

# Using Planning to Manage Parking – UK experiences

Tom Rye,

Reader in Transport, Napier University and secondee to  
City of Edinburgh Council (Transport Policy)

Seminar, Oslo, 20<sup>th</sup> September 2005



# Structure of presentation

- ▶ Evidence of parking as TDM tool
- ▶ UK policy on using parking as demand management tool – national and local
- ▶ Local Transport Plan requirement in the Transport Act 2000
- ▶ Workplace Travel Plans and parking management
- ▶ Examples of workplace Travel Plans
- ▶ Implementing parking management
- ▶ Use of planning law to secure travel plans
- ▶ Car free housing
- ▶ Local experience – Edinburgh
- ▶ Some lobbying against UK parking policy
- ▶ Conclusions

# Evidence of parking as TDM tool

- ▶ Literature sparse
- ▶ Feeney (1988) and Pratt (2003) confirm general levels of parking elasticities
- ▶ Empirical studies (Young, 1991; Topp, 1991) show reduction in demand in response to parking management at specific workplaces
- ▶ Modelling e.g. Dasgupta *et al* (1994) shows parking much more effective than PT fares cuts as TDM tool
- ▶ No conclusive literature in UK to show parking restraint leads to loss of economic vitality

# UK parking policy

- ▶ Since 1994 national planning policy advocates parking for demand management
- ▶ Since 2000/2001, national guidance - max standards for off-street parking in new development
- ▶ Local Transport Plans – must show use of parking (on- and off-street) as TDM tool (to “lock in” benefits of other invstmt)
- ▶ Constraints for many authorities’ parking policies: proportion of PNR, and off-street parking run by private operators
- ▶ LTPs must also include policies on travel plans
- ▶ Certain authorities use planning conditions and planning obligations to get developers to implement travel plans

# PPG13 Parking standards

- ▶ Food retail 1 space per 14m<sup>2</sup>
- ▶ Non food retail 1 space per 20m<sup>2</sup>
- ▶ Cinemas and conference facilities 1 space per 5 seats
- ▶ B1 including offices 1 space per 30m<sup>2</sup> = 1 space per 2-3 staff
- ▶ Higher and further education - 1 space per 2 staff + 1 space per 15 students
- ▶ Stadia 1 space per 15 seats
- ▶ Residential (PPG3) max 1.5 spaces/house

# Effectiveness of policies 1

- ▶ Overall evaluation of PPG13 effectiveness – not complete (1999 pilot study on web)
- ▶ No overall evaluation of on-street or off-street parking management/pricing policies - though traffic levels in many city centres stable/falling
- ▶ Possible to collate impacts from LTP Monitoring – not yet done
- ▶ No evaluation of residential parking standards' impacts

## [7] Effectiveness of policies 2

- ▶ Impact of parking stds on travel plan take-up
- ▶ UK Govt *Soft Factors* (2002) and *Review of Personal Journey Planning Techniques* (2002) and *Smarter Choices* (2004) reports show:
  - About 7% of UK employers claimed (2002) to have travel plans (car travel decreased by 7% to 12% at **active sites**)
  - 20 organisations reviewed in 2002 – average 14% reduction in drive alone commuting
  - 33 organisations in 7 economically buoyant areas reviewed in 2004 – average 18%
  - Same areas – travel plans calculated to reduce total car commuting by 0.4% - 3.3%
  - Costs per employee around £47/US\$80/€62 per year

- ▶ Most receptive organisations – large ones, with a **problem** – hospitals, universities, drug companies, banks
- ▶ Typical measures implemented:
  - Promotional and awareness raising
  - Car-sharing – databases, reserved parking spaces
  - Improved walking and cycling facilities
  - Cheaper and better public transport
  - Car park management/charging
  - Flexible and tele-working and on-site facilities– cut need to travel
  - Financial incentives
- ▶ Barriers?
  - New idea – not so many tested examples – few obvious results
  - Not central to business
  - Costly? Can cause controversy

# Examples of travel plans 1

- ▶ **Egg banking plc, Derby, UK**
- ▶ **Call centre, 1400 staff (880 on site at once), 500 parking spaces, occupied 2001**
- ▶ **No convenient on street parking but P+R nearby**
- ▶ **Travel plan consists of:**
  - Parking charges for staff (£0.5/day) but not car sharers
  - Cheap frequent buses to town centre and nearby P+R site
  - Cycle parking and shower and changing facilities.
- ▶ **53 cars per 100 staff per day arrive at site; regional average is 62**
- ▶ **Travel plan is related to planning application**

# Examples of travel plans 2

- ▶ Bluewater Shopping Centre, Kent, UK – opened 1999
- ▶ Up to 8,500 permanent staff – up to 5,500 on site at any one time
- ▶ 13,000 parking spaces but almost all for shoppers
- ▶ Travel plan measures (aimed at staff and shoppers)
  - 60 buses per hour to site, bus station, discounted tickets and information.
  - Shuttle bus from nearest train station, Bluewater Railcard ( 33% off fares) and Bluewater as “station” in national rail information systems
  - Cycle routes to site, with cycle parking
  - A month’s free travel on public transport for new employees
  - Parking management, enforcing low levels of provision for staff
  - Local recruitment strategies
  - Cost £5 million plus £200k/year
- ▶ 40% of staff drive to work; local average around 80%
- ▶ Travel plan is related to planning application

# Examples of travel plans 3

- ▶ Astra Zeneca, Cheshire, UK
- ▶ Drugs company, 4,200 staff, 3,277 parking spaces, greenfield out of town site
- ▶ Travel plan related to development of site
- ▶ Key travel plan elements:
  - Subsidised buses and inter-site shuttle bus (initially free to staff)
  - Car sharing scheme with reserved spaces
  - Tele-working/more flexible working practices
  - Better on-site facilities for cyclists
- ▶ Solo drive mode share 90% in 1997, 73% 2001

# Planning law and travel plans

- ▶ UK planning law allows measures related to development to be imposed on or agreed with developer, for example:
  - Membership by occupier of local “Travel Plan Forum”
  - Bus stops, walkways and cycleways within development
  - Way in which parking is used and when
  - Subsidised bus services to development paid for by developer
  - Targets for mode share and penalties attached to non-achievement
- ▶ Use in an area – related to economic buoyancy of area

[13] **Planning condition, or obligation?**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Section 75 (106) agreements (“planning obligation”)</li> <li>✓ Allow payment of money</li> <li>✓ Allow reciprocal obligations by LA</li> <li>✓ Allow checks &amp; balances on LA discretion</li> <li>✓ Are negotiated not imposed</li> <li>✓ Can be complex</li> <li>✓ Use for travel plans not yet tested in court</li> </ul> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▶ Planning conditions</li> <li>✓ Faster</li> <li>✓ Remove the need to involve lawyers</li> <li>✓ Simpler</li> <li>✓ Limited in scope</li> <li>✓ More easily enforceable</li> <li>✓ E.g. “development shall not open until cycle parking is installed and ready to use”</li> </ul> |
|---|--|

Both conditions and obligations **not** specifically designed to secure transport measures

- ▶ DfT (2002) review of 20 organisations – most said parking problems key to travel plan implementation
- ▶ Average 14% decrease in drive alone
- ▶ 6 sites with parking charging – average 18% reduction
- ▶ “Parking restraint is a hallmark of high-achieving travel plans”
- ▶ Max parking standards - driving travel plan implementation



- ▶ Need for clear objectives
- ▶ Process of implementing charge
- ▶ Levels of charge, exemption from them
- ▶ Enforcement
- ▶ Administration
- ▶ Use of charge
- ▶ Overspill



# Car-free housing

- ▶ Wimbledon
- ▶ Edinburgh
- ▶ Camden



# Local experience of parking management - Edinburgh

[17]

- ▶ Restraint based standards for new office development in suburbs
- ▶ Restraint-based standards for housing
- ▶ Political pressure to make on-street parking more “customer-friendly”
- ▶ Political pressure to provide more off-street parking
- ▶ Current market research
- ▶ Likely policy developments...



- ▶ RAC Foundation (funded by Royal Automobile Club)
- ▶ Their arguments:
  - Rising car ownership puts pressure on existing parking supply - local authorities must meet this by building more off-street parking at origins and destinations.
  - People will buy and use cars even if their residential parking standards are restrained, and park them wherever they can.
  - Restraint-based PNR standards at workplaces - no account of the lack of alternatives to car use for journey to work.
  - Parking restraint negatively affects economic and especially retail performance.

- ▶ UK local authorities use parking as demand management tool
- ▶ Policy is very important in driving effective travel plans for new development
- ▶ Many political pressures on councils *not* to use parking as demand management tool (but at same time, pressure to tackle congestion) – a move away from demand management?
- ▶ RAC Foundation’s argument that parking policy should be “predict and provide” based – insufficient evidence
- ▶ Future research:
  - How much will people pay for and use off-street residential parking?
  - Do restraint-based parking standards reduce car ownership and use? How does this vary by location/accessibility?
  - What problems do restraint-based parking standards cause at workplaces?