



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

## Summary

of Highways and Transport Evidence  
on behalf of Woking Borough Council

of

David Gwyn Lewis BSc(Hons) MSc (Hons) MCIHT

PINS Reference: APP/A3655/W/20/3265969  
LPA Reference: PLAN/2019/1176

## Contents

- 1.0 Qualifications and Experience
- 2.0 Scope of Evidence
- 3.0 Reason for Refusal 4
- 4.0 Conclusion

## 1.0 Qualifications and Experience

1.1 My name is David Gwyn Lewis and I am a Regional Director at Motion Consultants Limited. I hold a Master Degree in Transport Planning and Engineering and am a member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation and the Transport Planning Society. I have over 14 years' experience in the field of transportation planning and traffic engineering.

## 2.0 Scope of Evidence

2.1 My evidence focuses on Reason for Refusal 4, relating to parking associated with the stadium and medical centre elements of the Proposed Development. I have considered these in the context of the Woking Core Strategy, SPD Parking Standards and the NPPF.

## 3.0 Reason for Refusal 4

3.1 Reason for Refusal 4 confirms that the Proposed Development provides insufficient on site parking for the proposed stadium and medical centre uses and has failed to demonstrate that this will not result in a material impact on parking conditions on local streets.

3.2 In response to this my Evidence demonstrates the following:

- ▶ The proposed parking provision for the stadium use is significantly below the adopted parking standards of WBC and SCC, at just 10% of the maximum provision allowed;
- ▶ Where parking requirements are being assessed on an individual assessment basis, the assessment should demonstrate that either the demand for parking is met on site or is appropriately managed and mitigated off site;
- ▶ My evidence demonstrates that an appropriate individual assessment of off site car parking demand associated with the proposed stadium has not been undertaken and the Appellant has not demonstrated that demand for off site stadium car parking will be managed and mitigated appropriately;
- ▶ Detail provided by the Appellant confirms that the majority of matchday staff will not have access to on site car parking but no detail is provided with the submission to confirm the number of matchday staff that will be employed at the stadium on a matchday and will be required to park off site;
- ▶ The proposed Masterplan does not detail where the proposed provision of accessible car parking will be provided within the stadium parking area;
- ▶ No detail has been provided by the Appellant as to how 8 parking spaces proposed for the medical centre use will be allocated or managed within the stadium car park and no Parking Management Plan has been provided. If 8 parking spaces are permanently dedicated to the medical centre use, this will reduce available parking for the stadium. If shared use of spaces between the medical centre and stadium use is proposed, this will result in conflict between the medical centre and a stadium uses, when both are operating concurrently;
- ▶ The stadium currently has an average attendance of 2,135 spectators for a home match and based on the surveyed mode share it is estimated that an average home match currently results in 665 spectators driving to the stadium and seeking to parking near the stadium;
- ▶ Should the Stadium Travel Plan achieve its targets the proposed stadium could result in 2,360 spectators driving to the stadium and parking off site;
- ▶ No analysis is provided within the Transport Assessment to on-street parking demand associated with matchday staff;
- ▶ The majority of home football matches are played on a Saturday afternoon but the Appellant has made no assessment of baseline parking conditions on a Saturday;

- ▶ The weekday parking survey presented in the Transport Assessment was undertaken in August, during school holiday period, and therefore does not provide a neutral baseline of existing parking conditions;
- ▶ The Appellant has undertaken no assessment of the impact of additional on-street parking demand associated with the proposed stadium;
- ▶ The proposed stadium could result in parking demand for 2,360 cars associated with spectators to park in the vicinity of the site, this is an increase of 1,695 cars seeking to park off site in comparison with a current typical matchday;
- ▶ The majority of local streets around the site will remain uncontrolled on matchdays;
- ▶ The increase in on-street parking demand as a result of the Proposed Development could result in all streets within the scope of parking survey experiencing 100% parking occupancy on matchdays with further on-street parking outside the scope of parking survey;
- ▶ High levels of parking stress are detrimental to local parking conditions and result in harm to highway safety and residential amenity;
- ▶ The Proposed Development will result in high levels of parking stress on streets surrounding the site which could result in drivers parking in inappropriate locations, resulting in an unacceptable impact on highway safety, contrary to the NPPF;
- ▶ High levels of on-street parking stress resulting from the Proposed Development will restrict the ability of local residents, and their visitors, to park close to their properties, resulting in detrimental harm to residential amenity;
- ▶ The impact of on-street parking associated with the Proposed Development will not contribute to making high quality public spaces, contrary to the NPPF; and,
- ▶ The park and stride car parks identified by the Appellant are further away than uncontrolled free on-street parking opportunities and the park and stride strategy is unlikely to be utilised by a material number of spectators.

## 4.0 Conclusion

- 4.1 On the basis of my evidence, I am of the professional opinion that the Proposed Development provides insufficient on site parking for the proposed stadium and medical centre uses and has failed to demonstrate that this will not result in a material impact on parking conditions on local streets. 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.