Outside of London, it appears to be a factor, which has supported strong development in Brighton and Edinburgh. Indeed, some commentators foresaw that despite attempts to deregulate land use in order to speed up housing capacity delivery, urban intensification was inevitable, and that this would favour car clubs.

In Ealing, the extension of the car club service into the Northolt area of the Borough (see Grand Union Village case study), which does not have, by London standards, high population density, high PTAL or access to local services, is an indication of the new frontiers for car club expansion. Similarly, in the London Boroughs of Sutton (see Sutton case study) and Bromley (see Trinity Village case study), car clubs are tentatively expanding or consolidating in areas with more suburban characteristics.

Similarly, parking constraints are identified as an important means of restraining car ownership levels, and hence use of a car club, but are not the only factor restraining car ownership. Lifestyle or culture can be a factor. The Wandsworth student hall example in fact identified that the target group was largely made up of international students that were not much interested in car use at all, whether via a self-owned car or membership of a car club. Ten car club cars were apparently viable in that locality, in a context of only moderate or low parking restraints for long-established residents.

On the other hand, the BedZED development in Sutton showed the importance of culture in people joining a car club. The development was specifically marketed on its clean environmental characteristics. New residents relocating from central London where parking constraints were high, into a location with fewer parking constraints, might arrive without a car and choose not to own one, even though the new neighbourhood is more car friendly, if provided with a car club alternative. Similarly, Brighton was seen by car club professionals as 'acting like a suburb of London' due to the popularity of commuting, with weekday train travel being combined with a mobility mix including car club and public transport outside of the working day.

In Bristol, income was seen as a relevant variable in explaining use, with most of the vehicles stationed in affluent areas with some concerns about the viability of the Easton cluster – a lower income area.

Similar to the PTAL approach to quantifying the 'supply-side' of the local transport market, it is possible to quantify socio-cultural factors through Mosaic analysis of the spatial distribution of socio-consumer groups associated with car club propensity, such as in Brighton 'Group E: *educated young single people living in areas of transient populations'*.

Socio-demographic factors are relevant but should perhaps not be overstated: suburban, lowdensity, multi-bedroom housing on the Bristol fringe is more likely to be unsuitable for car clubs as a result of the high car ownership of those developments (linked to low parking constraints) than because they tend to be occupied by families with children: the same families located in inner-city, high density, parking-constrained London boroughs might well be car club users.

These success factors have been present to varying degrees in each of the case studies undertaken during this research. The table below shows the presence of the success factors in relation to 4 developments in London (mostly in outer London) and one in York and presents an assessment of the success of the car club in each case:





Development	Local Authority	Parking pressure around the development (e.g. CPZ)	Parking ratio (spaces per unit)	PTAL score / access to public transport	Scale / Density of the development	Proportion of social / affordable units	Successful and sustainable car club and travel patterns?
Grand Union Village	London Borough of Ealing / Hillingdon	Some CPZ, some on- street parking is available on and residential roads near to the development	0.87 spaces per dwelling	PTAL 3 has local bus services but nearest station with access to central London is Greenford 4.5Km away.	960 dwellings 44.2 dwellings / Ha	35% affordable / key worker	Eventually, but significant problems when on-site car parking was not effectively controlled. Now supports three vehicles.
New River Village	London Borough of Haringey	Yes, the development is surrounded by CPZs	0.68 per dwelling	PTAL 4 – good PT links to central London with Hornsey station and Turnpike Lane less than 1km away	622 dwellings 15 acre, 6.7ha 93 dwellings per hectare	25% RSL and shared ownership	Very successful. City Car Club has 3 cars here and would like more.
Trinity Village	London Borough of Bromley	No CPZ, parking is available in neighbouring residential streets	1 - 1.5 per dwelling (1.5 for 3 + bed room units)	PTAL 3 - Good bus access to Bromley and Orpington town centres / train stations, but no direct rail to central London.	632 dwellings	96 dwellings (26%) are 'social' housing units	Currently two cars, one of which may remain commercially viable after S106 support ends.
BedZED	London Borough of Sutton	No CPZ, parking is available in neighbouring residential streets	0.5 / unit	PTAL 4 – good train / tram access to Victoria and other parts of London. Hackbridge station is 0.5Km away	82 houses and 17 live/work apartments 58 dwellings per Ha	50%: 25% for shared ownership and 25% social housing for rent.	Initially 3 cars on-site, now 1 on-site and two relocated to development s nearby.
Derwenthorp e	City of York Council	No CPZ, parking is available on- street on the site and in neighbouring residential streets	1 car parking space per unit	Bus service to city centre (2Km away) + direct off-road cycle route to city centre.			Car club is currently ok, remains to be seen whether it succeeds post-S106 funding.





Comparing these case studies, the most successful developments (in terms of achieving low-car objectives and viable car clubs) have been those with high population density, in areas well served by public transport and where car parking has been restricted both within the development and its environs (exemplified by the New River Village case study). However, the striking feature is that not all success factors have to be present to secure sustainable transport patterns and successful car clubs, success has been achieved in areas of relatively low housing density, for example BedZED in Sutton, where the car club has remained viable 13 years after start-up and the development remains popular. One important lesson is that where some of the 'predictor' factors are weak or absent, then other factors (see below) assume greater significance.

Two other secondary factors are also identified:

- Co-location and clustering of cars
- Presence of spatially-overlapping user groups

The provision of 'alternative' car club vehicles in a neighbourhood cluster has multiple benefits: a further vehicle within walking range in case the nearest one is booked; a variety of vehicle types within a radius or at the same location. In some cases, the clustering of vehicles in the same neighbourhood is seen by the professionals (i.e. experienced members of the car club sector) as a key factor in providing reassurance to members that cars will be available when required.

Operators are unlikely to be attracted to provide a car club in a stand-alone development, isolated from existing car clubs, unless it is large enough to support at least one vehicle and/or has other 'key factors' to ensure success (e.g. BedZED in Sutton). In Bedminster, Bristol, for example, an additional car secured in a development had complemented an existing cluster. Similarly, in Edinburgh the case study for Millar Crescent show how well the addition of a third car to a cluster in the Morningside district resulted in high utilisation of all three and significant take up from a new development.

However, the importance of clustering would benefit from further investigation as some of the clusters identified in the research are not particularly proximate and it is questionable how attractive the second-choice car would be for someone accessing it on foot.

'No development is an island': there are few developments that are large enough to support a dedicated, exclusive car over the long-run solely from amongst the occupants of a particular site. However, there are several cases in which the combination of off-site and on-site resident or business users makes the difference between a car club being viable, or not. Here, LAs can make a direct difference by using car clubs themselves to provide the pool car facility for travel in the course of work. For example, in the case of York City Council, a number of City Car Club cars are block-booked 08.00-18.00 but available to the public out of office hours, greatly enhancing the viability of the city's car club.

In Ealing, the use of car club cars by council staff, both for work and through a facility that extended work membership for paid private use, is an important factor in achieving a relatively high ratio of members to cars - an average of 70 members per car.

### Summary

Whilst there is a fairly clear list of primary and secondary factors associated with success, and some factors will be more often shown as important compared to others, 'top-down' location searching




has its limits: the relevance of the factors to the specific potential site under examination will always need critical assessment, or else sites with potential might be ruled out.

Similarly, in Edinburgh, the planning officers assessing proposed development have developed a good feel for where a car club will work. With the benefit of over 10 years of local developments with car clubs in the planning conditions, this has started to be integral to the planning culture of the city. However, there is a moment in the process before the conditions are finalised where the local manager of operator, City Car Club is consulted. His comments on the viability of a planned development and possible links to the existing car club network help to inform the process.

#### Roles of different actors in achieving success

#### Developers

Generally, developers only consider including or funding car clubs where required to by a planning authority (e.g. Redrow, Cheswick Village, Bristol area case studies; MNM Developments, Millar Crescent, Edinburgh case-studies).

However, exceptions occur in the cases in which having a car club is not mandated by local planning policy but is:

- seen to increase the likelihood of a development being granted planning permission with a given level of off-street parking and/or
- likely to make the development more saleable (because the target occupants are perceived to hold driving licences but not necessarily own cars)

Car clubs can be seen by developers as a relatively low-cost, deliverable part of a planning agreement around transport and access. For example, a bus service to a large development at an early stage of build-out can be expensive from the point of view of a developer and unattractive from that of the public transport company. It will be obvious if running largely empty, and appear a 'white elephant', creating the impression that buses are not and will not be used. A car club is less conspicuous in that respect, and also has a lower absolute cost commitment, so is in some ways better suited to provide an alternative to car ownership in the early phases, although not all residents will have driving licences, so the commitment to provide public transport services is, in due course, likely to remain important.

A few developments, taken forward by specialist developers with a stronger commitment to sustainable development, include a car club service as part of design ethos e.g. BedZED, Derwenthorpe. However, those developers and occupants are though to represent a specific market niche - which may have potential for expansion.<sup>11</sup>

More generally, developers who understand the car club concept tend to have fairly clear and shared perceptions about when they are relevant. For example, the developer of the Robinson's Building in Bristol judged that occupants of one-bedroom flats would not necessarily expect parking, whereas those in the market for two-bed accommodation would be more likely to want it. An attractive building in the right location could overcome limited parking, by being able to attract sufficient demand from those for which parking was an option rather than an essential.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>11</sup> See: Melia, S., Barton, H. and Parkhurst, G. (2013) Potential for carfree development in the UK. Urban Design and Planning, 166 (2). pp. 136-145. ISSN 1755-0793 Available from: http://eprints.uwe.ac.uk/13180





#### Local Authorities

LAs have been fundamental in the transition from 'third sector' pioneer car 'clubs' to the involvement of commercial organisations and social enterprises in expansion of the car club sector.

Local authorities have several key roles with respect to car clubs in developments:

- Creating the regulatory framework that promotes them, such as requiring car clubs as part of S106 (S75 Scotland) agreements;
- Ensuring that the details of specific planning agreements are negotiated and delivered;
- Raising awareness and promotion of car clubs through sustainable travel awareness campaigns (in partnership with car club operators); and
- Enabling or facilitating any works to be undertaken on the public highway, notably the provision of parking bays.

Notably, these functions are likely to involve different parts of an LA's 'executive'. The time taken for highway departments to secure changes on-street can sometimes be a frustration for operators. However, this description of the process followed in Bristol suggests that on-street bays are not straightforward to deliver: the Council follows a formal consultation process before installing new bays, which involves local members and the Council's legal department and can take up to 9 months, partly due to workload issues (particularly in the legal department) with multiple projects progressing at the same time.

The officers felt that the process seemed rather bureaucratic and "could probably" be streamlined, although they were not entirely sure of the reasons for all the different stages. Similarly, on occasion it was felt by operators that planning agreements could have been drafted in a 'tighter' way by local authorities and that some developers were able to exploit loopholes.

In contrast, having a local plan or local implementation plan with specific targets for car club growth is helpful in providing a framework for dealing with specific applications. Alternatively, as in Edinburgh, having a clearly published tariff of contributions for developers has contributed to widespread acceptance of the inclusion of car clubs in most developments in higher density urban areas of the city. So, where a car club is part of the planning approval the maximum cost, depending on the scale of the project, is predictable.

#### Operators

The attitudes and behaviour of operators show broadly similar approaches to judging commercial viability of locations and target groups, but not identical. As in all organisations, attitudes are likely to reflect specific personnel as well as the developing experience of the organisation. However, in some cases operators have been willing to move into locations which another operator has vacated.

Operators are a source of expertise and where local authorities have limited experience this can help to avoid basic errors (see case-study, Cheswick Village, South Gloucestershire).

#### Inter-relationships

Early involvement of operators is critical if the car club implementation is to be more than a temporary phenomenon to secure planning consent. This should take the form of pre-application discussions between potential operators, the developer and the local planning authority to assess





the potential viability and feasibility of providing bays and/or vehicles, or whether, indeed, support for a nearby existing service might be more appropriate.

Some case-studies (Brighton, Bristol) showed a more 'applied' LA involvement in the early years of car club development. For example, both had originally collected funds from developers due under S106 agreements for car clubs, but in recent years had replaced this approach with one involving developers and operators dealing directly. Bristol had actively moved away from administering the funding as the Authority had formed the view that the cumulative funding being held for car club development was not justified by the rate of spend<sup>12</sup>.

There are though benefits to LA involvement in funding. The extension of the car club into the Northolt and Greenford areas of Ealing was facilitated by the pooling of S106 contributions from a number of small developments. This would not have been possible without coordination. The involvement of City of Edinburgh in managing the S75 funding contributions has ensured a degree of confidence in the process from all stakeholders, which on issues as sensitive as parking has been important. So where development planners are experienced at including a car club in the provision, they use consultation with the operator, as in Edinburgh, to confirm that a new location will fit into the existing network and where to recommend suitable on-street parking to the parking team.

#### Role of planning and highway management tools in success

A key factor that ensures that car clubs are an appropriate addition, as well as attracting to a development the kind of occupants likely to use a car club, will be the local policy on parking provision, and how it is delivered. LAs can specify parking standards, i.e. the minimum or maximum number of car parking spaces they expect to see included in planning applications for a given amount of development, typically related to the number of bedrooms per unit in the case of a residential scheme.

Low-car and car-free housing schemes give a car option in the occupants' mobility mix. This means they can sometimes receive planning permission in situations in which an application not designed around lower-than-typical car ownership would not. Whilst some developers are concerned to consider how a development will 'work' into the future, others focus more on the period up until the development is fully sold.

In some cases, particular planning conditions can minimise the likelihood of more intensive car ownership than planned. For example, the Derwenthorpe development near York has a low parking standard for a suburban development of 1.1. However, a covenant prevents owners letting the residences, preventing occupation by short-term residents who may have lower community engagement than longer-term residents and who may seek to 'externalise' the costs of excess-overplanned car ownership onto neighbours. However, independent evaluation had in fact shown that the owner-occupants were not all 'living within their parking capacity means', with some households having two or three cars, rather than one.

The specific circumstances of each development may differ from the general situation in the neighbourhood, so neighbourhood level statistics may or may not have relevance for specific sites; it may only need a small number of vehicles to 'tip' a street from having adequate to inadequate parking capacity for the demand. Therefore, planning agreements may seek to control the future car

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>12</sup> Such a problem may have been specific to that time and place and may be less likely to occur in future following the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy and the narrowing of S106 criteria.





ownership and parking behaviour of residents even in areas where parking is not perceived to be a general problem.

#### **Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs)**

Many developments involving car clubs are delivered in CPZs or Residents Parking Areas (RPAs). The CPZ will generally exist in order to balance parking supply and demand, or restrain demand for traffic management reasons, or some combination of the two. However, some car clubs operate outside CPZs. Therefore, provided that the demand for car use without ownership is effectively created, and there are not problems with agreements being undermined due to occupants owning more cars than was intended, then a CPZ is not essential.

The history of parking controls in Bristol provides some useful lessons. Car clubs initially spread in areas where there was parking pressure but no controls. The central Controlled Parking Zone has been a later arrival because of the revenue loss and administrative complications involved in reallocating bays in controlled areas. The officers' comments about the spread of Residents' Parking Zones may be relevant to other areas. Their message is that authorities should think about car clubs when they are planning new CPZs because the demand for car clubs may grow within them and it will be more difficult to install additional bays later.

The history of the car club at Grand Union village shows the difficulty in a big development of operating without a residents' permit system in a design framework that aspired to be low car. Not only did the success of the car club dwindle in the face of relatively unrestricted car ownership, but the alternative travel options have not proved as attractive as anticipated, despite continued efforts by the travel plan consultant (see case study). At a late stage a CPZ was introduced to regulate the relatively chaotic parking that has developed as the estate is nearly complete.

#### Restriction of residents' permit eligibility

Planning agreements involving car clubs need, by design and communication, to be as resilient to future scrutiny as possible. There are examples in which actors may seek to have planning conditions removed: the eligibility of residents of a development in New Church Road, Brighton & Hove, for residents' parking permits, combined with a desire to see on-development car club reserved bays removed. Initially residents of the development were not able to apply for parking permits but after lobbying by residents, this condition was relaxed in 2015. Similar concerns were raised in Ealing.

A specific debate about the provision of permits (or not), has been seen in Brighton and elsewhere. It focuses around the level of on-street parking capacity and utilisation in the locality, with some politicians (and officers) linking the restriction on residents of new developments being entitled to on-street permits to the identification of an actual parking shortfall. If it becomes a clear principle that existing parking capacity problems are necessary before residents of new developments are restricted from applying for on-street permits, this will tend to limit the opportunities for lower-car development (although Wandsworth suggests this is not absolute). Recent legal advice suggests that planning obligations used to secure car-free development need to comply with the requirements of S106 of the Town and Country Planning Act, 1990. For a car free obligation to constitute a planning obligation it must restrict the development or use of land in a specified way.

In Edinburgh, the use of a covenant to prevent residents of a car free development being able to successfully apply for parking permits was applied to new occupants Millar Crescent (see case study)





as part of closing of a loophole that became evident in earlier developments (see Quartermile casestudy).

#### Graduated car club provision

Planning agreements have used operator utilisation rates to trigger the provision of additional car club vehicles for example at Trinity Village (see case-study). In this case, subject to the demand achieving specific levels (e.g. 25% of vehicle-hours utilised), additional cars will be funded and the service expanded.

#### Summary

As in the case of those factors that make car clubs relevant for new developments, there is no one set of regulations and conditions associated with successful operation. Some level of demand-over-supply parking pressure is likely to pre-exist in the locality or a development with a car club is unlikely to be under consideration. Thought will need to be given as to whether unintended consequences (such as vehicles being acquired and parked in neighbouring streets) are likely to emerge, given the combination of expected future occupants and local conditions.

#### **Role of incentive tools**

In negotiating directly with developers or through conditions laid down in planning agreements, there is often a need for incentives to ensure early take up of cars located on site – often in a development with very few residents. The measures used as incentives are designed to encourage residents to try out the car club. Apart from the costs and the commitment, this involves going through the online or phone based signing up process, which involves a licence and status check.

Information on these incentives needs to be available before people move in – preferably to people thinking of buying/renting through the sales office staff.

Free membership is offered for a specific period (often less than a year to allow a trial of the service). In some cases, the offer for an initial year is for discounted membership. This is usually combined with a certain amount of free 'drive time' usage to enhance the concept of a trial. In London where more than half of properties are rentals and turnover of residents is frequent, it is sometimes difficult to ensure that car club membership is retained by the incoming residents<sup>13</sup>.

Whilst funding is usually by the developer it may be capped at a pre-set level of take up. Sometimes this is matched with a financial contribution from the car club operator. Securing car club members who are also active users at the early stage in occupation can be critical to building up utilisation and avoiding car club vehicles suffering from flat batteries due to underuse. More important is the visibility and word of mouth promotion - although if a car is very busy, the parking bay is of course often vacant.

The use of incentives may generate levels of demand which are not sustained beyond the timespan of the incentive, and as with Grand Union Village (see case-study), early clusters of cars are reduced once the usage settles down.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>13</sup> This also raises questions about how car club membership is transferred to new residents, if indeed this does happen at all in practice.





#### Summary

There is a risk that sudden withdrawal of incentives will leave a car club operator with an abrupt change in commercial viability. Ideally incentives should be designed to be withdrawn gradually, enabling a transitional management, for example, with efforts put in to signing up members beyond a development boundary in order to make the location sustainable. It is also preferable that the operator has been able to make the location self-sustaining by the point that the incentives are withdrawn. In practice though, sustainability is sometimes not achieved in this timescale.





### 7. Specific design issues

#### Location of car on site or on-street nearby site

Some local authorities, such as London Borough of Sutton, have encouraged location of car club bays on development sites to preserve on-street parking capacity and to avoid the conflict that can arise with local residents in some neighbourhoods about dedicated on-street parking. Developers may also welcome the psychological 'ownership' factor of the vehicle being on-site: in one case-study (Trinity Village) a car was liveried as exclusively available to residents of a Bromley development.

However, on-street location, in contrast, emphasises the wider availability and relevance of the car within the local community, and is the preferred option of LAs like Brighton and Edinburgh. LAs also have much more control over on-street bays. Off street bays can be withdrawn at any time or the developer may change their mind and change the usage of on-site bays from car club to provide residents parking. In this case the LA may not be aware of this change.

Developers are likely to favour provision of on-street bays if they feel access to the car by outsiders will compromise site security and seclusion. There are cases in which a compromise has been sought, by placing the car at the periphery of a site: technically on the land of the development but apparently on public space. This may raise issues of parking bay maintenance if the ownership responsibility is not clear.

A further type of compromise, noted in the Brighton case-study, is that car club cars located on private land may not need to be accessible to public members '24/7', although this may jeopardise the operators view of what is a viable location.

#### Design features to promote use of car clubs and compliance with parking restrictions

There is a balance to be struck between developments having clear demarcation and allocation of parking rights and restrictions, with intensive instructional signage creating an 'officious' air, and trying to create a welcoming environment that treats users of the space as responsible and considerate, and not needing intensive instruction and enforcement. Problems can be created by introducing car club bays in underground car parks – access issues involving keys and fobs can cause problems for users trying to access the vehicle. In some underground car parks mobile reception is not very good – this means that the car club operators systems sometimes struggle to make contact with the vehicles which can lead to other operational issues.

Physical location and a sense of community ownership were two other important factors:

"We've had issues in the past where bays have maybe been located in places that are perceived as being not safe. [If the bay is] adjacent to a park, it obviously means it may be dark and slightly intimidating. So I would always say that I think where it works the best is when it's in the middle as close as you can be to a dense housing area...I think visibility is also important for marketing the vehicle."

One incident, where a community initially objected to the perceived loss of parking space brought a 'community leader' into discussions with the Council (Bristol).





"The interesting thing for me was the Community Leader really took it on himself to always keep an eye on this vehicle... if another vehicle parked in the bay, he would go out and tell 'em "No, don't park in the bay. This is the car club..." So it became a part of the community."

The use of cycle parking at car club bays is a design feature that ensures access to a wider neighbourhood. This has been sporadically trialled in a number of the LPAs outside London and has been installed as commonplace in various London Boroughs (e.g. Lewisham, Lambeth, Hackney, Islington, Camden, Greenwich) installing cyclehoop parking at most car club bays over the past five years.





### 8. Conclusions

#### Introduction

Car clubs are now well-established in some areas, making it possible to draw on that experience from the early-adopter cities and boroughs. A clear policy framework is desirable but equally important is practice in securing contributions where appropriate.

Timing is important – it requires early stage intervention to get agreement – the timing of S106/S75funded interventions is important to provide people with services and alternatives to car ownership at the point of occupation. Car clubs work as part of a wider travel plan, whether it is nominal or active.

Clarity at the planning stage is important to provide developers with certainty about their contribution and what is expected, but S106/S75 should not be so narrowly defined that they cannot adapt to changes in circumstance (e.g. delays in phasing of the development).

Success criteria include high population density, low car parking and good public transport accessibility. Developments need most, but not necessarily all of these to deliver a success with a viable car club. Where some success criteria are weak, then others assume greater importance.

#### General conclusions - car clubs in urban developments

1. Car clubs can help to expand opportunities for developers to bring forward land in cities which otherwise might not have been commercially viable by:

- a. Facilitating planning permission in high density developments that have insufficient land for parking or would need to build underground parking at high cost; and/or
- b. Facilitating planning permission for developments with limited off street space for car parking in high/medium density urban areas.

2. With the growth of the sharing economy and introduction of one-way car sharing (Drive Now, London), developers plan for future consumers who do not aspire/cannot afford car ownership. Car clubs will have an important role to play in offering a package of mobility options to new residents that do not own a car.

3. Car clubs are helping to fulfil local authority policies on congestion/traffic, air quality and carbon reduction by reducing car dependency and car ownership.

4. Car clubs in urban developments help operators to expand their networks in areas where car club services already exist and the proposed development is within or close to area of coverage.

5. Finally, car clubs in urban developments free up space within development sites that can be used as additional amenity or play space.





#### Stakeholders – why are some supportive and some are not

Stakeholder	Supportive	Not supportive
LA	Enables low car/car free housing	No existing car club programme
	development – heads off local objections	
	Helps secure more housing in high	Has existing car club but directs
	density areas	S.106/S75 to other capital programmes
	Part of strategy to reduce impact of car	Lacks a track record in administering
	ownership in congested cities	funds for this purpose; Unaware of
		successful implementation
Developer	Has good project but limited or no space	Unaware of successful implementation
	for of street parking	on either small or large scale
		developments
	Customer driven – accepts there is a	Perception/reality that sales are less
	market for properties with little or no	likely without parking for residents
	residents parking	
Operator	Success factors appear positive after	Not viable long term even with incentives
	completion and occupation	
	Locations fits with growth of local car	Demographics and location not good for
	club network	pioneering new concept





### 9. Recommendations

As a result of the research undertaken to inform this report, the following recommendations on the development of S106/S75 agreements involving car clubs are made:

- We suggest that there should be a requirement for developers / applicants to engage in preapplication discussions with car club operators and the local planning authority to assess the potential viability and feasibility of providing a car club bay(s) / vehicle(s) for the development. An important point is clarity, i.e. that all parties are clear what they are entering into and what their commitment is.
- 2. Having a local implementation plan (or Local Transport Strategy) with specific targets for car club growth is helpful in providing a framework for dealing with specific applications.
- 3. It is helpful to avoid ambiguity in the wording of the S106/S75 agreement. The agreement should include a sound, reasoned justification for including car clubs within a S106 agreement, to ensure that there is a robust defence in the event of an appeal<sup>14</sup>. This should also include a clear reasoning as to how the specific measure will mitigate the external impacts of that development.
- 4. Local authorities and operators should consider incentivising the uptake/use of a car club in a new development. This will help to ensure that levels of awareness are higher and also that new residents hopefully do not purchase a car if the car club is available from when they first occupy their new home.
- 5. Car club operators should allow (and encourage) shared use of the car club by residents in streets surrounding the development.
- 6. Local authorities should consider the opportunities available to pool S106/S75 contributions from a number of small developments to provide a car club bay near to the development sites.
- 7. Local authorities and car club operators should actively consider the opportunities for expanding the car club network around new transport infrastructure (e.g. Crossrail in London and potential extensions of the Edinburgh tram). This advance planning will help to ensure that population growth isn't mirrored by traffic growth.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>14</sup> Including clear evidence of the benefits of car clubs in terms of traffic demand-management, including reduced parking demand, reduced traffic generation and pollution.









### **10. Appendices**

List of case studies included as appendices:

Case study location (bold) and development details		
1. City of Edinburgh Council		
1a. Quartermile development		
1b. Millar Crescent development		
2. Bristol City Council		
2a. Robinson Building		
2b. Cheswick Village		
3. Brighton and Hove		
3a. New Church Road		
4. London Borough of Wandsworth		
4a. Griffon Studios		
5. London Borough of Islington		
6. London Borough of Sutton		
6a. BedZED		
7. London Borough of Ealing		
7a. Grand Union Village development		
London Borough of Haringey		
8a. New River Village		
London Borough of Bromley		
9a. Trinity Village		
City of York Council		
10a. Derwenthorpe		





# **Car Clubs in New Developments**

### A review of experience and good practice in low car and car free developments (2003-2014)

A research report by University of the West of England (Centre for Transport & Society), in partnership with Carplus

April 2016





#### Report details:

Report Type	Final version for publishing
Version	V15
Date	11th April 2016

#### Control:

Authors	Steve Melia, Graham Parkhurst,
	Chas Ball, Andy Wild, Kate Gifford
Project manager	Kate Gifford
Last edited	11th April 2016

#### Contact details:

Kate Gifford, Carplus

Kings House, 1 King Street

Leeds LS1 2HH

Tel: 0113 410 5263

E-mail: <u>kate@carplus.org.uk</u>

# **Planning Obligations**



AUTUMN | Edition 7

# A Great Place to Live Section 106 Project Fact Sheet



m-

# INTRODUCTION – PLANNING OBLIGATIONS

#### What is Section 106?

Section 106 (S106) is part of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 which allows agreements to be made between a council and developers as part of the planning permission process. This is to make sure the impacts of new developments on an area are properly considered.

Section 106 agreements mean the council can secure money through Planning Obligations from developers to provide benefits for the area, such as; new or improved open spaces, transport improvements, improvements for schools, leisure/community facilities and employment and training programmes.

Tower Hamlets Council secures and manages one of the highest levels of Section 106 financial resources out of all the London boroughs. The projects identified here are just a small selection from a range of schemes that have been completed, or are currently being delivered.

Future editions of the Section 106 Project Fact Sheet will highlight other improvements being made across the borough using Section 106 resources. For more general information and a summary of the Section 106 accounts, visit the Planning Obligations section on the council's website at www.towerhamlets.gov.uk

The projects included in this fact sheet amount to approximately over £6.5 million of S106 projects, which have been delivered by the council and its partners.

#### Future Section 106 projects in the pipeline include

- Wellington Way Health Centre
- Bromley by Bow Station improvements
- Middlesex Street public art project

These will be highlighted in future Fact Sheets.



### **SECTION 106 PROJECT SITE MAP**



999 T

# ENABLING PROSPEROUS COMMUNITIES

The 'Bishop's Square Procurement Project' is funded by £450,000 allocated from the Bishop's Square Programme. The project was targeted at supporting Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) located within the vicinity of the Bishop's Square development area in Tower Hamlets.

The project aimed to maintain and increase business growth of SMEs and assist businesses so they are more prepared to tender for procurement opportunities and contracts.

To date the project has succeeded in assisting local businesses secure 400 new contracts to the value of £5.6million. An additional £1.2million was also secured by local businesses in secondary contracts through the supply chain.

Outputs are expected to increase as final implementation of the project completes. Bishop's Square Procurement Project

Location 1 on Site Map Ward: St Dunstan's and Stepney

Development: Bishop's Square Development



Bishops Square Procurement Project business event

### **Enabling Prosperous Communities**



Bishops Square Procurement Project business event





# **REFOCUSING ON OUR TOWN CENTRES**

S106 money to the value of £120,000 has funded a 'Town Centre Enhancement and Promotional Campaign' to promote Spitalfields and Brick Lane to visitors and residents.

A series of walks throughout the borough, 'Paths to Gold', was created, inspired by the Olympic venue which is expected to be a major visitor attraction in the East End beyond the Olympic Games. These walks helped visitors and residents navigate the borough and guide them to local historical, cultural, retail and recreational destinations throughout the Games period and will create a lasting legacy for the borough to attract future visitors.

Paths to Gold is still available to download free as an 'App' for smart phone owners from www.towerhamlets.gov.uk /olympics or as a printed map providing details of the main routes and attractions along the way for non smartphone users.

Each route is devised in several formats, to ensure that they appeal to as many visitors as possible. Walks include: Unique Boutiques, Street Art and Markets, The Curry Capital 2012, Explore High Street 2012 and Waterside Meander. Paths to Gold is available to download free as an 'App' for smart phone owners or a printed map providing details of the main routes and attractions along the way for non smartphone users.

The App is also an interactive tool providing comprehensive and up to date information about Spitalfields, Brick Lane and beyond featuring attractions and local businesses and services along the way.

wayfiding and street branding using 'markers' such as visual panels, Quick response (QR) codes that can be scanned by mobile phones and other innovative tools to engage visitors with local sights have also been funding in conjunction with this project.

By promoting local town centres, the project aims to help reduce retail vacancy levels, increase levels of spending in the area and encourage more businesses into the borough.

#### Town Centre Enhancement Project

Location 2 on Site Map LAP: 2 Ward: Spitalfields and Banglatown Development: Spitalfields Market



#### Paths to Gold app

# **IMPROVING EDUCATION AND SKILLS**

The Council's Employment and Enterprise Team are dedicated to increasing employment opportunities for residents over the next 5 years to increase the borough's employment rate.

With the support of S106 contributions, projects have been developed to target challenges faced by residents seeking local employment opportunities.

Section 106 contributions, totalling £53,533, have funded a project aimed at preparing local residents for the types of jobs needed for the Crossrail programme, which will bring a new, high speed rail link through the borough.

In particular the project will provide residents with the relevant information, skills and experience so they can access jobs in areas including manual handling, curbing and paving and waste management. 40 participants have passed the initial assessment phase, and 30 of those candidates will commence training in January 2013. Those participants who successfully complete the training and have the necessary certificates required by contractors and the labour agencies will be put forward for apprenticeships and/or jobs opportunities on the Crossrail programme. Preparing for jobs and apprenticeships in the railway industry

Location 3 on Site Map Development: Various local developments





### **Improving Education and Skills**

The 'Working Start' programme was funded by £648,368 S106 money. This project will target 90 workless and unemployed residents in the borough and support them into a paid 3 or 5 month work placement. The participants will then be assisted to move into work, training or education with support from Skillsmatch, the flagship job brokerage service for the London Borough of Tower Hamlets. Since the first work placements commenced in January 2012, 43 residents have been placed into employment.

### Thayhar Begum, a programme participant said:

"We did role plays and presentations. It has helped me identify my strengths and weaknesses and how to work with my weaknesses. I am more confident than I was when I started....I have secured a position. I would like to work my way up the company and take on more responsibility."

#### Working Start Programme

Location 4 on Site Map Development: Various local developments



# STRENGTHENING NEIGHBOURHOOD WELLBEING

St John's Community Centre in Glengall Grove delivers a wide range of community activities including keep fit, prayer facilities, elders healthy living programme, bingo, dance classes and youth activities.

Over the years the deterioration of the kitchen area has seen a reduction in the level of private hire which has had an impact on the level of income that the community centre receives.

At present, the centre generates most of its income through hire fees, but this was not sustainable if user numbers continued to fall. A S106 contribution of £65,000 supported the creation of a new, accessible kitchen, significantly improving the community centre and assisting the charity aim to become self sufficient.

# St John's Kitchen refurbishment

Location 5 on Site Map LAP: 8 Ward: Blackwall and Cubitt Town Development: 19 Cuba Street and land at the junction of Cuba Street and Manilla Street





Kitchen building before and after improvement work



### Strengthening Neighbourhood Wellbeing





Kitchen interior before and after improvement work



### **DELIVERING SUSTAINABILITY**

Throughout the UK and particularly in London, rising congestion levels have been impacting on the quality of life. In response to this, car free housing developments have increased substantially following the introduction of the council's 'car free homes 'policy in the late 1990s. Car free developments provide an effective measure to reduce on-street parking pressure in our local neighbourhoods, reduce congestion and air pollution and encourage more sustainable means of travel such as walking and cycling to support more climate-friendly lifestyles.

As an alternative to the private car, the council seeks to secure community car club bays in new car free developments.

Car clubs are a new way to use a vehicle without owning it. One car club vehicle can replace between five and ten private vehicles. This represents a huge benefit to the environment, air quality, carbon footprint, congestion and parking. People who use car clubs tend to make smarter choices about their travel patterns, by using the car only when it is needed. The reduction in trips helps reduce congestion and pollution.

The car club vehicles are new so they have modern and improved safety features. Therefore, they are less likely to breakdown or fail on the driver. Each company has a different cost but they are usually less than £5 an hour. The cost includes, petrol, insurance, tax, maintenance and cleaning.

#### Car Club Scheme

Location 6 on Site Map LAP: 6 WARD: Bromley by Bow Development: Former St Andrews Hospital



Car clubs are a new way to use a vehicle without owning it

### **Delivering Sustainability**

The car club vehicles have specially dedicated bays in easy to access locations making parking very easy which can be booked by telephone or internet.

At the St Andrews hospital development in Bow, car club bays were provided which accommodate 3 cars and 1 van on site. A membership

There is also an excellent network of vehicles in the area that residents utilise providing a very viable alternative to private car ownership.

To find your nearest car club use the following link: Find vour nearest car club.



Car club bays at the St Andrews Hosptial site

# CREATING HEALTHY AND LIVEABLE NEIGHBOURHOODS

The new health and well being centre built on the site of the old St Andrews Hospital in Bromley by Bow was officially opened by Lutfur Rahman, Mayor of Tower Hamlets on 27th November 2012.

The building was secured through the redevelopment of the hospital site and a further £5.2million of pooled S106 health contributions has funded the fit-out work to complete the new centre.

The state-of-the-art facilities at St Andrews Health Centre first opened to the public on 30th June 2012, providing a walk-in service, together with St Andrews GP surgery and a host of community health services including health visitors, psychology, adult community nursing and diabetes clinics. The Green Light pharmacy located onsite is open from 8am to 8pm 365 days of the year providing patients with seamless care throughout the year.

St Andrews Health Centre is a fine example of how the council works in harmony with the health service, to provide much-needed modern facilities for local people. The council is committed to continue to support the NHS deliver health facilities using S106 funding, to provide similar high-quality facilities across the borough, in the future.

#### St Andrews Health and Well Being Centre

Location 7 on Site Map LAP: 6

Ward: Bromley by Bow Development: Former St Andrews Hospital, Devas Street





### **Creating Healthy And Liveable Neighbourhoods**



# LEAMOUTH ROUNDABOUT WORKS PROJECT

Leamouth roundabout in Blackwall was identified as forming part of the Olympic Route Network providing a key walking and cycling route.

Safe crossings across the eastern arm of the roundabout was previously prevented by a central barrier.

To provide a safe pedestrian and cycling route across the Lower Lea Crossing in time for the Olympic Games, this barrier was removed and signalling works and crossings installed funded by £32,124.41 S106 money. Improving routes for cycling and walking will contribute to a sustainable Olympic legacy, supporting wider economic, social and environmental objectives and representing non-polluting and healthy ways of travelling.

#### Leamouth Roundabout Works Project

Location 8 on Site Map LAP: 8 Ward: Blackwall and Cubitt Town Development: Elektron Building, Aspen Way



Leamouth roundabout approach



### TRANSLATIONS

Monday - Friday 9.00am - 5.00pm



163972

English	For free translation phone
Albanian	Për një përkthim falas telefononi.
Arabic	للترجمة المجانية الرجاء الاتصال هاتفيا
Bengali/Sylheti	বিনাখরচে অনুবাদের জন্য টেলিফোন করুন
Chinese	欲索取免費譯本,請致電。
French	Pour une traduction gratuite, téléphonez
Greek	Για δωρεάν μετάφραση, τηλεφωνήστε.
Gujarati	મફત ભાષાંતર માટે ફોન કરો.
Kurdish	بۆ وەرگێړان (تەرجومەكردن) بە خۆرايى، تەلەفۆن بكە.
Lithuanian	Del nemokamo vertimo skambinkinte
Malayalam	സൗജന്യമായ തർജ്ജിമയ്ക്കായി ബന്ധപ്പെടുക
Polish	Po bezplatne tlumaczenia prosimy dzwonic
Portuguese	Para uma tradução grátis, telefone.
Punjabi	ਮੁੱਫ਼ਤ ਅਨੁਵਾਦ ਲਈ ਫ਼ੋਨ ਕਰੋ
Hindi	मुफ़्त अनुवाद के लिए फ़ोन कीजिए
Russian	Перевод – бесплатно. Звоните.
Serbo-Croat	Za besplatne prevode pozovite
Somali	Turjubaan lacag la'aan ah ka soo wac telefoonka.
Spanish	Para obtener una traducción telefónica gratuita llame al:
Tamil	இலவச மொழிபெயர்ப்புக்கு தொலைபேசி செய்யவும்.
Turkish	Ücretsiz çeviri için telefon edin.
Urdu	مفت ترجے کے لئے شیلیفون شیجئے۔
Vietnamese	Điện thoại để được thông dịch miễn phí.

# Also available in audio, large print or braille, phone 020 8430 6291

Version 7 - 9/2006

© Newham Language Shop

Development Implementation Team Planning and Building Control Division Development and Renewal Directorate Tower Hamlets Council Telephone: 020 7364 2541 Produced by Tower Hamlets Council's Communications Unit. TD14131 IM. December 2



### Appendix C E-Car Club proposal

11

# PROPOSAL

### Wheat Quarter

21st August 2018



#### **E-CAR INTRODUCTION**

E-Car Club (part of the Europcar Group) is the UK's first entirely electric pay-per-use car club, designed to provide individuals and businesses in carefully selected communities across the United Kingdom with the convenience and flexibility of access to full-sized electric cars and vans without the high cost of owning them. Vehicles may be booked by phone or online, weeks in advance or at the very last minute. They can be reserved for as little as an hour, or as long as several days. Each member is provided with a smart card and secure code with which to access reserved vehicles and prices start at approximately £5.50 per hour. E-Car is grateful for the support of a wide range of partners, including Europcar, British Gas, Innovate UK, TFL, OLEV, ChargePoint Services, Carplus, Renault and Nissan Motors.

#### **HOW IT WORKS**

E-Car have tried to ensure that the process of accessing, booking and using the vehicles is as simple and convenient as possible. There is a 4-step process, as follows:



**Join**: You let us know who you would like to have access to the vehicle, E-Car will then contact them to check their licence and ensure that they are eligible. The member of staff will then receive their own membership pack, which includes a: welcome letter, guide on how you use and book the vehicles, personal membership number, PIN and membership card.

**Book:** Vehicles can be booked over the phone, online or using the E-Car mobile app. The E-Car booking system is available, 24/7/365 and bookings can be made minutes before the vehicle is required or weeks in advance (dependent on availability).

**Unplug:** The vehicles are accessed with your membership card, by placing your card on the card reader on the windscreen that will open the doors at the time of your booking. The keys are found inside the on-board computer, you simply unplug the car and you're ready to go.

**Drive:** Electric vehicles drive like any other automatic car, so all you need to do is switch on and drive off. If you have any issues during your journey, E-Car's customer service team are there to guide you through the process.

#### **ORGANISATION BENEFITS**

E-Car is designed to provide a number of material benefits including:

**Provision of an affordable, convenient and flexible transport solution:** E-Car is designed to provide much of the convenience and flexibility of private vehicles but at a lower price point. When factoring in total cost of vehicle ownership, as well as the hassle of owning one, E-Car provides a cost-effective solution for urban residents.

**Lower transport emissions:** E-Car only deploys wholly electric plug-in vehicles. Inherently more efficient these vehicles have a significantly lower "well-to-wheel" footprint than comparable petrol alternatives. E-Car also endeavours to source its electricity from renewable sources wherever possible. By sharing assets among members, the model also reduces the number of vehicles on the road, further lowering emissions and congestion.

**Improved air quality:** With no tailpipe emissions whatsoever (no PM10s, nitrous oxides or carbon monoxide) E-Car helps to contribute to improved air quality in areas of high air pollution.

**Access to Europcar's mobility solutions:** As part of the Europcar Group, being a member of E-Car provides you with discounted and preferential access to other Europcar mobility solutions. Whether you require a hire car for a longer journey or even a chauffeur service for special occasions.

**Increased EV awareness:** E-Car introduces communities to the benefits of Electric Vehicles. It is hoped that a number of common misconceptions regarding price, performance and range – to name just a few – can be overcome as individuals become more familiar with the concept of e-mobility.

**Charging Infrastructure:** E-Car will support in planning and selecting suitable sites (if required) and guidance on market leading suppliers and installers.

**Reduced parking pressure:** Although the introduction of E-Cars will require the allocation of dedicated parking spaces, the model encourages households and businesses to reduce the number of vehicles they own over time - substantially relieving parking pressure and encouraging sustainable commuting.

#### WHY E-CAR CLUB?

**Specialist EV Car Club:** Electric vehicles are core to our business, so our systems are designed to be the best in the market to manage EVs, with key features that: provide members with live charge data for last minute bookings; guaranteed charge level for future bookings; and a notification system that signals a vehicle is back at its "home hub" and not on charge – this has resulted in a model that reduces underutilisation risk, minimises charging time and maximises availability to our members.

**Customer support:** E-Car offers a fully managed service, with online, mobile and phone support 24/7/365, operated by highly trained and understanding customer service staff, who excel in supporting users with all aspects of the car club model, including EV specific queries.

**Marketing schemes:** Our marketing team will work closely with your organisation to tailor a marketing strategy to meet the needs of your location and users.

**Dedicated point of contact:** You will be allocated a dedicated account manager to support the scheme, provide feedback on utilisation and answer any questions if required.

**E-Cars existing network:** E-Car Club have an existing network of vehicles operating in Hertfordshire, Bedfordshire, London and across the UK and are looking to develop our network in Welwyn Garden City.

#### **THE PROPOSITION**

E-Car proposes that a fully electric car club vehicle be made available to residents and the local community around the development site for a minimum period of three years.

#### The following deployment schedule is proposed:

• Electric Vehicles - The deployment of Renault ZOE Z.E., Nissan LEAF (or equivalent) in dedicated bays adjacent to existing or new charging infrastructure.

#### During the deployment, it is proposed that E-Car Club will:

- Fully administer the scheme, meeting all other substantive costs including but not limited to those relating to vehicle acquisition, booking systems, telematics and communications hardware, member screening, comprehensive motor insurance, breakdown cover, cleaning, servicing, marketing of the scheme and full operational management.
- Provide guidance on charging infrastructure installers and providers, if required, facilitating introductions to partners. Support the planning and selection of sites for the installation of charging infrastructure.
- Offer the first residents purchasing the properties preferential rates on membership of the car club.
- Provide complete utilisation statistics (including mileage, £/mile, user and cost centre breakdown).
- Capture the experience as a case study for EV deployment.

### During the deployment, it is proposed that the client will:

- Assist in finding suitable parking bays for exclusive use by E-Car vehicles.
- Install or provide access to charging infrastructure that is suitable to operate an electric vehicle car club (Dual, 7kW, 32A, Type 2, Mennekes charging post).
- Designate parking bays next to the charging infrastructure for exclusive use of the E-Car Club vehicles (with the necessary bay marking).
- Support the promotion of the car club to residents

### **INDICATIVE PRICING**

With the long timescale before the site is ready, it is difficult to provide accurate pricing at this stage, as the cars and cost structure could change over that time. Also, it is unclear whether there will be scope for more than two vehicles on the site or the duration of contract. Therefore, the pricing table below is indicative based on typical S106 requirements until we receive further information.

The price below includes full administration of the scheme, including but not limited to costs relating to vehicle acquisition, booking systems, telematics and communications hardware, member screening, comprehensive motor insurance, breakdown cover, cleaning, servicing, marketing of the scheme and full operational management.

## **COST STRUCTURE PER VEHICLE**

ltem	Number (estimate)	Unit Value	Total
Renault ZOE Z.E. – Deployment Fee	1 vehicles * 3 years	£7,540 (per car/year)	£22,620
Total			£22,620

N.B. VAT will be added to these charges at the applicable rate

Prices are subject to change but are valid for contracts signed up to 45 days from the date of this proposal.

Prices are provided on a 'commercial in confidence' basis and should not be shared with third parties without prior permission from E-Car.

# NEXT STEPS

I hope this proposition is in keeping with your expectations and I very much look forward to discussing the proposed project further in due course.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact Russell Fenner on 020 3603 2259. Alternatively, you can email at <u>russell.fenner@ecarclub.co.uk</u>.

E-Car Club, 29 Shand Street, London, SE1 2ES



© 2016 E-Car Club Ltd. All rights reserved.

ecarclub.co.uk | info@ecarclub.org | 020 3603 2259



# Appendix D Parking locations

12



Wheat Quarter, Former Shredded Wheat Factory Welwyn Garden City

North Site – Ground floor Provisional Car Parking Type Locations August 2018



Car Club
Car Club
Additional CC
Residential

North Site Ground and Basement

447 resi permit spaces\*25 Car Club spaces \*81 Visitor spaces142 commercial spaces

\* Potential Additional 25 Car Club spaces subject to demand, converted from resi permit spaces





Wheat Quarter, Former Shredded Wheat Factory Welwyn Garden City North Site – Basement Provisional Car Parking Type Locations August 2018





South site Provisional Car Parking Type Locations August 2018





# Appendix E Residential parking calculations

Spaces	per d	welling	0.60
--------	-------	---------	------

	-						
	Std	Allocated		CC	Visitor	Provided	Equiv
1-bed	0.75	0.45	0.60	0.06	0.1	0.61	0.91
2-bed	1.00	0.60	0.60	0.06	0.1	0.76	1.06
3-bed	1.50	0.90	0.60	0.06	0.1	1.06	1.36
4+ bed	2.00	1.20	0.60	0.06	0.1	1.36	1.66

Total spaces

810	Std + v	Allocated	CC	Visitor	Prov	Equiv
1-bed	417	221	29	49	299	446
2-bed	317	173	17	29	219	305
3-bed	51	29	2	3	34	44
4+ bed	0	0	0	0	0	0
	785	422	49	81	552	795
Ave alloc	0.969				0.681	0.981
Incl vis	1.069					

Schedule	NORTH	
1b	490	60%
2b	288	36%
3b	32	4%
4+b	0	0%
	810	

#### Total spaces

643	Std + v	Allocated	CC	Visitor	Prov	Equiv
1-bed	203	108	14	24	146	217
2-bed	374	204	20	34	258	360
3-bed	102	58	4	6	68	87
4+ bed	0	0	0	0	0	0
	680	369	39	64	472	665
Ave alloc	1.057				0.734	1.034
Incl vis	1.057					

Schedule	SOUTH	
1b	239	37%
2b	340	53%
3b	64	10%
4+b	0	0%
	643	