

**From:** White, Vanessa

**Sent:** 10 May 2011 13:33

**To:** Harrison, Stephen

**Cc:** White, Kevin

**Subject:** Highway comment on Planning Application 11/00240/ful-Swaythling Gateway

Based on the Odyssey TA Adendum/Technical note dated 3<sup>rd</sup> May 2011, my recommendation for refusal of this planning application is as follows:

The development the subject of this application proposes the following parking:

Permit parking for 13 staff members of the doctors surgery.

11 further spaces for use by patients and retail shop visitors on a limited parking basis (two of which are designated for disabled use).

8 on street parking spaces plus 1 space for a car club vehicle, which will be subject to waiting restrictions. (I have included the one space the applicants wished to designate for the sole use of a Parkville Road resident, as the space will be subject to the same controls of all other parking on the public highway) One further space is designated for the Student accommodation use, although the applicants wish to claim 3 vehicles can park in this space, but this is for sole use anyway. The total number of available parking spaces is therefore 32 for the entire development, with 19 to be used by car borne visitors to the site (2 of which are for disabled use), and 13 are dedicated for doctors use during surgery hours.

Current SCC maximum parking standards allow for the following in an area of medium accessibility Doctors Surgery (3 spaces per consulting room, 75% of that figure for medium accessibility. This proposed surgery has 8 consulting rooms, but the practice likely to relocate here require 13 parking spaces as a minimum to operate.)

Low accessibility would therefore allow 24 parking spaces, 13 for permitted staff, and 11 for patients.

Medium accessibility permits 18 spaces, but with the medical staff requiring 13 spaces, only 5 remain for patients, which has been proved inadequate by the studies undertaken by this application and the previous applicants.

The most recent submission of ground floor uses now includes 918m<sup>2</sup> of shop use, with potentially a part of this being for D1 use. Because this is not clear, to be more realistic in car parking calculations I have used the Retail shopping calculation rather than Food shopping which is a lesser requirement.

(Retail shop 1 space per 20m<sup>2</sup> gfa = 45 spaces, 75% of that for medium accessibility). = 34 spaces. Included in the 918m<sup>2</sup> is the pharmacy (150m<sup>2</sup>), which will have linked trips associated with the doctors surgery, and is responsible for 5-6 of the above spaces, so requirement of 34 could be argued to be reduced to 31 spaces. (this excludes any provision for student parking).

2 earlier schemes have been approved with 25 spaces shared between doctors surgery patients, and visitors to the smaller shop and community facility. The parking for the residential element of these schemes was provided in addition to this, and the doctors having their own secured number of parking spaces. The residential was also able to use the shared parking area for overnight parking. also, in both cases, the retail element was restricted to one unit, with community facilities in the other ground floor areas. Community uses often generate more movement during evening and week end periods which would then not clash with the main demand of the doctors surgery.

The applicants have failed to demonstrate that the level of car parking to be provided to serve this proposed mixed use development will be adequate and will not result in overspill parking which will be to the harm and detriment of both highway safety and local amenity. With the lack of available space accessed from Parkville Road visitors will be likely to illegally use the delivery lay by on High Road for short visits. Also, any backing up of traffic trying to enter Parkville Road would cause a serious highway hazard at the junction with High Road. Longer term overspill parking will impact on neighbouring streets, public and private, increasing kerbside parking pressure to the detriment of existing users.

Whilst it is recognised that some drivers may decide to continue driving if they see that this site seems congested, this will still result in attention loss and slowing whilst driving along High Road. The numbers of parking spaces needed to serve 918m<sup>2</sup> of retail shopping is 31 (based upon the previously described rationale) for a medium accessibility area, and the applicant has not been able to provide numbers near this. Whilst SCC would be prepared to reduce this figure on the basis that a proportion of visits to the site would be local and linked, (as already stated) and therefore on foot/cycle, bearing in mind the comments below on the parking for the doctors and student demand, plus accommodation of existing demand, the provision shown is inadequate.

The developer proposes to provide a resident of Parkville Road with a parking space on the public highway which is not technically possible, such parking should be provided off of the public highway, all parking on the public highway would be subject to waiting restrictions.

The original submission was made on the basis of site enforcement against students bringing their cars, which will no longer be the case, due to the applicants advise that the university are now not wishing to enforce against such measures. This is contrary to the SCC Local Plan guidance for student accommodation. This will likely result in overspill parking in surrounding streets to the detriment of residents of those areas, notwithstanding the point raised that if the potential car parking is remote that students will be deterred from bringing cars with them to University. Such overspill parking can result in obstructions to the public highway creating a safety hazard. This problem is only exacerbated by the fact that this site is currently a public car park which is to be lost, and although under used, will have some effect on the neighbourhood with regard to displaced parking. Some near streets are subject to some parking restrictions as 2 hour/residents parking controls are in place, and it is likely that these areas will be further widened in the near future under current SCC policy. This will not be a deterrent to prevent all students from bringing cars with them, and they will seek parking further afield.

The applicant has suggested in their amended Transport Assessment that up to 42 of these students may bring their cars to University with them. overspill car parking caused by students will result in long term parking, as students do not have any parking provision at the university, so the cars would be left not only at night, but during the daytime also.

The 3 parking spaces for the University use cannot be counted as such, one vehicle will have some difficulty in manoeuvring, 3 will create a problem of blocking in and awkward vehicular movements.

The arrangements for student arrivals and departures is not fully explained, and as currently described, there is insufficient time and space to accommodate these movements without risk to backing up of traffic on the public highway waiting to access Parkville Road, which will be in addition to all other movements which would normally be happening, causing serious highway safety risk as vehicles may find they cannot clear the junction.

The lay by for deliveries and the carriageway improvements and provision of parking spaces in Parkville Road are essential for this scheme, and should not be counted as part of the overall S106 contribution which is subject to a viability assessment, these form essential build costs for the development to come forward. In the absence of a Section 106 Agreement to secure the following measures to mitigate against a successful scheme, I would suggest a further reason for refusal based on the lack of adequate servicing provision and further exacerbation of the lack of parking provision.

The changes to the Transport Assessment do not take into account the changes to the ground floor uses. When community uses were proposed, it was possible that demand could be out of normal hours, but now the use is retail/D1, the travel demands are different, and have not been considered. Also, trip generation needs to be considered with regard to S106 contributions, and travel demands needed site specific works.

Whist PPG 13 provides flexibility for the provision of parking for developments, it also states that a balance has to be struck between adequate levels of parking to be provided, which may exceed parking standards to guard against the development causing harm to its neighbourhood. In this instance, we do not expect the developer to exceed current policy, but to be more realistic in provision to prevent harm to highway safety and local amenity to adequately accommodate the proposed development.

Regards

Vanessa White  
Highways Development Management Team Leader  
**Southampton City Council**  
Tel: 023 8083 3952