



Report of the Director of City Development

Executive Board

Date: 12 March 2008

Subject: CAR PARKING STRATEGY IN TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES

Electoral Wards Affected:

All

Ward Members Consulted
(referred to in report)

Specific Implications For:

Equality and Diversity

Community Cohesion

Narrowing the Gap

Eligible for Call In

Not Eligible for Call In
(Details contained in the report)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report details the results of a study conducted to establish the basis for agreeing future priorities for investment in the development and delivery of parking strategies for the 28 town and district centres identified in the Unitary Development Plan (UDP).

Details are provided about the ten centres which scored highest in the appraisal together with the assessment compiled for all the centres in the review.

The report sets out proposals for taking the parking strategy development work to the next stage of targeting priorities for detailed strategy development and for consultation with Ward Members and local communities.

1.0 Purpose Of This Report

- 1.1 This report summarises the findings from the town and district parking strategy overview studies previously approved by the Executive Board.

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 The planning principles that influence car parking policy in Leeds' town and district centres are set out in the Council's adopted Unitary Development Plan and the West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan.
- 2.2 Provision of car parking for long stay and short stay use is best planned as part of an overall integrated approach to transport which is set out in the Local Transport Plan. Generally prime town centre space is allocated priority for the short stay spaces needed to benefit the economic vitality with the volume and location of long stay space being carefully managed in line with transport and planning policies.
- 2.3 National, regional and local policy is supportive of promoting the vitality and viability of town centres. Provision of long-stay car parking essentially to be used by car commuters is not supported, particularly as town centres generally have a relatively high level of public transport accessibility and large walk-in catchment. Each town centre would, however, need to be considered separately as their situations vary considerably. The character of towns and district centres varies widely between the inner suburban centres such as Headingley and Beeston and those out centre towns such as Morley and Wetherby.
- 2.4 In developing and applying parking strategies, full account must be taken of compatibility with Local Transport Plan objectives, concerned with accessibility, congestion, safety, air quality and asset management.
- 2.5 New development, especially in the larger towns, may provide opportunities to negotiate the provision of public car parking in private schemes. A firm strategy basis which is soundly rooted in policy will be required which can support such negotiations, and preferably retain such parking in Council control. Where such proposals are significant, a general strategy may need to be refined by in-depth local investigations to support the Council's case.
- 2.6 At present the 28 individual centres identified in the UDP do not have specific local parking strategies. It is considered that a more integrated approach could provide a greater consistency when reviewing parking issues and considering developments in the future.
- 2.7 A report to the Executive Board on the 20th September 2006 entitled Car Parking Strategy in Town and District Centres considered an approach to develop parking strategies for the UDP town and district centres in Leeds.
- 2.8 Approval was given for work to be undertaken to establish appropriate parking assessment criteria and a framework for the development of parking

strategies, together with an action list of town centres and an evaluation of costs.

3.0 Main Issues

3.1 Following the approval of the September 2006 report, consultants were commissioned in January 2007 to undertake the work which has comprised a review of the UDP town and district centres and the preparation of a strategy development and advisory framework.

3.2 This report provides a summary of the study which was completed in September 2007 and makes recommendations for the progression of parking strategies in those centres which scored highly in the assessment.

Town and district centres study

3.3 The study has looked at all the 28 town and district centres identified in the UDP and summarises the main issues and problems associated with parking.

3.4 A prioritisation matrix has been used to collate background information and in this each centre has been scored against a series of eleven criteria – covering the key factors for parking policy which are detailed in Appendix 1 - from which an overall weighted score is determined. The weighting gives greater priority to the most influential factors from a parking strategy viewpoint. This weighted score is used to rank each centre to inform the decision as to which centres should receive early priority for strategy development.

3.5 The criteria were scored on the basis of site visits and the evaluation of factual data available to the study consultants together with input from Leeds City Council officers at an evaluation workshop. The prioritisation process has resulted in a ranked list of all the 28 centres, with weighted scores ranging from 6 to 33.5. A number of centres achieved identical scores and were given equal ranking. Full details of the scoring and ranking are provided in Appendix 2.

3.6 Appendix 3 provides a more detailed analysis of the ten centres given the greatest scores. Headingley is first, followed by Morley, Cross Gates and Harehills Corner which all achieved similar scores. The next five centres are very close together. The sensitivity of the scoring process has been tested and this has showed the process to be robust, with the above four centres remaining consistently listed within the first five ranked sites.

3.7 Following completion of the study the highest ranked sites have been reviewed to take on board the latest situation in terms of work already ongoing including where relevant investment is already planned through the town and district centres regeneration. In relation to this, consideration has been given to which centres carry the strongest case for early intervention

through a detailed and comprehensive assessment of their needs. On this basis the centres of Headingley, Morley, Otley and Pudsey appear to carry the strongest case for early and comprehensive intervention.

- 3.8 In terms of the remaining 6 centres within the highest ten sites, as Appendix 3 indicates all these sites already have interventions or investigations of one kind or another underway. It is therefore recommended that a more limited studies programme is the most appropriate approach at these locations, based on the preparation of parking capacity inventories supported by appropriate parking duration surveys to confirm usage levels and patterns of demand. This information will be used to supplement and inform work already in progress and provide the basis for developing existing parking provision and management in the future.

Parking strategy framework

- 3.9 The Parking Strategy Framework has been developed to provide a consistent basis for the preparation of detailed local parking strategies once the priorities for action have been established. It is based on the established Institution of Highways and Transportation (IHT) guidance on Parking Strategies and Management and provides detailed step by step guidance on the various issues to be considered when developing parking strategies.
- 3.10 The framework is broken down into eleven stages (Appendix 4) covering everything from identifying the study area, through surveys, problem identification, interventions and public consultation. It is capable of flexible application to meet the requirements of a range of centres in terms of scale and individual circumstances.
- 3.11 The completion of a strategy will provide a set of detailed proposals to address the identified parking issues in the centre under consideration.

Consultation

- 3.12 The study work described in this report provides an initial overview of the main pressures and issues facing the main town and district centres as a basis for targeting further work. As such no specific consultations have been carried out either with Ward Members or other stakeholders.
- 3.13 Clearly parking provision and strategies are a key concern to local residents and businesses in the town and district centres. As such all the next phases of parking strategy development and review will fully engage with Area Committees, Ward Members and local communities. Detailed proposals for bespoke consultation will be prepared for each of the priority locations as the work programme is developed.
- 3.14 As a first step, subject to the approval of this report, all Ward Members will be consulted on the outcomes of the study as detailed in the appendices to this report.

4.0 Implications For Council Policy And Governance

Compliance with Council Policies

- 4.1 The development of proposals which support the more effective provision and management of car parking both on and off street are consistent with aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan 2006-11 policies for managing the demand for travel.
- 4.2 Improved parking management in town and district centres will also support better local environments and the objectives of the Environmental Policy and Regeneration Plan.
- 4.3 This report has no implications under Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act 1998.

5.0 Legal And Resource Implications

- 5.1 This report does not have any specific legal implications.
- 5.2 The consultant's report has provided an indication of the likely costs for undertaking the development of comprehensive local parking strategies. For the largest centres these costs lie in the £30,000-£45,000 per study and will vary depending on the size and complexity of the location. However, where work is already underway more local parking inventory and usage studies may be sufficient to allow the direction of further investment and the costs, which will again vary by location, are likely to lie within the range £4,000-£6,000 per centre.
- 5.3 Budget provision for this work has been provided in 2007-08 totalling approximately £60,000. At present around £40,000 has been expended on the completion of the study described in this report. Further site specific expenditure will be subject to the agreement of this report and financial provision being prioritised within City Development to undertake an additional couple of studies per annum. There is currently no capital programme provision for work arising from the studies.
- 5.4 In addition to the core funding, certain Area Committees have already funded specific pieces of work for their areas, for example Outer North West have funded a feasibility study for a park and ride car park at Netherfield Road in Guiseley. Works being funded and undertaken as part of the town and district centres programme are also contributing to the overall aims of the parking study.
- 5.5 Management of the future programme will be undertaken from within the staffing resources of the Transport Policy Section.

6.0 Conclusions

- 6.1 A process has been developed that will form an objective basis for the prioritisation and progression of parking strategies for the 28 town and district centres identified in the UDP. This report has identified the ten highest ranked locations and detailed where relevant planning work is already in process.
- 6.2 Headingley, Morley, Otley and Pudsey are considered to present the strongest case for early and comprehensive strategy development, whilst six other centres have been identified as already having various programmes of work underway where more limited studies will be of benefit informing the future management of Council controlled on and off-street parking.
- 6.3 Further progress of the parking strategy programme detailed in this report will be contingent on revenue funding allocations being made for 2008-09 and future years to support the initial surveys and strategy development fees. Implementation of the strategies will be subject to future capital programme funding which will be the subject of future specific reports.

7.0 Recommendations

- 7.1 Members of Executive Board are requested to:
- i. note the content of this report;
 - ii. give approval to the continued development of the parking strategy programme focusing on the centres described in sections 3.7 and 3.8 of this report (Appendix 3); and
 - iii. give approval to further consultation with Ward Members on the outcomes of the study and future priorities including those not covered within recommendation (ii) above.

APPENDIX 1 – TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES ASSESSMENT CRITERIA

Each centre was scored against a series of eleven criteria from which an overall weighted score was determined. This weighted score was used to rank each centre.

The criteria were scored on the basis of site visits, factual data and input from Leeds City Council officers at an evaluation workshop.

The eleven criteria were:

- size of retail centre – derived from floorspace surveys;
- regeneration – scored according to regeneration programmes (Town and District Centres regeneration programme, Neighbourhood renewal areas, EASEL);
- current parking management – derived from the number of parking tickets issued;
- environmental sensitivity – scored with respect to noise issues, AQMAs and conservation area status;
- proximity of attractors – scored with respect to the number of schools, colleges and hospitals nearby;
- exceptional attractors – based on the presence of nearby stadiums, racecourses, universities and train stations (due to park and ride issues);
- parking behaviour – based on site visits and workshop inputs including occurrences of inappropriate parking (both on and off street);
- supply and demand - based on site visits and workshop inputs;
- integration – derived from bus frequencies;
- safety – based on parking related road traffic accidents;
- public concerns – scored during the workshop with respect to correspondence levels.

APPENDIX 2 : TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES PRIORITY ASSESSMENT

	Priority Ranking	Size of Retail Centres	Regeneration	Current Parking Management	Environmental Sensitivity	Proximity of Attractors	Exceptional Attractors	Parking Behaviour	Supply & Demand	Integration	Safety Implications	Public Concerns	Total Score	Total Weighted Score
Weighting		2	1.5	1	0.5	1	1.5	1	2	1	1	2	14.5	
Headingley	1	2	1	3	2	2	2	3	3	1	3	3	23	33.5
Morley	2	3	1	3	2	3	0	1	2	1	3	3	22	29.5
Cross Gates	3	3	1	3	1	1	1	2	2	1	2	3	19	28.5
Harehills Corner	4	2	3	3	1	2	0	3	3	1	2	1	21	28
Armley	5	3	2	1	0	3	0	3	2	1	1	2	18	26
Guiseley (Otley Road)	5	3	0	1	1	3	1	2	2	1	1	3	17	26
Wetherby	5	2	1	3	2	3	1	1	2	2	1	2	19	26
Otley	8	3	1	3	2	2	0	1	2	2	3	1	20	25.5
Pudsey	8	2	1	3	2	3	0	3	2	1	1	2	20	25.5
Dewsbury Road	10	2	0	1	1	3	1	3	3	1	2	1	17	24
Hunslet	11	2	0	2	0	3	0	2	2	1	3	1	16	21
Yeadon	12	3	1	1	2	2	0	1	1	2	2	1	16	20.5
Garforth	13	2	1	1	0	1	1	1	2	1	1	2	12	20
Rothwell	14	2	1	1	2	3	0	1	1	2	2	1	16	19.5
Chapel Allerton	15	2	0	0	2	3	0	2	2	1	2	1	15	19
Horsforth (Town Street)	15	1	0	2	2	3	0	3	2	1	1	1	16	19
Bramley	17	1	2	0	0	3	0	1	2	1	0	1	11	16
Halton	17	1	1	0	1	1	0	3	2	1	1	1	12	16
Kirkstall	17	3	2	0	1	3	1	0	0	1	1	0	11	16
Farsley	20	1	1	1	2	2	0	0	1	1	1	2	12	15.5
Boston Spa	21	1	0	0	2	3	0	1	2	2	0	1	12	15
Kippax	22	2	1	0	0	2	0	1	1	2	1	0	10	13.5
Holt Park	23	1	0	1	0	3	0	0	2	1	0	1	9	13
Seacroft	24	2	3	0	0	3	0	0	0	1	0	0	9	12.5
Oakwood	25	2	1	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	0	0	9	10.5
Meanwood	26	2	0	0	2	2	0	1	0	1	1	0	9	10
Moor Allerton	27	2	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	5	6.5
Middleton (Ring Road)	28	1	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	4	6

APPENDIX 3 – TOWN AND DISTRICT CENTRES, HIGHEST RANKED SITES FROM ASSESSMENT PROCESS

Centre	Priority Ranking	Total Weighted Score	Council controlled off street public parking (spaces)	Comments
Headingley	1	33.5	0	The majority of problems are associated with on street parking, and although there are two off street parks neither is LCC controlled. In view of the high pressure on parking in this location achieving a successful solution will be complex. However, the high ranking suggests that a study should be considered a priority.
Morley	2	29.5	847	LCC has substantial control over public parking here, both on and off street. Given the high level of LCC parking control the potential for successful interventions is very good, and therefore taking the ranking in account would suggest that this location should be considered for a study at an early stage in the process.
Cross Gates	3	28.5	0	The bulk of public parking is associated with the Arndale Centre. On street TRO's are currently being reviewed. In the light of this, and the limited LCC control of off street parking in Cross Gates, it may be more appropriate to consider any further work on parking as part of a later round of studies once the present work has been concluded.
Harehills Corner	4	28	0	The majority of problems are associated with on street parking – there are no off street public car parks. The potential for successful interventions is limited. However, the primary issues relate to serving the main retail frontages on Roundhay Road. A transportation study is currently in progress looking at public transport, traffic and road safety issues and therefore, by considering parking within the remit of this work, it may be more appropriate to consider any further work on parking as part of a later round of studies once the present work has been completed.
Armley	5	26	0	The majority of problems are associated with on street parking, and although there are two off street parks neither is LCC controlled. The potential for successful interventions is fairly limited, furthermore investigations have previously been instigated and are already ongoing to look at the potential parking measures (which also takes account of the proposals for the replacement sports centre and parking). On this basis it may be more appropriate to consider any further work on parking as part of a later round of studies once the present work has been completed.
Guiseley (Otley Road)	5	26	31	The bulk of public parking is associated with Morrisons supermarket. Work is ongoing to provide additional station parking on Netherfield Road which, together with proposals for Traffic Regulation, should address issues with commuter parking at the station. In the light of this, and the limited LCC control of off street parking, further work for Guiseley may appropriately form part of a later round of studies.
Wetherby	5	26	293	LCC has control over a significant proportion of off street public parking, with the Horsefair Centre providing the remainder. The potential for successful interventions is fairly good and significant studies have been undertaken in recent years. Therefore taking account of work that is ongoing it may not be necessary to consider a study within the initial rounds of work.
Otley	8	25.5	349	LCC has substantial control over public parking here, both on and off street. Given this high level of LCC parking control the potential for successful interventions is good. Given that the town is large and has not received recent attention in terms of parking review it may be appropriate to plan a study at an early stage in the process.
Pudsey	8	25.5	299	LCC has substantial control over public parking here, both on and off street. Given the high level of LCC parking control the potential for successful interventions is good, and consequently it may be appropriate to plan a study at an early stage in the process.
Dewsbury Road	10	24	0	The majority of problems are associated with on street parking – there are no off street public car parks. Given the relatively low ranking and the limited potential for successful interventions, it may be more appropriate to consider Dewsbury Road as part of a later round of studies.

APPENDIX 4 – PARKING STRATEGY FRAMEWORK, KEY STAGES

The Parking Strategy Framework is based on the Institution of Highways and Transportation guidance on Parking Strategies and Management and provides detailed step by step guidance on the various issues to be considered when developing parking strategies.

The framework is broken down into eleven stages:

- 1 – identifying and agreeing the strategy area;
- 2 – community involvement;
- 3 – data collection;
- 4 – presentation of results;
- 5 – issue and problem identification;
- 6 – objectives and targets;
- 7 – devise potential schemes and policies;
- 8 – assessing impacts;
- 9 – preparation of a financial business plan;
- 10 – intervention and implementation programmes;
- 11 – monitoring regime.