motion
Golden Cross House
8 Duncannon Street
London
WC2N 4JF

Tel: 0208 065 5208
www.motion.co.uk

Site: Land South of Kingfield Road and East of Westfield Avenue, Woking

Prepared by: David Lewis

Date: 19th May 2021

1.0 Introduction

1.1 This Note had been prepared in relation to additional evidence presented by Mr Southwell in relation to on-street parking at the 7th day of the Public Inquiry and a subsequent Note (Ref: CD6.20).

2.0 Mr Southwell's Additional Baseline Analysis

2.1 At Paragraph 2 of his Note, Mr Southwell asserts that the on-street parking demand associated with the stadium on the surveyed matchday was 699 vehicles. This has been calculated by the difference between total surveyed on-street parking demand on the matchday and subsequent non-matchday.

2.2 The parking survey undertaken by Mr Southwell and presented within the Transport Assessment does not identify why the observed cars were parking within the study area. Furthermore, the approach he is now taking does not take account of other parking opportunities around the ground such as some private streets and car parks, roads outside the study area and private driveways, which Mr Southwell himself acknowledged does occur during his evidence. It is therefore an over simplification of the assessment to compare the difference in parking between two days and assume that the difference equates to the stadium parking demand. This approach is therefore not a reliable basis for estimating existing car parking demand associated with the football stadium.

2.3 A more reliable approach is to have reference to the travel survey carried out by the Appellant, the results of which are presented within the Transport Assessment and Stadium Travel Plan submitted alongside the planning application and both confirm that the current car driver mode share of spectators is 31.15% (Ref: Table 8.20 of the Transport Assessment). This is based on a travel survey undertaken at the stadium on the same day as the parking survey, 6th August 2019.

2.4 On the day of parking survey and travel survey, 6th August 2019, the attendance at the football match was 3,922. Based on the surveyed mode share of 31.15% of spectators driving to matches at the stadium it is evident that 1,222 spectators would have driven to the site and would have been required to park somewhere near the stadium. This is the approach I presented within my Proof of Evidence.

2.5 On the basis that 1,222 spectators drove to the site on the surveyed matchday, Mr Southwell's analysis that parking demand associated with the existing stadium on the surveyed matchday was 699 vehicles is clearly an underestimate of parking demand and there is parking demand for 523 vehicles (1,222 – 699 = 523) which is unaccounted for within Mr Southwell's analysis.

2.6 I would highlight that there are a number of locations close to the site which provided parking opportunities on the surveyed matchday and are excluded from Mr Southwell's assessment that only 699 vehicles parked close to the site. These include private streets local to the site including Turnoak Avenue, which have been highlighted during the course of the Inquiry as being used for parking by spectators and are not identified as a parking opportunity within the parking survey. In addition, Evidence submitted by the South Woking Action Group (SWAG) has demonstrated the on the surveyed matchday there was a temporary off-site car park provided at the Loop Road Recreation ground providing a further 120 car parking spaces for spectators as well as on-site parking at the stadium itself. On that basis it is evident that Mr Southwell's conclusion that there were just 699 vehicles parked near the site on the surveyed matchday is an underestimate of stadium parking demand.

3.0 Mr Southwell's Proposed Development Analysis

3.1 The proposed stadium has a capacity of 9,026 spectators. The Stadium Travel Plan submitted by the Appellant alongside the planning application concludes that the car driver mode share, if all sustainable measures are successful, will be 26.15% (Ref: Table 4.2 of the Stadium Travel Plan). On that basis it is evident that the proposed stadium will result in parking demand for 2,360 cars (9,026 spectators x 26.15%) and this is presented at Table 4.4 of my Proof of Evidence.

3.2 At Table 1 of his Note, Mr Southwell concludes that the proposed stadium will result in 1,350 vehicles parking on-street around the stadium if the Travel Plan measures are successful. Based on the evidence that the stadium will result in total parking demand for 2,360 spectators driving to the stadium and needing to park, it is evident that Mr Southwell's analysis of the parking demand of the proposed stadium has 1,010 parked vehicles unaccounted for within his analysis.

3.3 At Table 3.1 below I summarise the total parking demand associated with the existing stadium on the surveyed matchday, proposed stadium and the proposed stadium, should the Travel Plan measures be successful. These figures are based on the attendance/capacity of the stadium and the surveyed/target spectator mode share presented in the Appellants Transport Assessment and Travel Plan. This is consistent with analysis presented within my Proof of Evidence.

3.4 Table 3.1 also shows the extent of on-street parking that Mr Southwell concludes will occur as a result of the development within the study area, based on his Note (Ref: CD6.20). Table 3.1 also demonstrates the extent of parking demand associated with the existing and proposed stadium which is unaccounted for within Mr Southwell's analysis.

	Attendance	Car Driver Mode Share	Total Parking Demand	Mr Southwell's Analysis	
				Parked with Study Area	Unaccounted for Parking
Surveyed Match	3,922	31.15%	1,222	699	523
Proposed Stadium	9,026	31.15%	2,812	1,609	1,203
Proposed Stadium (with Travel Plan)	9,026	26.15%	2,360	1,350	1,010

Table 3.1: Parking Analysis

3.5 Table 3.1 demonstrates that Mr Southwell's analysis of parking demand presented in his Note has 523 vehicles, which would be required to park, unaccounted for in his analysis of the surveyed matchday and 1,010 vehicles unaccounted for in his analysis of the proposed stadium. The increase of unaccounted for parking demand within Mr Southwell's analysis between the surveyed matchday and proposed stadium is 487 vehicles (1,010 – 523 = 487).

4.0 Parking Impact

4.1 At Paragraph 9 of his Note, Mr Southwell concludes that there will be an increase of 651 vehicles parking on-street around the stadium on a matchday. As set out above, I consider this is an underestimate of expected parking demand associated with the proposed stadium by some 1,010 vehicles.

4.2 At Table 5.1 of my Proof of Evidence I presented a summary the results of the parking survey undertaken by the Appellant. I have replicated this at Table 4.1 below and have included reference to 'voucher' parking opportunities that Mr Southwell had referenced within his rebuttal evidence.

	Vehicles Parked	Capacity	Available Spaces
Unrestricted	593	1,244	651
Single Yellow	100	151	51
Voucher Parking	86	96	10
Pay and Display	450	478	28
Parking Bays	124	161	37
Long Stay Parking Bays	88	90	2
Total	1,441	2,220	779

Table 5.1: Existing Matchday On-Street Parking Occupancy

4.3 The parking survey showed that, inclusive of the voucher parking opportunities, there were 779 available parking opportunities with the scope of the study area on the surveyed matchday. The parking survey demonstrates that on the existing surveyed matchday there were 1,441 vehicles parked and a total of 2,220 on-street parking opportunities within the study area, equating to parking occupancy level of 65%.

4.4 If a further 651 vehicles were parked within the study area, as concluded by Mr Southwell, this would increase on-street parking demand from 1,441 to 2,092 parked vehicles on a matchday. Based on the on-street parking opportunities this equates to on-street parking occupancy increasing from 65% to 94% (2,092 / 2,220 = 0.94) throughout all streets within the study area on a matchday and will result in stressed parking conditions throughout the study area.

4.5 On the basis of Mr Southwell's own analysis, the on-street parking demand on a matchday will reach 94% occupancy which constitutes a high-level of parking stress, which as demonstrated in my Evidence will have an unacceptable impact on highway safety and detrimental harm to residential amenity. However, for the reasons set out above, I consider the approach now set out by Mr Southwell in his Note to be flawed as it underestimates the car parking demand associated with the football stadium. As demonstrated in this Note, there is parking demand for a further 1,010 vehicles associated with the proposed stadium unaccounted for within Mr Southwell's analysis and this will have a very significant additional impact on on-street parking conditions both within the study area and outside the study area.

4.6 In summary, as set out in my Proof of Evidence, the Proposed Development is likely to result in a significant increase in on-street parking in the vicinity of the site which is not being managed or mitigated by the Appellant and this would result in a detrimental harm to local parking conditions, highway safety and residential amenity. I am of the professional opinion that the Proposed Development does not accord with the Woking Core Strategy, SPD Parking Standards (2018) and the National Planning Policy Framework and the Borough Council were therefore correct to refuse planning permission for the reason set out in reason for refusal 4.