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1 Introduction and Scope

1.1 This topic paper sets out the Council’s justification for selected policies in the Public Realm and Transport chapter of the Local Plan Policies. It supports Shared Spaces (T2), Cycle Parking Standards (T2, Appendix 4), Car-free development policy (T3), Public Realm (T4) and Travel plans (T1, Appendix 3).

1.2 It is an adjunct to the comprehensive supporting text in the submission document and is provided for the express purpose of justifying the policy, explaining the evolution of policy between the Proposed Submission and Submission versions of the document and responding to consultation comments. It should be read in conjunction with the Consultation Statements which detail the key issues raised and the Council’s response in relation to the earlier versions of the document.
2 Public Realm and Transport
Policy Context

2.1 During Islington’s Local Plan review process, the NPPF and London Plan have also been subject to revision. The documents referred to in this topic paper are the NPPF (June 2019) and the London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019).

National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework

2.2 The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF, June 2019) sets out the government’s objectives for new development and establishes three overarching objectives for sustainable development, including a social objective:

To support strong, vibrant and healthy communities, by ensuring that a sufficient number and range of homes can be provided to meet the needs of present and future generations; and by fostering a well-designed and safe built environment, with accessible services and open spaces that reflect current and future needs and support communities’ health, social and cultural well-being.

2.3 Paragraph 102 emphasises that ‘Transport issues should be considered from the earliest stages of plan-making and development proposals, so that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use are identified and pursued. Patterns of movement, streets, parking and other transport considerations are integral to the design of schemes, and contribute to making high quality places’.

2.4 Paragraph 110 states that applications for developments should:

give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas; and second – so far as possible – to facilitating access to high quality public transport, with layouts that maximise the catchment area for bus or other public transport services, and appropriate facilities that encourage public transport use; create places that are safe, secure and attractive – which minimise the scope for conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles, avoid unnecessary street clutter, and respond to local character and design standards.

2.5 Paragraph 111 states that:

All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.

2.6 Paragraph 112 sets out that planning policies should make efficient use of land, taking into account the availability and capacity of infrastructure and services – both existing and proposed – as well as their potential for further improvement and the scope to promote sustainable travel modes that limit future car use; and the importance of securing well-designed, attractive and healthy places.
2.7 The NPPF (February 2019) also emphasises the importance of good design in planning. Paragraph 124 states: The creation of high quality buildings and places is fundamental to what the planning and development process should achieve. Good design is a key aspect of sustainable development, creates better places in which to live and work and helps make development acceptable to communities.

**Department for Transport**

2.8 The Manual for Streets published by the Department for Transport in 2007 emphasises that there is a clear distinction between road and streets. While roads’ main function is accommodating the movement of motor traffic, streets are typically lined with the built form and public space\(^1\). The place function of the street is fundamental to achieve a fulfilling environment which people enjoy to inhabit, walk, meet and cycle. This function comes from the strong relationship between street and the buildings and spaces that frame it\(^2\). The greater the activity the street can accommodate such as walking, sitting, chatting with friends, browsing and window shopping the more the street is successful as a place, and the more the wider neighbourhood functions as a place.

**London**

**The London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019) – Greater London Authority**

2.9 The New London Plan, Policy T1 sets a target of 80 per cent of all trips in London to be made by foot, cycle or public transport by 2041. It also makes the street an interesting place and encourage people to walk more and thus contribute to the Mayor’s healthy street approach which aims that by 2041 all Londoners will be able to undertake at least 20 minutes of active travel every day.

2.10 Policy T1, para 10.2.1 sets out that high quality streets are fundamental to the character and efficient functioning of the city, and play a fundamental role in moving people around safely, improving public realm and providing spaces for people to come together.

2.11 The New London Plan, Policy T2, Parag 10.2.4 emphasise that “the dominance of vehicles can be reduced by using design to ensure slower vehicle speeds and safer driver behaviour”. Design can force driver to travel at the appropriate speed and thus reduce the need for signs and other traffic elements, as well as contributing to the Mayor’s ‘Vision Zero’ principle\(^3\).

2.12 Policy T2 in the Draft London Plan requires that all development plans should promote and demonstrate the application of the ten Healthy Street Indicators. This approach is an evidence based to improve health and encourage active travel modes such as walking and cycling. Policy T2, Parag 10.2.4 states that Healthy Street approach aims to “bring about positive changes to the character and use of city’s streets.” “The purpose of the Healthy Streets Approach is not to provide an idealised vision for a

---


\(^3\) [https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/transport/improving-londons-roads/vision-zero-london]
model street. It is a long-term plan for improving Londoners’ and visitors’ experiences of our streets, helping everyone to be more active and enjoy the health benefits of being on our streets.”

![Figure X: Healthy Street Indicators, Lucy Saunders](image)

**Local adopted policy**

2.13 Islington Core Strategy (February 2011) – promotes sustainable transport choices in order to mitigate the impact of developments on the environment, to respond to congestion affecting roads and public transport, and to promote healthier lifestyles.

2.14 The Statement objective 1.17, 1.18, 1.19 all refer to the sustainability dimensions of transport through active travel, meeting the needs of those who live, work and study in Islington, as well as to drive regeneration. Policy CS 10 encourages sustainable transport choices and the principle of car free development.

2.15 Development Management Policies (June 2013) – provide a more detailed policy framework to implement the overarching aims of the Core Strategy.

2.16 **Policy DM8.1:** The design of developments, including building design and internal layout, site layout, public realm and the provision of transport infrastructure, is required to prioritise the transport needs of pedestrians, public transport users and cyclists above those of motor vehicles.

2.17 **Policy DM8.2:** Development proposals are required to meet the transport needs of the development and address its transport impacts in a sustainable manner and in accordance with best practice. Where the council considers that a development is likely to have a significant negative impact on the operation of transport infrastructure,

---

4 [http://content.tfl.gov.uk/streetscape-guidance-.pdf](http://content.tfl.gov.uk/streetscape-guidance-.pdf) p15
this impact must be satisfactorily mitigated. Development proposals are required to include the submission of either a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, or a Transport Statement and Local Level Travel Plan.

2.18 **Policy DM8.4:**

A. Where public realm works are required as part of development, these shall be undertaken to best practice standards, meeting the objectives contained in Islington's *Streetbook SPD* and having regard to the guidance contained in the Mayor's *Better Streets* (2010) and English Heritage's *Streets for All* documents.

B. Major development proposals are required to contribute financially to strategic improvements to walking and cycling infrastructure, including the borough cycle network, the London Cycle Hire Scheme, Cycle Superhighways and wayfinding boards, through the use of CIL and/or Section 106 legal agreements.

C. Major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions of 100m2 or greater, are required to provide cycle parking, which includes design considerations, accessible cycle parking and provision for families.

D. Major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions of 100m2 or greater are required to provide end-of-trip facilities for cyclists in accordance with best practice.

E. Proposals for uses that are publicly accessible are required to contribute financially to publicly-accessible cycle parking located in the public realm within the vicinity of the site. This provision shall be secured by a Section 106 legal agreement or CIL, as appropriate.

F. It must be demonstrated that there are no road safety conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles entering, parking and servicing a development. Cyclist entrances must be safe and convenient. Separate cycle lanes should be demarcated.

2.19 **Policy DM8.5**

A. Residential parking (for Use Class C3)

Applications for vehicle parking within the curtilage of existing residential properties will be refused. No provision for vehicle parking or waiting will be allowed for new homes, except for essential drop-off and wheelchair-accessible parking. In line with the Core Strategy, all additional homes will be car free. Unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, no parking permits will be issued to occupiers of these new homes.

B. Non-residential parking (for all uses not falling within Use Class C3)

(i) Parking will only be allowed for non-residential developments where this is essential for operational requirements and therefore integral to the nature of the business or service (e.g. car hire, Use Class B8 storage and distribution uses). In such cases, parking will only be permitted where an essential need has been demonstrated to the satisfaction of the council and where the provision of parking would not conflict
with other council policies. Normal staff parking will not be considered essential and will not be permitted.

(ii) Any permitted parking is required to be off-street and located to be accessible and convenient in relation to the development and to provide an accessible route from the parking space to the development. Where on-street drop-off, wheelchair accessible parking or other essential parking is proposed details must be submitted to demonstrate the need for on-street provision and to show that arrangements will be safe and will not cause a traffic obstruction or nuisance.

(iii) Planning applications for uses that require coach parking ancillary to another use will not be permitted where the coach parking would give rise to adverse impacts on road safety and congestion. Coach parking should be provided on-site, unless the applicant can identify an alternative location which satisfies the council in terms of road safety and congestion and other relevant planning matters.

(iv) Planning applications for commercial developments where ongoing use of a vehicle fleet will be required during the operational phase of the development (such as minicab offices, delivery restaurants and couriers) will only be approved if the applicant can demonstrate that the transport impacts of the development have been satisfactorily mitigated. Only the minimum necessary provision shall be permitted in the above circumstances.

C. Wheelchair-accessible parking

Wheelchair-accessible car parking is required to be provided in accordance with best practice standards, as set out in the council’s Planning Obligations SPD and Accessible Housing SPD, and BS8300:2009. Developments are also required to provide adequate provision for mobility scooter storage and charging. The council will require accessible parking bays to be located on-street where practical; such spaces should be identified and the cost of provision secured by a Section 106 legal agreement to enable the council to install the accessible parking spaces.

D. Car clubs

The council will support the provision of car clubs, including the provision of wheelchair accessible car club parking bays, where appropriate. Major residential developments will be required to contribute towards the provision of car clubs in the vicinity of the development, through CIL and/or Section 106, as appropriate.

E. Public car parks

Proposals for, or including, new public car parks (and other motor vehicle public parking, including for coaches) will be refused. Proposals for the redevelopment of existing car parks for a different use shall be subject to the car-free restriction within this policy and the Core Strategy.

The Council's draft Transport Strategy (September 2019)

2.20 The Council's draft Transport Strategy sets out the Council’s transport vision, central aim, objectives, policies and proposals for the next two decades. In June 2019, the Council declared a climate emergency, committing to taking bold action to reduce carbon emissions and to tackle climate change. Key principles include making it safer to walk and cycle, reducing car use, eliminating all deaths and serious injuries from transport, significantly cutting transport related carbon emissions, improving air quality, improving Islington's streets and neighbourhoods as enjoyable and welcoming places by the introduction of 'low traffic' neighbourhoods.
Responses explaining changes

2.21 In their Regulation 18 consultation response, TfL City Planning (Consultation reference R19.0183) requested that the Council recognises bus services as accessible transport in supporting text in T1, which was amended. The Council also accepted the addition at T2 F that the Council will work in partnership with TfL to ensure network infrastructure and service improvements increase access (including step free access), capacity and public transport interchange improvements. For policy T2, section 7.13, the Council added that pedestrian crossings should be designed in line with pedestrian desire lines. Section 7.15 was amended to include that new developments should not preclude the delivery of cycle infrastructure. In policy T3D, a point was added relating to operational parking not impeding on pedestrian and cycle movements. Policy T3F was amended to include that coach parking should not be located directly outside the main entrance of developments and should not impede on pedestrians and cycle movements. In T5 the reference to the use of TRAVL was removed as out of date.

2.22 TfL City Planning also requested a few changes that were not accepted by the Council. For instance, the insertion of the ‘Healthy Streets Wheel’ is not considered to offer clarity on the Healthy Streets approach. The transport policy signposts to the Mayor’s Transport Strategy and London Plan, which have substantive guidance. TfL also requested that the policy include wording on controlling the rise of app-based demand mobility – however this cannot be controlled directly through planning policy. TfL argued that cycle storage and parking should be highlight visible – Islington responded that legibility is a better principle than visibility, as some cycle parking can sometimes be located underground.

2.23 The Council will pursue the conversation on all outstanding matters with TfL City Planning and collaborate to produce a statement of common ground.
3 Shared spaces

Introduction

3.1 The Council's approach to shared spaces is being brought into policy to strengthen the Council’s commitment to inclusive public realm. This section forms a justification of the soundness of policy T2: Sustainable Transport Choices.

3.2 The shared space policy is set out in Policy T2: Sustainable Transport Choices. The overall aim of this policy is to deliver on the strategic policy T1: Enhancing the public realm and sustainable transport.

Policy Framework

National

3.3 In July 2018 the department for Transport published its Inclusive Mobility strategy. It recommended that local authorities pause the development of shared space schemes 'while we review and update the Department’s guidance'. Local Transport Note 1/11: Shared Space was withdrawn.

“These schemes, which often include the removal of kerbs and crossings, have caused anger among blind and partially sighted groups who claim they make the streets harder to navigate and have created no go areas for the disabled”.

“A long running campaign spearheaded by Conservative Peer Lord Holmes and the National Federation of the Blind of the UK and its shared space coordinator Sarah Gayton, has for several years called for a halt to shared space”.

Transport Network; Dom Browne 25 July 2018

In a Ministerial letter to local authorities in September 2018, Kit Malthouse clarified:

“Features often included in a shared space scheme, such as the minimal use of traffic signs and other traffic management related street furniture, removing traffic signals, removing/modifying formal and informal crossings, raised side road entry treatments, continuous footways, table junctions and shared use routes for pedestrians and cyclists are often integral parts of other traffic management schemes. The use of these features in traffic management schemes is not included in the request to pause level surface shared space schemes”

“A proportionate approach should also be taken in applying related aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework, so that the nature of each site, its surroundings and its users are taken properly into account. Giving priority to pedestrians and cyclists, and addressing the needs of people with disabilities or reduced mobility, does not mean that segregated footways or cycle paths are always required. This is especially the case where traffic volume and speed will be low, such as within small housing schemes, or those parts of larger schemes designed as mews or cul-de-sac”.
3.4 The New London Plan ((Intend to Public Version, December 2019)) set out that:

Policy D5 Inclusive design, is supported by the text: “Inclusive design creates spaces and places where people can lead more interconnected lives, creating more inclusive communities. Links to the wider neighbourhood for all pedestrians should be carefully considered, including networks of legible, logical, safe and navigable pedestrian routes, dropped kerbs and crossing points with associated tactile paving”.

Policy T2 Healthy Streets also requires Development plans to apply the “Mayor’s Healthy Streets Approach to: improve health and reduce health inequalities; reduce car dominance, ownership and use, road danger, severance, vehicle emissions and noise; increase walking, cycling and public transport use; improve street safety, comfort, convenience and amenity; and support these outcomes through sensitively designed freight facilities.”

Local adopted policy

3.5 Islington’s 2013 Adopted Development Management Policy 2.2 Inclusive Design sets outs that all developments shall demonstrate that they deliver safe, legible and logical environments, and produce places and spaces that are convenient and enjoyable to use for everyone.

3.6 In 2010 Islington adopted an Inclusive Landscape Design SPD which, in liaison with a focus group of local disabled people, addressed the issue of shared cycle and pedestrian routes. It advises: “Shared spaces have become very fashionable of late and appear initially to offer a panacea to the landscape or urban designer; reducing congestion, street furniture and physical barriers. However, unless carefully considered, they expose users with visual or hearing impairments to some very real and perceived dangers. As a consequence, those routes often become no-go zones for particular groups”.

“Local disabled people involved in the production of this document were also concerned that people whose perception and or interpretation of hazards are impaired would also face an increased risk where surfaces are shared. All felt that clearly segregated routes are essential because, in their experience, claims that cyclists’ behaviour is modified in pedestrianised areas are incredible”.

“There are no hard and fast answers and no absolute solutions. The specific local conditions of each situation should be carefully considered and any proposal tested in liaison with relevant users”.

3.7 In 2012 Islington adopted a Streetbook SPD, informed by a multi-disciplinary panel and independently facilitated diverse group of disabled people. It advises: “Where cyclists share pedestrian areas, the track should be clearly identified by a raised delineator and at the very least finished with a surface treatment of a contrasting tone. Far from the envisaged ‘civilised negotiation’ of rights to shared space members reported increased tension and hostility. It is the Council’s position then to require that wherever a cycle track shares a footway or footpath, it should, ordinarily, be clearly delineated and provided in a contrasting tone”.
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3.8 And in terms of single surfaces the Inclusive Design SPD set an objective, amongst other objectives to ‘produce a safe and inclusive environment’, supported by the design consideration to ‘Minimise the potential for real and perceived risk e.g. by optimising key sight-lines and effectively delineating between different user paths (single surfaces should be avoided in all but exceptional circumstances).

3.9 As important however is the design process it advocates: beginning with a broad-ranging and detailed site appraisal and the development of a strategic proposal that responds to that appraisal. A key aspect of the appraisal is an analysis of the street’s place on the route:place spectrum and its capacity/the desirability to become either a more effective route or a better place to dwell. According to the objective set and the design considerations described, a single surface would only ever be considered where the street is defined almost entirely as a ‘place’; where the amount and speed of traffic is very low, the area is quiet and sight lines clear.

Discussion

3.10 The adoption of a suite of complimentary SPDs have supported a consistent approach to the design of routes and places. Shared space and the critical importance of the public realm in promoting walking and cycling are issues that have obtained great importance and attracted real controversy over the last Plan period. For instance, in July 2015 Lord Holmes published ‘Accidents by Design: the Holmes report on “shared space” in the United kingdom’5, while in April 2017 the Women and Equalities Committee published ‘Building for Equality: Disability and the Built Environment’ 6, calling the Government to halt shared space schemes. In addition, Islington planners have worked consistently over that period with colleagues across the Council and representative community groups to establish a reasonable and balanced approach to the design of our routes and places.

3.11 To that end Islington is determined to take an Inclusive Design approach, promoting walking and cycling for all our communities, including those with sensory or cognitive impairments, children and older people, for whom ‘negotiating’ safe passage (with cycles and other vehicles) along a street is not a reasonable option. We have, in particular, listened to the experience of visually impaired people, as articulated by RNIB. That organisation is becoming increasingly concerned that, afraid of the increasingly unclear definition of safe / pedestrian only routes, many visually impaired people are avoiding single surface areas and all but essential trips; this is undermining independence, health and wellbeing. The RNIB has an on-going campaign about shared spaces7, calling for an understanding of the real challenges they represent for blind people.

3.12 The production of an Inclusive Landscape Design, a Streetbook and Urban Design Guide SPDs have refined the approach and informed a revised Local Plan policy.

Draft Local Plan Policy

7 https://www.rnib.org.uk/campaigning/current-campaigns/shared-space
3.13 Strategic Policy PLAN1 establishes the (in line with the Lifetime Neighbourhood concept) integrated design principles of connectivity, context, inclusive design and sustainability.

3.14 In line with Islington’s Integrated Design principles which were introduced in PLAN1, the approach is contextual, inclusive, sustainable and connected. Adopting this integrated approach ensures public realm interventions benefit all users.

3.15 The overall aim of the shared space policy is to bring forward into the Local Plan the approach in the Inclusive Landscape and Streetbook SPDs, delivering on the draft strategic policy T1.

3.16 Policy T2C makes clear the Council’s approach to shared space and resistance to single surface.

Discussion

3.17 Following the Regulation 18 Consultation in 2018, only TfL City Planning submitted a comment to T2C, drawing our attention to the Minister’s clarification for the DfT’s position on shared space. In response the policy was changed and now distinguishes shared space and single surface within the policy, supporting text and in the glossary.

3.18 The Regulation 18 Local Plan in November 2018 read:

T2.C. The use of “shared space” to jointly meet the needs of people walking and cycling is considered to be unsafe and inappropriate and will not be supported in new developments and/or public realm improvements.

3.19 TfL’s response to the Regulation 18 consultation in 2018, T2.C read:

“We understand your concerns regarding the use of ‘shared space’ as a design approach. However, we believe your policy to resist the use of ‘shared space’ is unnecessarily strong and could prevent delivery of cycling and walking improvements in some tight spaces, where a more pragmatic approach is often required. The Department for Transport (DfT) recently clarified their original call for a pause to level surface schemes by stating that: “The pause does not apply to streets within new residential areas, or the redesign of existing residential streets with very low levels of traffic, such as appropriately designed mews and cul-de-sacs, which take into account the relevant aspects of the National Planning Policy Framework and associated guidance” (DfT, MHCLG, 28 September 2018). The current policy does not identify the specific features of ‘shared space’ that are deemed to be problematic or consider the context as part of the design approach. The main concerns of ‘shared space’ layouts are approaches that do not provide a kerb upstand. Policy T2 C and supporting text in section 7.12 should therefore clarify that provision of level surface schemes in situations that have a high movement function will not be supported. We would also suggest a softening of the policy line for new developments and residential streets where traffic flows and speeds will be very low or where there is limited space. It is worth noting that the DfT are working with Transport Scotland to develop their guidance on shared space and this is expected towards the end of 2019.

Compromises may need to be made in some contexts, especially if the alternative could be simply not delivering cycle improvements or parking. Road Safety Audits should be carried out wherever there is a permanent change to the highway network, which will help improve safety for all users and mitigate the risks of road danger.

3.20 Following this comment, the Council modified T2C to add the caveat that:

“Shared spaces may be acceptable where it has been demonstrated that they deliver logical, legible, inclusive and safe environments”.

3.21 TfL also responded to supporting text 7.12 which read: ‘Shared space” (single space) schemes involve removal of public realm features such as kerbs, road surface markings, designated crossing places and traffic signs. While they can lead to sustainable transport benefits, through the reduction of vehicle trips and increases in pedestrian and cycle usage, they also have inherent safety issues; in particular, vulnerable pedestrians such as visually, hearing and cognitively impaired people can find “shared space” schemes dangerous and difficult to navigate. “Shared space” schemes will therefore be resisted in Islington’.

3.22 TfL response stated that: ‘This section references the shared space policy and then moves on in quick succession to describe walking and cycling surfaces (shared use). It is recognised that the technical terminology is ambiguous and not helpful. However, the user dynamics and issues for shared spaces where motor vehicles are expected, versus shared use footways where pedestrians and cyclists will only be present, are fundamentally different. We would therefore recommend separating policy lines on shared use footways (informed by DfT guidance: LTN 1/12), from that of shared space (formerly covered by LTN 1/11 and awaiting an update). It is worth noting that the DfT are working with Transport Scotland to develop their guidance on shared space and this is expected towards the end of 2019’. It is worth noting that at time of writing, the clarification and guidance from the DfT is still expected.

3.23 To respond to this comment, the supporting text at 7.12 has been modified as follows: Shared space (single space) is a design approach which aims to declutter the public realm through the removal of features such as kerbs, road surface markings, designated crossing places and traffic signs. While they can lead to sustainable transport benefits, through the reduction of vehicle trips and increases in pedestrian and cycle usage, they can involve the use of single surfaces, which have inherent safety issues. Single surfaces are particularly detrimental to vulnerable pedestrians such as visually, hearing and cognitively impaired people, who can find shared space schemes dangerous and difficult to navigate. Therefore, the use of single surface shared space, which involves the removal of kerbs, will be resisted. Shared space must deliver logical, legible, inclusive and safe environments, informed by a contextual appraisal. Kerbs must be a minimum height of 60mm.

3.24 The Council considers its response therefore distinguishes between shared spaces and single surfaces, and qualify reference to shared space with a note of caution, whilst welcoming efforts to improve the safety, comfort and convenience of the public realm for pedestrians and cyclists, referring to the objectives and process recommended in the Streetbook SPD.

3.25 The Council is willing to add, as TfL requested in their Regulation 19 response, that single surfaces would be unacceptable ‘where they involve a uniformly flat surface’. However, the Council is not willing to distinguishing between shared carriageway and shared footpaths, as they both present significant safety issues. The policy therefore
requires from applicants a similar level of thinking around shared spaces for cars, cyclists and pedestrians, and shared footpaths.

3.26 These points will be further explored through the Statement of Common Ground with TfL City Planning.

3.27 Policy T2 C brings together pre-existing local guidance, user experience, Ministerial and Mayoral expectations. The policy is a practical manifestation of draft policy PLAN1 which sets out an integrated approach to design which combines context, inclusive and sustainable connections.
4 Car-Free Policy

Introduction

4.1 The Car Free Policy has been successfully implemented in Islington for the past 15 years, and has been policy since 2011. The purpose of this section is to provide the background to the Council’s existing approach to vehicle parking in the Local Plan, and to update the evidence base and provide further justification for its continued and improved implementation.

National

4.2 The NPPF’s Paragraph 4 ‘Promoting Sustainable Transport’ notes Transport policies have an important role to play in facilitating sustainable development but also in contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. Developments should be located and designed where practical to give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities.

4.3 Paragraph 40 states: If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels; and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

4.4 NPPF paragraph 105 and 106 removes the mandatory maximum parking standards of PPG13 and allows local planning authorities to set local parking standards, taking into account:

- The accessibility of the development
- The type, mix and use of development
- The availability of an opportunities for public transport
- Local car ownership levels
- An overall need to reduce the need to high emission vehicles

London

4.5 The London Plan (Intend to Public Version, December 2019) sets out that all areas in the Central Activities Zone, Inner London PTAL 4 should be car free (Table 10.3). Policy T6 sets out that car parking should be restricted in line with levels of existing and future public transport accessibility and connectivity. Car-free development should be the starting point for all development proposals in places that are (or are planned to be) well-connected by public transport, and Boroughs that have adopted or wish to adopt more restrictive general or operational parking policies are supported, including borough-wide or other area based car-free policies. In addition, all decision to make a new development car-free helps Londoners to depend less on cars and live healthier lives.
4.6 The Mayor’s Transport Strategy (2018) also supports the car free policy approach through Good Growth and at Proposal 80, through restricting car parking provision within new developments, with those locations more accessible to public transport expected to be car-free.

Local adopted policy

4.7 The strategic aim of the car free policy is that Islington is able to decouple development from traffic generation, in order meet housing need and facilitate jobs growth without an unacceptable worsening of air pollution, road congestion, noise and road safety. The policy aims to change the mode of spatial development from car-based to walking, cycling and public transport oriented development.

4.8 The alternatives – to allow far less development but with parking, or to enable the same volume of development with severe social justice and environmental consequences - are both unsustainable and unacceptable.

London Borough of Islington: Core Strategy (2011)

4.9 The Core Strategy establishes that developments will be car free, which means no parking provision will be allowed on site and occupiers will not have the ability to obtain parking permits, except for required wheelchair accessible parking and under exceptional circumstances for existing residents in social rented units.

Islington’s Development Management Policies (2013)

4.10 The Car Free Policy is set out in Islington’s Core Strategy (CS10H) and Development Management Policies (DM8.A), and requires that all development is ‘car-free’. The policy goes beyond restricting the creation of on-site parking spaces, and also removes the ability of inhabitants of car-free developments to obtain a parking permit, which reduces congestion, parking stress and negative highways impacts. The policy can only fully mitigate the highways impact of new development by ensuring that it is truly ‘car free’, and this is done by simultaneously restricting new parking bays as well as new parking permits.

4.11 The car-free policy approach set out in Core Strategy CS13 and DM Policy DM8.5 is a borough-wide, strategic approach, which depends on its uniform application across the borough to achieve its objective. This objective is to enable the borough to meet the need for development to provide jobs and homes without worsening the already critically harmful congestion, air quality and public health issues it faces. It is applied fairly and uniformly across the borough, and erosion of the policy would compromise the council’s ability to ensure that all new development is sustainable and deliverable. It is worth noting that the continuous implementation of the car free policy in Islington for the past 15 years has not impacted developments negatively in the borough.

Background

Implementation

How the Council’s policy permit free Car Free policy is secured.

Applications for vehicle parking within the curtilage of existing residential properties will be refused. No provision for vehicle parking or waiting will be allowed for new homes, except for essential drop-off and wheelchair-accessible parking. In line with the Core Strategy, all additional homes will be car free. Unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated, no parking permits will be issued to occupiers of these new homes.

4.13 These provisions are secured either by a S106 obligation or a condition. The council’s traffic management orders underpin these provisions.

4.14 The council is aware of the decision of the Court of Appeal in R (Khodari) v Royal Borough of Kensington and Chelsea [2017]. In that case the obligation which prohibited an application for a permit was found to be outside the provisions of Town and Country Planning Act 1990 S106.

4.15 The council does not consider this judgement makes its approach unlawful because the council’s obligation prevents occupation by someone who has a permit and is therefore within the provisions are S106. Further the obligation is made under the provisions of Section 16 of the Greater London Council (General Powers) Act 1974.

4.16 Since 2012 Islington has two exemptions to car free, one of which agreed by the Executive on 27 March 2012 was an exemption from the car-free housing policy for residents who have held on-street or estate residents’ parking permits for more than one year before moving into car free developments.

4.17 The Section 106 agreements issue by the Council state: ‘the Owner shall not Occupy or permit or continue to permit the Occupation or continued Occupation of any dwelling comprised in the Development by any person who has a permit to park a motor vehicle in a Residents’ Parking Bay within the Borough of Islington except in the following circumstances:

- The person is or becomes entitled to be a holder of a disabled persons badge pursuant to section 21 of the Chronically Sick and Disabled Persons Act 1970; or
- The person has held a Residents’ Parking Permit to park a motor vehicle in a Residents’ Parking Bay within the Borough of Islington for a continuous period of at least one year immediately before his/her use and/or Occupation of the relevant dwelling.’

4.18 In the future, the Council may review this position and re-consider the exemption for existing permit holders. The car free policy is flexible to accommodate this potential change.

Negative issues

4.19 Transport for London research⁹ revealed that the health of every Londoner is negatively impacted by motorised road traffic, but people who live and work on the most heavily trafficked roads are disproportionately negative impacted by all the health harms of road transport in London. Whilst London’s roads provide access to jobs and services, they also pose a range of significant threats to human health, and the primary source of these threats is motorised road transport. This can cause air

---

pollution, collisions, noise and community severance and it also inhibits physical activity.

**Air pollution**

4.20 A considerable cause of air pollution is development itself – through the construction of buildings however about half of the main air pollutants are caused by transport NO2, PM10 and PM25. Vehicle emissions are the cause of 48% of NOx emissions and 54% of PM10 emissions in central London. Royal College of Physicians, in 2016, reported that inhaling particulates causes around 29,000 deaths in the UK per year, which, on recent evidence, may rise to around 40,000 deaths when also considering nitrogen dioxide exposure. In Islington specifically, major roads are the main contributor to NOx concentrations; non-exhaust emissions (brake and tyre wear) account for the largest proportion of PM2.5 and PM10 emissions. The Council’s draft transport strategy reports that roads are responsible for 49% of NOx emissions, 75% of PM10 and 81% of PM.25 in Islington.

**Noise**

4.21 According to 2011 statistics, 16.8% of Islington’s population, compared to an average of 11.5% of London total, is exposed to road, rail and air transport noise of 65dB(A) or more, during the daytime. This ranks Islington the 6th highest London borough in terms of noise levels. The percentage increases during night time to 20.7% with exposure to 55dB(A) or more. Guidance on acceptable noise levels are set out in the draft Local Plan appendix 2 in Table A2.1 which would rank these levels as a significant adverse effect for residential accommodation. When ranked by complaints about noise, Islington is third among London’s boroughs with a rate of 36.9% in 2015/16. A survey of Islington residents undertaken in 2011 identified road traffic, sirens, human noise and construction noise as the most noticeable noise when out and about in Islington.

**Vibration**

4.22 Road traffic, and particularly heavy vehicles, are a significant source of vibration in Islington. Vibration can affect people’s health as well as damage structures and buildings, which is of particular concern in sensitive areas that have high levels of architectural, historical or amenity value (such as conservation areas, listed buildings, green spaces and high streets).

**Congestion**

4.23 The Borough wide road network is very crowded. Existing traffic congestion is serious, and Islington has the 5th highest average excess delays in London during the morning peak period, as well as the third lowest average morning peak speed. Since the Core

10 https://www.rcplondon.ac.uk/projects/outputs/every-breath-we-take-lifelong-impact-air-pollution


Strategy was adopted in 2011 the borough’s population has increased from around 206,000 to a projected 231,800 in 2017, projected to grow to 246,700 by 2025. The borough’s population has increased by almost 13% in only six years, with a 20% increase over 14 years.

4.24 This increase in population is consistent with the fact that congestion in London has been getting worse since 2012. For instance, across London as a whole, the number of minutes lost to delay increased by 14% between 2012 and 2014-2015.\footnote{London Assembly Transport Committee, London stalling, reducing traffic congestion in London, January 2017 \url{https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/london_stalling_-_reducing_traffic_congestion_in_london.pdf}}

![Figure 4.1: Congestion has increased in London since 2012. TfL, 2016](source: Total vehicle delay for London 2014-15, Transport for London, 2016)

4.25 Islington is congested and polluted despite having the second lowest vehicle ownership rate of any London borough at 31\%\footnote{https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Health_Impact_of_Cars_in_London-Sept_2015_Final.pdf Figure 2, page 6}, and the lowest number of daily trips by car per resident\footnote{https://www.london.gov.uk/sites/default/files/Health_Impact_of_Cars_in_London-Sept_2015_Final.pdf Figure 5, page 11}, which highlights that most traffic in the borough has its origin in neighbouring or Outer London boroughs (the latter accounts for 70\% of London traffic flow\footnote{http://content.tfl.gov.uk/understanding-and-managing-congestion-in-london.pdf paragraph 2.8, p.6}). If car ownership rose as a result of new development or incremental changes to car free policy, the consequences for the borough would be unacceptable in terms of the environmental and health effects for people who live and work in the borough potentially adding to already high levels of congestion.

Safety

4.26 In 2017, 3,881 people were killed or seriously injured in traffic collisions in London, 125 of these accidents were in Islington. It is worth noting that traffic collisions disproportionately affect pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists. For instance, cyclists...
represent the group with the second highest number of road traffic casualties on Islington's roads, despite representing 5% of the mode share only\textsuperscript{19}. Cars represent more than half (51\%) of non-injury vehicles involved in this serious accidents in Islington, followed by goods vehicles (27\%), buses (11\%) and taxis (8\%)\textsuperscript{20}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>People killed or seriously injured – casualty type</th>
<th>Non-injury vehicles involved where people were killed or seriously injured (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>37 Pedestrian</td>
<td>8 Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28 Motorcycle</td>
<td>27 Motorcycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Pedal cycle</td>
<td>4 Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Taxi and Private Hire</td>
<td>1 Motorcycle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Goods vehicle</td>
<td>1 Car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>3 Car and coach</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4.2: TfL road safety borough fact sheet, 2017

4.27 Car ownership in Islington is decreasing. Between 2004 and 2017, the total number of licensed vehicles (comprising cars, lights goods vehicles, heavy goods vehicles, motorcycles, buses and coaches) in the borough dropped from 46,865 to 42,887, a decrease of 8.5\%. Licensed cars reduced from 39,663 to 35,894, a decrease of 9.3\%\textsuperscript{21}. Comparisons between the 2001 census and the 2011 census also highlight that the proportion of households that have access to a car has dropped by 16.6\%\textsuperscript{22}.

4.28 In general, the transport policy across London since TfL was created in 2000 has worked. Between 1997 and 2016, the number of jobs in London grew by 1.6 million, an increase of 40 per cent. Over the same period its population grew by 1.7 million, an increase of 25 per cent\textsuperscript{23}, both higher rates than the UK as a whole, yet public transport and cycling have gained greater modal share while car use has fallen. Transport demand in Islington is high, especially at peak commute times, but the impact of a growing economy and population have been mitigated by a shift to active travel and public transport, and a decrease in car usage.


\textsuperscript{20} http://content.tfl.gov.uk/2017-borough-data-factsheet-islington.pdf Road casualties in your borough facts sheet, TfL, 2017

\textsuperscript{21} Number of Licensed vehicles by type, DfT, June 2019, http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/series/vehicle-licensing/

\textsuperscript{22} RAC Foundation, car ownership rates per local authority in England and Wales, December 2012.

\textsuperscript{23} Greater London Authority, Draft Housing Strategy (2017) p28
The above diagram shows the negative externalities associated with car use, which are borne collectively by society rather than the individual driver. However, these external costs are not borne equally by the communities affected.

Poorer and more vulnerable people are much more likely to suffer the negative consequences of congestion and pollution in the form of respiratory disease and road traffic casualty.

TfL’s Roads Task Force reported that:
“People living in more deprived areas are exposed to higher concentrations of air pollution, often because homes and residences of these groups are situated next to roads with higher concentrations of emissions”. Proximity to major roads indeed has an impact on property prices, which in turn impacts negatively on deprived communities.

Issues around complete implementation of the policy

The importance of applying the Car Free Policy for every case

4.32 On a site by site basis there is a variable impact of a particular application site having one or more parking permits. The policy is concerned with the cumulative impact if the Car Free Policy was not applied, not least given the scale of housing development in the borough. This is why in order to prevent worsening congestion and traffic conditions in the borough, the Car Free Policy needs to be applied to each and every site in Islington.

4.33 The continued implementation of the Car Free Policy in Islington has also been key to community support for development in the borough. Residents across the borough expect that the high volume of new development will not result in a worsening congestion and parking problems. On this approach relies the community consent for the disruption caused by construction and the building of more and more dense infill residential dwellings in an already very densely built-up borough. This consent is partly predicated on the fact that developments will contribute to meet the housing need without adding further congestion and traffic issues which would be caused if parking permits were issued to new residents.

4.34 The logic of decoupling development from increasing car usage must be followed through from the macro level right down to micro level individual decisions which in aggregate form the bigger picture. The policy must not only ‘discourage’ car use, but actively prevent it. At the macro level the policy currently prevents on-site parking spaces being created or kept in new development, both residential and non-residential. In addition to this, in all new housing – as part of the same policy prescription – the council seeks to prevent any parking permits being issued for the occupiers of new development. This is essential to implementation.

4.35 The entire borough is subject to Controlled Parking Zones – with different hours of operation in each zone. This is a common form of managing parking and residents and businesses must apply to the Council for a parking permit. Islington is divided in different areas where on-street parking is controlled during specific times. CPZs are the most effective way of managing parking and are commonly used in busy areas across the UK. The benefits of rationalising parking through CPZs include improved safety, with better visibility at junctions, easier access for emergency services, delivery and removal vans, reduced traffic and pollution by discouraging vehicles from driving through the borough.

4.36 The car free policy also enables a more efficient use of land, which provides more flexibility for sites to increase amenity spaces. The space that is not allocated to car parking can instead provide public open space and children’s play space. Amongst London boroughs, Islington has the lowest amount of open space per head of population. See Green Infrastructure topic paper for further detail.

4.37 Islington’s car free policy approach however recognises the needs of land uses for which operational parking is an essential requirement, for instance B8 storage,
distribution uses or industrial uses in Locally Significant Industrial Sites (LSIS) supported by yard spaces. The Industrial Land and Transport Study (2017) produced by Peter Brett Associated on behalf of TfL gathered evidence about the implications for transport of the release of industrial land in London, displaced further from Inner London, in potentially sub-optimal locations. The study concluded that the displacement of industrial land to the outskirts of London and beyond could have a range of potential negative impacts in terms of traffic congestion, air quality emissions and road safety, associated with the commuting patterns of workers, inbound and outbound supply chain issues and the transport requirements of staff in the course of their work24.

4.38 The strategic location of the LSIS enables shorter journeys and supply chains, which have a more positive effect on air quality, while ensuring that industrial, storage, distribution uses are kept close to London. Through their aspect of servicing the Central London Economy, these uses are increasingly essential to the functioning of London and meeting the needs of its growing population. Shorter supply chains support London’s circular economy and sustainable land use pattern.

4.39 It is worth noting that the London Plan 2019 inspector report (October 2019) notes that the distance travelled by road freight in London has increased by around 40% in the last 25 years, and this trend is expected to continue. The London Plan (Intend to Publish Version, December 2019) policy T7 sets out a number of measures to reduce the need for, and impact of freight trips, and to coordinate the provision of infrastructure and facilities to manage freight in a sustainable way at a strategic level25.

4.40 The flexibility in the policy for essential operational parking therefore supports sustainable development in London.

Draft Local Plan Policy

4.41 Policy T3 adds more qualitative requirements on essential drop-off or essential operational parking, sets out the quantitative requirements for wheelchair accessible parking, adds a ‘clean’ vehicle requirement for car clubs, strengthens the policy on car parks, and adds a new policy on electric vehicles and their associated on-street charging points.

4.42 The car free policy will apply to any housing units created through new build, change of use, conversion and subdivision of existing residential properties. However, some residents moving into car-free homes might face exceptional circumstances. For instance, existing residents in social rented housing with a parking permit, that return to a site after the development has been completed (such as with estate redevelopment).

4.43 Where occupiers are able to demonstrate exceptional circumstances, they may be allowed the right to keep a parking permit in line with the approach implemented to date.

4.44 The Car Free Policy seeks to re-balance space away from cars towards a transport system that is more space efficient, socially fair and sustainable. This approach is entirely compatible with the national and regional policy framework and principles of sustainable development, particularly in the context of a densely populated and

developed global city the size of London. As a Local Plan policy it has been successfully implemented since 2011 and is the only sustainable solution for Islington.

Car clubs background

4.45 Car-clubs provide an alternative to car ownership, and Islington has the highest membership in London, with 13,000 members having access to over 200 vehicles back in 2011 and every resident in Islington lives within 5 minutes of a car club car. In 2018, 19,000 car club memberships were registered in the borough – it is however worth noting that one person can have different membership with different providers, therefore the figure should not be read as equivalent to the number of people using car clubs. Car clubs offer a cheaper alternative to ownership when car use is occasional and non-urgent, but logistically they are unable to offer true ‘on-demand’ mobility.

4.46 In both rounds of consultation TfL City Planning stated that they do not support the installation of car club bays in the CAZ given high PTAL. TfL City Planning (R19.0183) reiterated this argument in their Regulation 19 consultation response, adding that car clubs in the CAZ have impacts in terms of road danger and congestion, and number of trips. This will be discussed further as a Statement of Common Ground.

4.47 Islington considers that car clubs do not replace public transport but car ownership. In that respect car clubs are an important measure to reduce car-ownership anywhere in the borough. In addition, Islington recognises that the transport network in London is not always accessible to all, therefore car clubs represent a good alternative to car ownership, especially to people with mobility impairments and families. Finally, the wider context of Islington’s Car Free policy and Transport Strategy, which support low traffic neighbourhoods provide assurances that car clubs will not encourage people into private motorised transportation.

4.48 As TfL suggests themselves, car clubs can benefit sustainable travel behaviours and reduce emissions. The CoMo 2019 annual survey of car clubs for London highlights that car clubs have the effect of reducing car ownership, reduce households’ annual car mileage, their members tend to use other shared mobility services (such as cycle hire schemes or dockless bikes). Car club members tend to use car modes less than the average London and car club cars in London have higher occupancy than private cars, improving cars’ efficiency; each round trip car club car replaces 10.5 vehicles removed from the road in the last 12 months.

4.49 All in all, given the long term context of car free development, the car free policy aids the car free policy implementation by reducing car ownership and enabling more people to move towards other forms of mobility.

27 Figure provided by operators, quarterly reports about usage and membership.
28 https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/car-clubs
29 https://como.org.uk/shared-mobility/shared-cars/why/
Electric vehicles charging points

Background

4.50 Charging points for electric vehicles must comply with the Streetbook SPD, minimise street clutter and combine functions with existing street furniture. This has materialised in Islington with the provision of charging points via existing lamp posts. Where possible, charging points should be provided on build-outs on the carriageway rather than on the footway, avoiding impact on pedestrian environment. The Streetbook guidance and British Standard 8300-2018 will be used to assess impact of new electric vehicle charging point proposals on the pedestrian environment.

Discussion

4.51 Electric vehicles (EVs) and hybrids represent an improvement in direct carbon emissions compared to internal combustion engine vehicles (ICEVs), although it is important to note that they still incur substantial energy costs in their manufacturing, not least via lithium mining for battery production. They also contribute to Particle Matter (PM) pollution through tyre and brake dust. In addition, electricity consumption is still carbon intensive, that is, until the electricity grid can be decarbonised.

4.52 It would be both unrealistic and undesirable to entirely eliminate car usage, so where cars are necessary, it would be beneficial for EVs to replace ICEVs. However, bullish estimates suggest EVs could make up 35% of global new car sales by 2040. Even

---

30 Islington Streets get new tranche of charge points in bid... Evening Standard, 15 July 2019  
https://www.standard.co.uk/futurelondon/cleanair/islington-streets-charge-points-clean-up-air-electric-a4190036.html

this high-end scenario does not foresee market dominance in the medium-to-long-term.

4.53 With that in mind, the Local Plan has adopted an enabling approach to public charging points for EVs.

4.54 Several Regulation 18 and Regulation 19 consultation responses (Cycle Islington Local Plan consultation reference R19.0154, Islington Living Streets R19.0121 and TfL City Planning) demanded EVCPs to be always located on the carriageway, away from footways. The policy is clear that charging points must be provided within parking spaces or not obstruct the pedestrian environment. Cycle Islington commented in their regulation 19 response that EVCPs should not conflict with future cycle infrastructure. The Council considers that a contextual approach based on the Streetbook SPD and working with planned cycle routes in mind allows the Council to install EVCPs sensitively, without hindering cycle movement.
5 Blue badge accessible car parking

Introduction and scope

5.1 Islington delivers wheelchair accessible car parking for residential and employment developments. The Council acknowledges that in spite of high levels of PTAL throughout Islington, the current transport network is not accessible to all, and for some disabled people the access to a blue badge parking bay ensures their autonomy and independence.

Policy Framework

National

5.2 The NPPF (February 2019) sets out that all developments should address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport (NPPF Paragraph 110.b). If setting local parking standards for developments, local authorities should amongst other things take into account the accessibility of the development and the availability of and opportunities for using public transport (NPPF Paragraph 105).

London

5.3 The London Plan (Intend to Public Version, December 2019, consolidated changes version) states in policy T6.1 part G that:

- Disabled persons parking should be provided for new residential developments. Residential development proposals delivering ten or more units must, as a minimum:
  - i) ensure that for three per cent of dwellings, at least one designated disabled persons parking bay per dwelling is available from the outset
  - ii) demonstrate as part of the Parking Design and Management Plan, how an additional seven per cent of dwellings could be provided with one designated disabled persons parking space per dwelling in future upon request as soon as existing provision is insufficient. This should be secured at the planning stage

All disabled persons parking bays associated with residential development must:

- i) be for residents’ use only (whether M4(2) or M4(3) dwellings)
- ii) not be allocated to specific dwellings, unless provided within the curtilage of the dwelling
- iii) be funded by the payment of a commuted sum by the applicant, if provided on street (this includes a requirement to fund provision of electric vehicle charging infrastructure)
- iv) count towards the maximum parking provision for the development
- v) be designed in accordance with the design guidance in BS8300 vol.1
vi) be located to minimise the distance between disabled persons parking bays and the
dwelling or the relevant block entrance or lift core, and the route should be preferably
level or where this is not possible, should be gently sloping (1:60-1:20) on a suitable
firm ground surface.

5.4 The London Plan (Intend to Public Version, December 2019) goes onto to state in
paragraph 10.6.9A that further information on how disabled persons parking should be
approached and delivered will be set out in guidance. The text also states that:

‘For car-free development, how provision will be made, including whether bays are
provided on-site or on-street, should be clearly set out and justified, in line with
relevant guidance and local policies.’ Table 10.6 establishes the residential and non-
residential parking standards for accessible parking.

Local adopted policy

5.5 Since 2013: DMP 8.5 has set out that wheelchair accessible car parking is required to
be provided in accordance with best practice standards. Paragraph 8.32 states that
‘On-street wheelchair accessible parking is encouraged, where appropriate, in
preference to on-site spaces. The developer shall identify, negotiate and pay for the
conversion of suitable bays. The amount payable will be determined based on a
standard cost of conversion. Where there is insufficient space to accommodate on-
street or on-site spaces, a financial contribution shall be made towards investment in
accessible transport initiatives, where it is considered that this would make
development acceptable in planning terms. Such a contribution may be made through
CIL or Section 106, as appropriate.’

5.6 Further guidance is set out in the Planning Obligations SPD and the Inclusive Design
SPD. The Planning Obligations SPD sets out that ‘the Council therefore seeks the
provision of one accessible parking bay, wherever possible on street, for every
wheelchair accessible home or hotel/hostel room provided (this should be 10% of total
units, in accordance with CS 12, CS 14 and the Accessible Housing SPD)’. This is
supplemented with further guidance in the Inclusive Design SPD which sets out detail
on the accessibility of parking.

5.7 This current guidance in the Obligations SPD is now being introduced into policy.

Background

5.8 In Islington, 3.3% of the population claims a disability living allowance (8,710 claimants
in 2017\footnote{32}), and 15.9% of people claim Attendance Allowance \footnote{33} – which is payable to
people over the age of 65 who are severely disabled, physically, mentally, or terminally
ill, and need a great deal of help with persona care or supervision. The Disability Living
Allowance is payable to children and adults in or out of work who are below the age of
65 and who are disabled, need help with personal care or have walking difficulties.

\footnote{32} State of Equalities in Islington, Annual report, 2018
\footnote{33} Source: Department for Work and Pensions, Feb 2019.
5.9 In addition to benefit claims, as of 2017, there was an estimated 30,600 people in Islington reporting disabilities such as mobility, dexterity and memory loss. These figures are based on a surveyed prevalence of 13% in an inner London Borough\textsuperscript{34}. 19% of working age adults have a disability\textsuperscript{35} and 51% of disabled people have a mobility impairment\textsuperscript{36}.

5.10 On 15 June 2019 the Department for Transport issued a new guidance to benefit those with less visible disabilities from the Blue Badge scheme, which will come into force on 30 August 2019. People with hidden disabilities will be able to access Blue Badge parking permits, for drivers or passengers with dementia, anxiety disorders or reduced mobility. Islington Council anticipates a significant increase in the number of applications for the blue badge scheme, increasing the demand for accessible parking bays. This policy therefore intends to deliver the required number whilst supporting accessible and sustainable transport alternatives.

5.11 Currently there are 8326 valid blue badges in Islington\textsuperscript{37}. With the new legislation the Council Traffic and Parking services estimate that there will be an addition 2500 more badges over a 3 year period as a result of the new legislation\textsuperscript{38}.

5.12 In the Local Plan, the Council acknowledges that the current transport network is inaccessible, not only through lack of step free access to train and underground services, and also in terms of parking standards that are often not wheelchair accessible. The policy is therefore based on an equitable approach that seeks to re-address an existing imbalance towards more accessibility.

5.13 To be consistent with Islington Planning Obligations SPD the dimensions for the accessible parking spaces should be as follows:

- designated on-street bays (for parallel parking) should be 6.6m long and 3.6m wide and located within 150m of the development (see figure 6.2). It must also be demonstrated that the location is safe and the bay deliverable.
- designated accessible bays within car parks (where bays are at right angles to the carriageway) should be 2.4m wide by 4.8m long with a zone 1.2m wide, provided between designated spaces and at the rear outside the traffic zone, to enable a disabled driver or passenger to get in or out of a vehicle and access the boot safely.
- standard car parking spaces (which are 2.4m by 4.8m) may also be designated for future enlargement (when the need arises) to 3.6m by 6.0m.

5.14 The accessible transport contribution has been implemented through policy since 2007. Between 2007 and 2019 the Council has collected 1.5 million through Section 106 agreements, of which £700,000 has been spent. Planning contributions are paid to the Planning Obligations team by developers. Meanwhile, the Council’s Parking team delivers a number of accessible parking bays, and receives the S106 money at the end of the financial year corresponding to the number of bays delivered.

\textsuperscript{34} State of Equalities in Islington, Annual report, 2018
\textsuperscript{35} Family resource survey 2016/17
\textsuperscript{36} Family resource survey 2016/17, Table 4.5
\textsuperscript{37} Source: Nasir Butt, Blue Badge Officer, Traffic and Parking services, Islington Council, 13 August 2019.
\textsuperscript{38} Idem.
Figure 5.1: Diagram 1028.4 types of parking bay, conventional dimensions. The traffic signs regulations and general directions, 2016. For comparison with spatial requirements for accessible parking.
Figures 5.2: British Standard 8300-2018-1, accessible parking provision spatial requirements

Discussion

5.15 Policy T3.G sets outs standards for residential and non-residential accessible parking. For residential use, accessible parking spaces must be provided based on 10% of the total residential units / bedspaces proposed. For employment uses, one accessible
parking space must be provided for every 33 employees. For other uses, the number of spaces must be proportionate to the number of building users. Spaces will only be made available for Blue Badge holders who live or work in the development linked to the parking space.

5.16 And paragraph 7.27 reads: Where it is not possible to deliver designated spaces on street, for example due to insufficient space or issues with amending Traffic Management Orders, a financial contribution should be made towards investment in other accessible or sustainable transport initiatives where appropriate, for example contributions to fund a scheme for transport users with mobility and/or sight impairments.

5.17 By bringing the Obligations SPD guidance into policy and the temporary use of parking bays for temporary uses, policy T3 G affirms Islington’s commitment to car free development, inclusive environments and support for alternative accessible transport options.

5.18 Only Blue Badge occupiers/employees will be eligible to use accessible parking spaces. Spaces will only be activated when demand materialises, either when a dwelling is occupied by a Blue Badge holder or a Blue Badge holder is employed. Provision must be in accordance with best practice standards, as set out in the Council’s Planning Obligations (Section 106) and Inclusive Design SPDs, and BS8300:2009.

5.19 Developments may also be required, through planning conditions or obligations, to provide adequate provision for mobility scooter storage and charging, safe drop off, and on occasion concessionary membership of local car clubs. It is also crucial that car-free developments, through their Design and Access Statements and Transport Assessments consider the full range of personal and public transport alternatives and their accessibility.

5.20 The Council considers that for a minority of residents, car ownership is essential, many more are making use of mobility scooters, cycles, taxi-card and or services such as ‘Dial a Ride’. The Council has no expectation that any accessible bays will be installed from the outset (only to remain vacant in perpetuity) but will expect developers to locate safe on street spaces that can be taken in and out of use. On the rare occasions where spaces must be identified on site then those bays should be designed in such a way that temporary uses (e.g. parklets/cycle storage, easily demountable) can be installed during periods when there is no demand from a resident blue badge holder. The temporary uses must be modular, easily moved to another place if needs be. The potential for the accessible parking bay can be realised at any moment in time.

5.21 For all uses, developers need to pay a contribution of £2000 per parking bay. This contribution is for 10% of all habitable rooms for residential developments, and for every 33 employees for commercial developments. For other uses, the Council seeks parking / a contribution to reflect the percentage of disabled users of the development.

5.22 TfL City Planning (R19.0183) responded to the Regulation 19 consultation that disabled parking bays need to comply with Table 10.6 which requests for major residential schemes that 3% of accessible parking bays are available from the outset, the remaining 7% provided in the future via a Parking Design Management Plan. TfL City Planning also pointed out that the London Plan (Intend to Public Version, December 2019) table 10.6 requires a 5% of accessible parking bays for non-residential uses, which would increase the number of bays / S106 contribution from 1
every 33 to 1 every 20 employees. TfL also supports the temporary use of bays as parklets or cycle storage. There will be further discussions around this as part of the Statement of Common Ground with TfL.

5.23 On the other hand, Islington Living Streets (R19.0121) responded at Regulation 19 consultation that the 10% requirement for residential uses seem very high considering the low level of car ownership among disabled people in Islington. Living Streets also questioned the temporary nature of parklets or cycle storage at paragraph 7.26. The temporary use is however not designed to transform standard parking bays temporarily, but rather to secure that blue badge parking bays remain available when a blue badge holder moves into a development, to accommodate their specific needs. As previously explained in this section, the Council considers that patterns of mobility for disabled people in Islington are supported by a myriad of services and devices, and that a minority of residents actually rely on a private car. To avoid parking bays remaining vacant in perpetuity, the Council expects developments to identify where accessible bays can be delivered, and that these bays come forward when a blue badge holder who owns a car moves into the development.
6 Cycle parking standards

Introduction and scope

6.1 This section provides justification for the new space quantum of cycle parking and increase in the proportion of accessible parking and introduces the possibility of where exceptions may apply in Islington with further design guidance set out. This cycle parking section of the topic paper is structured as follows:

- the existing Local Plan policy and background,
- the wider policy context,
- the evidence,
- the draft policy,
- the consultation responses.

Policy Framework

National

6.2 The National Planning Policy Framework states in the section for Promoting Sustainable Transport at paragraph 104 that planning policies should:

“Provide for high quality walking and cycle networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (drawing on Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans),”

The Planning Practice Guidance does not contain any further detail on provision of cycle parking facilities or their design.

London

6.3 The London Plan Policy T5 (Intend to Publish version, December 2019) aims to support the delivery of a London wide cycle network and provide cycle parking in line with minimum standards at Table 10.2.

6.4 The table sets minimum standards according to use class, long-stay and short-stay criteria. The London Plan cycle parking standards were first introduced in 2011, and iterated in the London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019) with increased provisions.

6.5 The London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019) also supports embedding inclusive design in all local planning policies, which provides a strong basis to improve cycle parking standards.

Adopted Local Policy
6.6 Policy DM8.4 sets out the requirement that major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions of 100m² or greater, are required to provide cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Appendix 6. Appendix 6 sets out minimum number of cycle parking spaces to be provided based on total floorspace of a proposal with different requirements of parking depending on the use class. The standards are identified for staff and visitors and on-site provision is required. DM8.4 makes clear that cycle parking is to be designed to best practice standards and be step-free and accessible amongst other design features. Parking for accessible cycles is also a requirement and residential cycle parking should include provision for cycle parking for family use. Further detail on design and meeting the standards is set out in Appendix 6.

6.7 The cycle parking standards are closely aligned with those set out in the current London Plan 2016 – standards which were first introduced in the 2011 London Plan.

Background

6.8 Provision of cycle parking facilities is the most popular answer to the question ‘cycling facilities that would encourage cycling’ and can be considered one of the barriers to cycling in London, especially amongst infrequent and new cyclists (TfL, Analysis of Cycling potential, 2010 and TfL Attitudes to Cycling, 2016, p.59). In 2016, respondents to TfL Attitudes to Cycling survey also quoted the fear of having their bike stolen as the third main barrier to cycling, just after “fear of being involved in a collision” and “too much traffic”.

6.9 The proportion of people cycling in the borough is likely to increase, as suggested by the London Strategic Cycling Analysis published in June 2017. Cycling in London has grown significantly over the past 15 years. There are now more than 670,000 cycle trips a day in London, an increase of over 130% since 2000. On average, cycling levels in the capital rose by 5.8% per year from 2000-2017, and there was an overall 24% increase between 2012 and 2017. There is evidence to support that new and upgraded infrastructure has accompanied cycling growth.

6.10 Islington’s population is increasingly diverse, with an ageing population and disabilities. In Islington, 3.3% of the population claims a disability living allowance (8,710 claimants in 2017), and 15.9% of people claim Attendance Allowance – which is payable to people over the age of 65 who are severely disabled, physically or mentally, and need a great deal of help with personal care or supervision. The Disability Living Allowance is payable to children and adults in or out of work who are below the age of 65 and who are disabled, need help with personal care or have walking difficulties.

6.11 In addition to benefit claims, as of 2017, there was an estimated 30,600 people in Islington reporting disabilities such as mobility, dexterity and memory loss. These figures are based on a surveyed prevalence of 13% in an inner London Borough.

---

41 Travel in London report 10, TfL, December 2017
43 State of Equalities in Islington, Annual report, 2018
45 State of Equalities in Islington, Annual report, 2018
6.12 Cycle parking also needs to be provided to meet the needs of family housing. Policy H2 sets out that developments should provide a good mix of housing sizes with Table 3.2: ‘Housing size mix priorities for each housing tenure’ indicating a high level of priority for family housing. Paragraph 3.33 clarifies that units of 2-bedrooms or more are considered to be family homes. Cycle parking therefore needs to be provided to respond to the needs of the housing mix and provide parking facilities for families.

6.13 Concern has been raised within the Council that the current quantitative requirements have sometimes led to undersized facilities, with racks that are not fit for purpose and little circulation space. The Council as a developer of social housing has first-hand experience of inferior design solutions.

6.14 In many instances racks have been provided as vertical or semi vertical. They pose a risk of injury to users, for instance if the cycle accidentally falls on to them, or if the user catches the sharp edges of the rack. Such racks are also not as secure as Sheffield stands, as attaching a chain to both wheels and frame is not necessarily possible, and the racks are not designed for widely used ‘D’ locks. The Council’s experience is that their advantage of ‘saving’ space leave little room for circulation, fails to meet the needs of users of non-standard cycles or people with less dexterity, and end up not being used to their capacity, leaving a ‘dead’ space where litter and leaves accumulate.

6.15 The current ‘per rack’ criteria have not delivered on quality. In many cases, applicants have tried to meet the minimum standards in the Development Management policies by delivering ‘space efficient’ solutions which have produced facilities with little circulation and inaccessible cycle racks.
Figure 6.1: Holly Park, N4. The mesh cage leaves cycles vulnerable to robbery, whilst the semi vertical racks are inaccessible. There is no circulation space in the store and leaves are accumulating underneath the cage.
The solution that was considered most appropriate was a ‘square meterage’ as well as a number of racks, for different categories of use. This way, the requirements can be both read as ‘per rack’ and spatially.

**Inclusive Design and cycling**

6.17 The Council commissioned Wheels for Wellbeing in October 2019 for a policy review work on accessible cycle parking. The policy is based on the suggestion that around 20% of the population has a disability, therefore development should provide a 20% of accessible parking.

6.18 In October 2018, the Council hosted an inclusive cycling day facilitated by Pedal Power and Wheels for Wellbeing. The session gathered Islington council planning officers, transport planning officers, public realm engineers. The day helped evidencing the need for more inclusive infrastructure in the borough, including cycle parking.

6.19 ‘A guide to inclusive cycling’ from Wheels for Wellbeing (Nov 2017) states that ‘there are very few cycle parking facilities designed to accommodate non-standard cycles. Almost all cycle parking stands (e.g. the Sheffield Stand) are intended for use by standard two-wheeled bicycles and are generally placed too close to each other to fit a three-wheeled cycle between them.’

6.20 From a 2011 survey led by Wheels for Wellbeing, it appeared that 13% of respondents in Islington who cycle have a disability, and use their cycles as mobility aids.
6.21 In addition, an ever growing proportion of people in London use cargo-bikes as a means of family mobility, or for delivery. For instance, in the context of the Ultra-Low Emission Zone, cargo bikes and e-cargo bikes are an ever more attractive alternative to vans for deliveries, as they are exempt from the charges. London Bridge Improvement District (BID) has for instance launched in April 2019 the Bikes for Business\textsuperscript{46} scheme which helps companies identify which cycle services are best suited to their needs, linking them to operators. The scheme is supported by TfL. In regards to family mobility, new operators provide options, from Pedal Me\textsuperscript{47}, Peddle My Wheels\textsuperscript{48}, CarryMe Bike\textsuperscript{49}s, London Green Cycles\textsuperscript{50}, etc.

6.22 With this growing popularity and increasing relevance to keep London moving, cargo bikes need to be incorporated in parking standards, as they more space than traditional bicycles.

\begin{figure}
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{cargo_bike_parking}
\caption{Cargo bike parking}
\end{figure}

\textsuperscript{46} Bike for Business scheme, Team London Bridge, launched in the Spring of 2019. \url{https://www.teamlondonbridge.co.uk/bikesforbusiness}
\textsuperscript{47} \url{https://pedalme.co.uk/}
\textsuperscript{48} \url{https://www.peddlemywheels.com/}
\textsuperscript{49} \url{https://www.carryme.org.uk/}
\textsuperscript{50} \url{https://www.londongreencycles.co.uk/}
Discussion

Policy T2: Sustainable Transport Choices sets out the following in part E:

E. All new developments in the borough must be designed to incentivise cycling by:

(iii) providing cycle parking and association circulation space for ease of use of cycle parking, in accordance with Appendix 4;

6.23 The spatial standard is based on the minimum set out by the London Plan, therefore this topic paper does not justify the 'space per' quantum. Appendix 4: Cycle Parking Standards in the Local plan sets out the standard and guidance on their implementation. It is worth noting that the Intend to Publish version of the London Plan (December 2019) is setting out slightly different minimum standards for cycle parking, in particular for student accommodation and for Specialist Older People Housing, following recommendations included in the London Plan Inspector’s report (October 2019). The Councils intention is to align with the London Plan minimum requirements and will seek to include changes to reflect this as part of any modifications to the Local Plan.

6.24 The previous Development Management policies did not comprise a standard for visitors and customers (also referred to as 'short stay parking'). Such parking is now included in the new cycle parking standards table, as it differs from staff and resident ('long stay') parking. Indeed, short stay parking can be provided within the public realm on a development, whereas long stay parking must be secure and sheltered.

6.25 The proposed requirement for short stay parking matches the requirements for the draft London Plan.

6.26 The proposed process to implement the policy is a two-stage one:

- The requirement establishes the minimum provision of racks per Use Category.
- This minimum is then translated into a quantum of space with two components that must be allocated to cycle parking.

6.27 For calculation purposes, the spatial requirement for cycle parking will include 2 components:

a. A space for the parked cycle itself, based on the amount of space needed for cycle along a Sheffield Stand. From this, it is determined that 1m² should be provided per cycle for standard cycles. 2m² should be provided per adapted cycles. The diagram below is based on the recommended cycle parking space requirements set out in Hackney Cycle Parking Guidance, 2014 and Cambridge City Council Cycle Parking

---

Guide for new residential developments, 2010\textsuperscript{52}. The minimum spacing between Sheffield stands must be 1000mm. This is always measured from the centre line of the stand. Aisles between rows of Sheffield stands are important to allow users to access the stands with their bike.

![Diagram of cycle parking layout with measurements 2000x1000mm for two cycles. Source: Hackney Cycle Parking Guidance, 2014](image)

Figure 6.4: Standard minimum: 2000x1000mm for two cycles. Source: Hackney Cycle Parking Guidance, 2014

![Diagram showing aisle width and clearance to walls. Source: Hackney Cycle Parking Guidance, 2014](image)

Figure 6.5: Aisle width and clearance to walls. Source: Hackney Cycle Parking Guidance, 2014

b. Circulation Space. In addition to the space required for parked cycles, applicants will need to demonstrate that they have integrated enough circulation space for the facilities. Circulation space must enable all users an ease of movement and

\textsuperscript{52} https://www.cambridge.gov.uk/media/6771/cycle-parking-guide-for-new-residential-developments.pdf
manoeuvre, so that they can enter the facility, reverse, and navigate as required. The space required for circulation will vary according to the layout of each facility, however the Council will expect generous circulation space as a feature of high quality provision. The appropriate amount of circulation space will vary on a case by case basis though and depend on the design itself, the mix of racks used and the layout of the storage room. Figure x below provides example of circulation. It is worth noting that the London Cycling Design Standard Chapter 8 notes that circulation space should amount to at least 20% of the total space provided\(^\text{53}\). LCDS and other design guidance will be material to Appendix 4.

For accessible cycle parking designers should incorporate the needs of people cycling a tricycle used as a mobility aid.

\[\text{Minimum dimensions for circulation. Source: Transport Initiatives.}\]

\[\text{6.28 The spatial standard will be used to ensure a minimum provision of cycle parking in floorspace terms which provides a qualitative element to provision. This will be relaxed where exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. Paragraph 6 sets out that where a policy compliant level of accessible parking and circulation space can be provided but the total space remains below the minimum level there will need to be maximisation of parking including use of racks for example.}\]

\[^{53}\text{http://content.tfl.gov.uk/lcds-chapter8-cycleparking.pdf}\text{ p21}\]
6.29 The following aspects of quality have been provided as guidance to support applicants in the design of cycle parking facilities and will be considered where overall insufficient parking spaces are provided.

**Accessible Locations**

6.30 The location of cycle facilities is crucial to encourage their use and allow more people to cycle.

- Facilities should be located close to main access road and building entry/exit points.
- Visitor cycle parking should be easy to find.
- Cycle parking should not be sited where it will obstruct passing pedestrians or vehicles.
- Facilities should be accessible and easy to use, with no inconvenient detours, steep slopes or narrow access ways. The facilities should be step free and convenient for residents and visitors of any age or mobility, without the need to lift or drag the cycle.

6.31 To adapt to a changing and ever-more diverse population, the Council has developed a principled approach to inclusive design with policies that focus on versatility and adaptability.

6.32 These ambitions need to translate into cycle parking provision, to accommodate people that have different level of dexterity, and different types of cycles, from conventional bicycles, to tricycles, hand-powered cycles or cargo bikes.

**Guidance on delivery of quality Inclusive Cycle Parking**

### Inclusive Cycle Parking guidance

![Figure 6.6: Photograph of a tricycle. Source: Wheels for Wellbeing.](image)

6.33 Where only a small quantity of cycle parking is provided, care should be taken to ensure a suitable minimum of parking for non-standard cycles is provided e.g. by
providing space for parking at the end of a row of Sheffield stands. Below 20 spaces, at least one accessible rack should be provided.

6.34 All new cycle parking facilities above 20 spaces should provide at least 20% accessible cycle parking spaces, of which 25% must be designated for non-standard cycles and 75% for ambulant disabled cyclists using regular cycles. All accessible cycle parking spaces should be clearly marked and reserved for the priority use of disabled cyclists. Clear and appropriate contact detail signage should be provided for the manager of the facility so cycle users are able to raise queries. The Council believes that the 75% / 25% split balances the needs for people with mobility impairments, and the growing proportion of people who use non-standard cycles for mobility issues, family mobility or professional delivery purposes.

6.35 Cycle parking suitable for families should also be provided as part of the 20%. This may include parking that can accommodate trailers for children, and is required at least in relation to family-sized units i.e. residential units with three or more bedrooms.

6.36 Cycle parking shall accommodate accessible cycle parking spaces for all types of non-standard cycle, such as tricycles and recumbents, which are most commonly used by disabled cyclists. Accessible cycle parking spaces shall be served by a route at least 1,500mm in width and the spaces shall be wider than standard cycle parking spaces. Accessible cycle parking ensures clear access within cycle parking installations for anyone using a larger cycle such as a tricycle, cargo cycles and these cyclists should have priority use. Such spaces could be provided at the end of a rack of cycle parking and must be floor standing.

6.37 Cycle parking for non-standard cycles has the same characteristics as accessible cycle parking plus they should be provided at the end of a rack of cycle parking, in order to accommodate for the wider turning circles of non-standard cycles and to allow for dismounting. Where possible, non-standard cycle parking bays should allow people on non-standard cycles to ride into and out of the bay (meaning no need for reversing, turning or lifting a cycle). Signage should be put in place that clearly denotes ‘non-standard’ cycle parking allocated for non-standard cycles (e.g. “Reserved for cargo and non-standard cycles. Priority to disabled cyclists”).

Figure 6.6: Disabled cyclist using a hand-powered tricycle as mobility aid. Source: Wheels for Wellbeing.
Guidance on stands and racks.

6.38 The main aim is to provide cycle storage and parking positions that are practically useful for the majority of people to fully secure their cycle to, with convenient ease of access and avoiding risks of personal injury when manoeuvring the bicycle. The needs of all users should be considered. It is noted that some types of cycle storage equipment can deter or exclude potential users, while others can be positioned so as to undermine ease of access.
6.39 The majority of cycle racks should be delivered as Sheffield stands. The remaining part can be delivered through alternative racks depending on the context.

**Sheffield stands**

6.40 One of the most widely used designs for cycle storage and parking are Sheffield stands. These are always floor standing, so are easy to use and to secure bicycles to, for the majority of people. They provide maximum security, as bicycle frames and both wheels can be secured to the stand. This is our recommended cycle storage / parking solution for all types of cycle storage shelters or rooms and for visitor cycle parking. Sheffield stands for standard racks should be placed parallel to each other and at least 100cm (3 feet 3 inches) apart to ensure that each stand can accommodate two bicycles with ease of access from either side.

**Vertical racks**

6.41 These are fitted to walls and use less space than Sheffield stands. However, each vertical rack position can only accommodate one bicycle and they are not useable by everyone, as they require lifting the bicycle fully off the ground and the fixings are usually at a height of around 1.5m (5 feet) or more. Many people cannot do this or find it difficult, with a possible risk of injury. In addition, vertically mounted racks are often designed for one specific type of bicycle which has a road-bike light frame, with associated slender wheels. It cannot accommodate heavier cycles with wider wheels, mudguards and other accessories such as a child’s seat. Wall racks are also less secure than Sheffield stands, as it is not as practical to secure a bicycle to an upright rack. Vertical racks should also be fixed at varying heights, with a proportion of those provided being no more than 1.2m (4 feet) high, for use by children or for children’s bicycles. Vertical racks are not suitable for visitor cycle parking.

**Diagonal racks**

6.42 These are free standing and occupy similar space to Sheffield stands, but require the same height as wall racks and, like wall racks, accommodate less bicycles than Sheffield stands. They are slightly easier to use than vertical racks, because the wheels can be slid into position. However, to do this the user has to take most of the bicycles weight and many people cannot do this, or find it difficult, with possible risks of injury.

**Multi-level cycle racks**

6.43 This type of cycle storage is power-assisted and requires headroom of at least 3m (10 feet). Due to the installation and maintenance costs and required headroom this type of facility is not recommended for resident or visitor use. It could however be located within office schemes or at transport interchange locations.

**Towards a spatial standard**
6.44 Indicative table for spatial requirements:

Calculation example: a new development for B1 (office) use, of 10,000sqm:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Requirement</th>
<th>Recommended</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total long stay parking</td>
<td>134 spaces</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accessible parking (20%)</td>
<td>27 spaces</td>
<td>54sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard parking</td>
<td>107 spaces</td>
<td>107sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visitor parking</td>
<td>20 spaces</td>
<td>20sqm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulation space</td>
<td></td>
<td>Context dependent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>181sqm in total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6.45 NB: this calculation is for the space required for parked cycles only, which excludes the circulation space. Circulation space must enable all users an ease of movement and manoeuvre, so that they can enter the facility, reverse, and navigate as required. The space required for circulation will vary according to the layout of each facility, however the Council will expect spaciousness and high quality provision.

Discussion

6.46 One resident in their Regulation 18 consultation response said that the provision of cycle places for residential use was too low and unambitious, particularly for families. This resident also suggested that when cycle parking cannot be delivered, a contribution from a developer could be accepted to secure on street cycle shelters. The Council’s spatial approach to cycle parking will guarantee an amount of space which is flexible to the needs of residents, which will lead to better quality, more usable provision. The suggestion of a contribution would conflict with CIL, particularly if contributions would be pooled to pay for hangars elsewhere in borough, which would have to be the case as it couldn’t be guaranteed that hangar provision could be installed ad hoc outside new development.
6.47 TfL City Planning responded to the Regulation 18 consultation to request the addition of short stay cycle parking standards.

6.48 In their Regulation 19 response, TfL City Planning (R19.0183) requested that the standard for cycle parking is based on GEA instead of GIA, which will be amended.

6.49 TfL also added that the cycling policy should include a mention that Islington will support the maintenance and expansion of the TfL cycle hire scheme at a level proportionate to the size of developments.

6.50 TfL City Planning would welcome further conversations to discuss the Regulation 19 spatial standard and how the requirements were calculated. All these points will be further discussed as part of the Statement of Common Ground with TfL.

6.51 Peabody Group (Local Plan consultation references R19.0178 and R19.0130) responded to the Regulation 19 consultation to say that the 20% of accessible cycle parking would lead to the prioritisation of quantity over quality, and result in waste, underused cycle parking facilities. As cycle parking facilities are often located at ground floor level, they would lead to a reduced active frontage, with negative impacts on the public realm. The Council’s response is that Peabody misunderstood the objectives of the spatial approach, which is a far more qualitative way of delivering cycle parking. The amount of accessible cycle parking was recommended by leading organisation Wheels for Wellbeing and has the support of TfL City Planning. Inclusive cycle parking is also in line with the London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019) which supports embedding inclusive design in Local Plans. Furthermore, not all ground floor is used for active frontage, and locating such parking at ground floor would arguably incentivise cycle use, increasing comfort, legibility and convenience for all.

6.52 It is worth noting that in order to apply the new spatial approach, the Council has reviewed their existing cycling parking standards to align them on the minimum standards of the London Plan (Intend to Publish version, December 2019). Numerically, this means that the Council has reduced its minimum standards, however it is hoped that the spatial requirements will significantly increase the quality of what is being delivered.
7 Travel Plans

Introduction and scope

7.1 Developments across Islington have an impact on the capacity of the road network, public transport capacity and walking and cycling infrastructure. These impacts need to be understood individually and cumulatively before, during and after implementation. This section clarifies the function travel plans play in mitigating transport impacts from developments.

Policy Framework

National

7.2 The NPPF states in paragraph 111 that:

'All developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement or transport assessment so that the likely impacts of the proposal can be assessed.'

London

7.3 The New London Plan states at T4 – assessing and mitigating transport impacts that:

A. Development Plans and development proposals should reflect and be integrated with current and planned transport access, capacity and connectivity.

B. When required in accordance with national or local guidance, transport assessments/statements should be submitted with development proposals to ensure that impacts on the capacity of the transport network (including impacts on pedestrians and the cycle network), at the local, network-wide and strategic level, are fully assessed. Transport assessments should focus on embedding the Healthy Streets Approach within, and in the vicinity of, new development. Travel Plans, Parking Design and Management Plans, Construction Logistics Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans will be required in accordance with relevant Transport for London guidance. Where appropriate, mitigation, either through direct provision of public transport, walking and cycling facilities and highways improvements or through financial contributions, will be required to address adverse transport impacts that are identified.

C. Where the ability to absorb increased travel demand through active travel modes has been exhausted, existing public transport capacity is insufficient to allow for the travel
generated by proposed developments, and no firm plans and funding exist for an increase in capacity to cater for the increased demand, planning permission will be contingent on the provision of necessary public transport and active travel infrastructure.

D. The cumulative impacts of development on public transport and the road network capacity including walking and cycling, as well as associated effects on public health, should be taken into account and mitigated.

E. Development proposals should not increase road danger.

** Adopted Local Policy **

7.4 Policy DM8.2.B sets out that development proposals are required to include the submission of either a Transport Assessment and Travel Plan, or a Transport Statement and Local Level Travel Plan, in accordance with the thresholds outlined in Appendix 5. This is to meet the transport needs of developments and address transport impacts in a sustainable manner and in accordance with best practice.

** Background **

7.5 Travel Plans imply thinking around sustainable transport from developers before, through and after implementation, minimising impacts of developments on the environment.

7.6 This exercise, combined with the spatial requirements for cycle parking or accessible parking, provides a range of initiatives to meet sustainable travel targets. In the instance of a major scheme like City North (approved in 2010), the Travel Plan\(^{54}\) provided marketing, users groups, car club, etc. Another scheme, Canaletto Tower, approved in 2012 (planning application reference P112819), provides a folding bicycle per dwelling, following their Travel Plan targets, and funded a sustainable travel officer role.

** Discussion **

7.7 The Draft Local Plan Policy T1A sets out that development proposals must take into account the link between land use, transport accessibility and connectivity, and promoting journeys by physically active means, like walking or cycling (known as active travel). Applicants must provide appropriate information to allow proper assessment of transport impacts and show how these impacts can be addressed, as set out in Appendix 3.

7.8 In January 2019, TfL City Planning responded to the Local Plan Review Regulation 18 consultation:

> The thresholds for Transport Assessments and Travel Plans in Table A3.1 are acceptable in principle to TfL. However, Travel Plans and Delivery and Servicing Plans will change in 2019, much like Transport Assessments. Our pre-application services

---

are changing now as they do not currently reflect Vision Zero and the Healthy Streets Approach.

The section on ‘Full Travel Plans / Local Level Travel Plans’ including Table A3.2 should therefore be removed. If the Council is genuinely dedicating resource to monitoring and enforcing travel plans, and can provide evidence of them achieving positive results, we would welcome further discussions. Whilst we support Travel Plans in principle, they do not currently appear to be acting as ‘the key management tool for implementing any transport solutions highlighted by the Transport Assessment’ or ‘primary tools for mitigating negative transport impacts of development proposals’ based on our own experiences and recent investigations. The Local Plan should acknowledge that Travel Plans require improvement and refer applicants to our website for further guidance next year.

7.9 Islington’s approach is to keep a standard for which Travel Plans or travel assessments are necessary, and demand from applicants’ commitment and holistic thinking over how their development will impact the transport network. In this respect, the purpose of travel plans goes beyond the monitoring element, to influence positively applicants’ thinking about transport related issues. The Council will explore further conversations with TfL on Travel Plans via the Statement of Common Ground.

7.10 If Travel Plans become superseded by a new method for transport assessment that incorporates Vision Zero and Healthy Streets, the policy will still remain in place as it provides the Council with the tools to ask applicants relevant requirements. The policy and Appendix indeed provides flexibility to incorporate Vision Zero and Healthy Streets:

Travel Plans must reflect the Council’s priority sustainable transport modes and support active travel. The submitted information is required to be sufficiently detailed and accurate to enable the Council to fully assess the development proposal. This may include traffic modelling to demonstrate that development proposals will not have an impact (individually or cumulatively) on the flow of traffic. A road safety audit/assessment may also be necessary on specific schemes. The Travel Plan/Local Level Travel Plan must inform other documentation submitted as part of a planning application, including Design and Access Statements, as part of a holistic approach to ensure that inclusive or specific transport options are available to meet the needs of all users, including disabled people.

7.11 The Appendix 3 further clarifies:

Transport Assessments are required to assess the impact of proposals on all relevant transport infrastructure, including the capacity of roads, public transport and walking and cycling infrastructure, and to detail action to manage this impact. They are required to 294 present qualitative and quantitative information about the anticipated transport and related environmental impacts before, during and after implementation of the proposed development, including details of the accessibility of the site by all transport modes and all users, including disabled people, and the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site.

7.12 The Appendix also explains that the list of documents requested by the Council for travel plans include context, policy, site assessments, travel survey / trip generation, objectives, targets, travel plan management, measures – however the list is not exhaustive and the Council may require further information depending on the circumstances of the development. The fact that the list is not exhaustive gives
flexibility to the Council to request specific elements, such as, for instance, a Healthy Streets check.

7.13 In addition, the Council’s Public Realm team is investing in the STARSfor platform to manage active travel plans for estates, schools and businesses. The platform manages baseline and ongoing travel surveys, logs active travel activities and monitors modal shift to meet different levels of accreditation. The Travel Plan policy can be used to encourage businesses and other organisations to take part in STARSfor, as a requirement of the travel plan.

7.14 All in all, the Travel Plan ensures that proposals take into account the crucial link between land use, transport accessibility and connectivity, and promoting journeys by physically active means, like walking or cycling.
8 APPENDIX 1: Wheels for Wellbeing review of Islington’s cycle parking policy
A review of the London Borough of Islington’s cycling policies

Overview

Wheels for Wellbeing is an inclusive cycling charity based in Brixton, south London. We are a grassroots disability organisation, running five sessions a week at our three inclusive cycling hubs. Using any of our fleet of over 200 cycles (handcycles, tandems, tricycles, recumbents, wheelchair cycles, side-by-sides and bicycles) disabled people of all ages can discover or rediscover cycling, whilst enjoying its health and wellbeing benefits. Every year around 1,200 disabled people, aged from 18 months to 99 years-old, cycle at our hubs. We are also a campaigning organisation and are increasingly recognised as the voice of disabled cyclists in the UK. As part of our campaigning and policy work, we provide technical advice, practical training and consultancy to transport professionals and local authorities who want to ensure that their policies meet the needs of disabled cyclists, as per the Public Sector Equality Duty (PSED) and Equality Act 2010.

We have been commissioned by the London Borough of Islington to undertake a review of the Borough’s draft Local Plan. As part of this review we have agreed to examine, and make recommendations for, the following:

- The Borough’s draft cycling policies, as laid out in their new Local Plan, and to make practical suggestions to improve these policies;
- The Borough’s accessible cycle parking standards (Appendix 6 of Development Management policies), including the figures for the provision of cycle parking; and
- To provide inclusive cycling imagery for the Borough’s future Inclusive Design Supplementary Planning Document.

In summary, the Borough’s cycling policies are highly inclusive, often going to great lengths to ensure the needs of disabled cyclists are taken into account. We have suggested that several policies need greater clarity and detail, or expanding upon. In some cases, we have simply suggested a change of wording/language, in order to make the tone of policies more inclusive.
Review of draft cycling policies in new Local Plan

Summary of recommendations:

- To take a less prescriptive approach to the design of the transport hierarchy, recognising the fact that many disabled people find cycling easier than walking
- To consider piloting a disabled cyclist’s ‘Blue Badge’ scheme, which would give disabled cyclists a valuable form of identification and afford them exemptions
- To consider the concept of Dutch-style ‘mobility lanes’, which are accessible by bicycles, non-standard cycles and mobility scooters alike

Recommendations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1: Strategic Approach to Transport</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>B. The design of developments, including building design and internal layout, site layout, public realm and the provision of transport infrastructure, must prioritise practical, safe and convenient access and use by people according to the following hierarchy:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) Walking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) Cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iii) Public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(iv) Freight, logistics and delivery vehicles where necessary, according to the principles and requirements set out in this policy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment [a11]: Transport hierarchy. We welcome the fact that, since the last iteration of Islington’s LIP, cycling appears to have moved up the hierarchy to supersede public transport.

Nonetheless, we would caution against the use of an overly prescriptive framework (particularly where the needs of disabled people as transport users are concerned).

For example, though disabled people are most commonly seen as taxi, private car hire or public transport users, very seldom are they considered to be cyclists (or potential cyclists). Therefore, any such hierarchy of transport must take this into account. What’s more, research conducted by Wheels for Wellbeing has shown that 69% of disabled cyclists find cycling easier than walking, with many using their cycle as a mobility aid.
A. All pedestrian and cycling infrastructure and facilities are required to be designed in accordance with relevant guidance and/or latest best practice standard and improving the comfort and safety of all users.

B. Discouraging the use of ‘shared space’ to try to jointly meet the needs of people walking and cycling. Shared space is considered to be inappropriate and will not be supported in new developments. Exceptions to this principle will only be accepted if a proposal is highly sensitive to its context and offers a bespoke solution.

C. All new developments in the borough must be designed to incentivise walking by:
   (i) Delivering public realm improvement that are secure, safe, legible, inclusive and permeable environments;
   (ii) Resisting proposals that have a negative effect on public realm; and
   (iii) Ensuring that pedestrian crossings are convenient and avoiding where appropriate complex, long and guard railing pedestrian crossing.
   (iv) Ensuring convenient and continuous routes for pedestrian and cyclists that follow desire lines and form networks.

D. All new developments in the borough must be designed to incentivise cycling by:
   (i) The council will resist schemes requiring cyclists and pedestrians to share the same space creating unnecessary conflict, wherever they can be avoided.
   (ii) It must be demonstrated that there are no road safety conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles entering, parking and servicing a development. Cyclist entrances to buildings, cycle stores and parking must be safe and convenient for all. Separate cycle lanes should be demarcated. Major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions greater than 100sqm are required to provide:
   (iii) cycle parking in accordance with the minimum standards set out in Appendix X Cycling, relevant supplementary guidance and/or any other relevant Mayoral strategy; and
   (iv) end-of-trip facilities for cyclists, at a level proportionate to the size of the development and the required level of cycle parking.
   (v) Cycling infrastructure including parking should be inclusive and accessible for all and be designed to accommodate all types of non-standard cycle, such as tricycles and cargo bikes. Reference should be made to the Inclusive Cycle concept in LCDS.

Comment [a2]: This goes beyond the proposals recently outlined by the Government. Is this policy aimed at local streets and housing, or more major developments?

On shared space schemes as a concept:
Wheels for Wellbeing is generally opposed to shared space schemes that force a mix of cars, cyclists and pedestrians to interact. Such schemes do not fully take into account the needs of cyclists and we are concerned that visually impaired pedestrians could also encounter difficulties and will be deterred from venturing through such places. People using wheelchairs and mobility scooters are allowed to ride in pedestrianised areas at a maximum speed of 4mph. Public awareness and acceptance of this is widespread - it is a normal, everyday practice. Many disabled people use their cycle as a mobility aid, and so we would like to see police use discretion and permit disabled cyclists to ride on footways, in pedestrianised areas and in ‘cyclists dismount’ zones where possible; or any other space that would otherwise permit wheelchair or mobility scooter users (e.g. train concourses, shopping centres).

Comment [NA3]: ‘Blue Badge’ scheme for disabled cyclists:
Local authorities should consider the option of designing and piloting a disabled cyclists’ Blue Badge scheme in their area. The purpose of such a scheme would be to give disabled cyclists a valuable form of identification, which could be used to:
(a) Permit disabled cyclists to cycle considerately in non-cycling areas (such as ‘cyclists dismount’ zones) when using their cycle as a mobility aid
(b) Reserve allocated cycle parking spaces that have been designed for use by non-standard cycles. Such a scheme could be developed in collaboration with local police forces, CCGs, community and disability groups.
8.2.1 The Local Plan promotes sustainable transport choices in order to mitigate the impact of developments on the environment, improve air quality, reduce health impacts, respond to congestion affecting roads and public transport, and promote healthier lifestyles. In addition, walking and cycling should be designed to meet the council’s Inclusive Landscape SPD and Streetbook SPD, and the Department of Transport Document Inclusive Mobility. Best practice should be defined at the time of submission of the planning application, based on up to date guidance from recognised organisations.

8.2.2 Walking is the priority mode of transport in the transport hierarchy. Development proposals should be designed from the outset to facilitate walking to and from the development.

8.2.3 Pedestrian crossings should be designed to be convenient, accessible and inclusive for people to use. Staged, long and complex crossing arrangements is considered not ideal in this situation. Attention has to be made for making pedestrian crossing shorter and quicker to use where appropriate. This also includes avoiding the use of guard railing wherever appropriate. Road junctions be designed to cater for the ease of pedestrian crossing. Attention should be paid to the effects of changes in surface and level on pedestrian crossings, with flush kerbs and easy transitions preferred to drop kerbs which present a challenge to users propelling themselves on wheels, such as wheelchairs and others using mobility aids.

8.2.4 As a borough on the edge of central London with a relatively flat topography, there is scope to improve cycle ridership levels, with road safety improvements such as vehicle/cycle segregation and the promotion of quiet and cleaner routes for walking and cycling. The council will ensure that new development contributes effectively to enabling the borough’s cycling potential to be met, in a way that meets the needs of all residents and visitors. The Streetbook SPD provides further guidance on this. The council supports Transport for London cycling infrastructure improvements that adhere to guiding principles and achieve the good design outcomes set out in the London Cycling Design Standards.

8.2.4.1 For those with limited mobility, a mobility aid (which may be a mobility scooter, cycle or other device) can be key to meeting their door to door transport needs. Cycle infrastructure should be designed in an inclusive way and incorporate support for the wider range of cycles and similar devices that may be used to support independent mobility. Inclusive design of cycle routes pays particular attention to surface quality, camber, transitions, forms of segregation and traffic calming. In many cases these devices provide a better form of mobility than walking and enable people to avoid using walking oriented infrastructure.

8.2.5 Transport for London’s Strategic Cycling Analysis 2017 has identified Kentish Town to Wood Green via Archway going up Junction Road, and Camden Town to Tottenham Hale via Nag’s Head on Seven Sisters Road as two of their top priority cycling connection routes with the greatest potential for shifting journeys towards cycling. The SCA recommends further study to investigate potential improvements.
8.2.6 Cycle Parking should be provided for all publicly accessible uses. Publicly accessible uses include, but are not limited to, uses within the A1 (shops), A2 (financial and professional services), A3 (restaurants and cafés), D1 (non-residential institutions) and D2 (assembly and leisure) Use Classes. Development proposals featuring any of the above uses must to include provision for facilities to park and store cycles in accordance with the Appendix X. In order to give developers certainty on consistency of standards across London. These standards are repeated below in table X for ease of reference.

8.2.7 End of trip facilities such as showers and changing facilities are essential in order to promote cycling as a legitimate mode of transport, especially for travel to workplaces. It is important to remember that such facilities should be fully accessible.

8.2.8 The lack of secure and accessible cycle parking is commonly recognised as one of the main barriers to cycling. Cycle parking should be accessible to disabled cyclists and other users of non-standard cycles (e.g. family cyclists). Major developments must provide cycle parking that will accommodate accessible cycle parking spaces for all types of non-standard cycle. All cycle parking facilities shall be step-free and use as few doors as possible. Explicit consideration should be given to the accessibility of cycle route to ensure that disabled cyclists are not discriminated against. Cycle parking should also consider that people may only need to store a portion of their mobility aid (e.g. a handcycle that may attach to a wheelchair).

8.2.9 Major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions of 100sqm or greater shall provide at least one accessible cycle parking space designated for an accessible bicycle (such as a tricycle), where the rider has priority use. In major schemes an additional accessible cycle parking space shall be provided for every 25 cycle parking spaces (or part thereof) and at least 1 space shall be provided as a minimum.

8.2.10 Accessible cycle parking spaces shall be served by a route at least 1,500mm in width avoiding sharp, 90 degree bends; the route must utilise doors that do not require strength to open (e.g. automatic doors, or doors with dampers to help slow their closing). Consecutive doors should be avoided and where they do occur they should be at least far enough apart to allow doors to be negotiated separately. A good approach is to keep at least 5m between doors. Ramps should be gentle (no more than 1 in 12, preferably 1 in 20), and where lengthy changes in elevation are necessary lifts are preferred and should be cycle through and direct from street level to parking locations (and be able to be used, without dismounting, by users of non-standard cycles). and the spaces shall be wider than standard cycle parking spaces. Such spaces could be provided at the end of a rack of cycle parking but only where this doesn’t result in them being less accessible than other parking to the destination. Spaces which have been designated for disabled cyclists should be clearly marked showing their reservation for this purpose.

8.2.11 Cycle parking suitable for families should also be provided for family sized homes. This may include parking that can accommodate trailers/cargo bikes for children.
The requirements for trailers and cargo bikes is similar to that for accessible cycles except that it places extra emphasis on length. This further places emphasis on the need to avoid excessive doors and turns in the path from the entry to the parking for these users.

8.2.12 Mobility scooters and charging points shall be located in an appropriate place within the development, such as a ground floor space next to the lifts. Comment [a110]: Lifts should be capable of carrying mobility scooters. Indeed, a weakness here and elsewhere at present is that there is a need to consider the need to charge e-cycles as well, and that for someone who relies on a mobility aid – especially where it is expensive – it is likely that it will be wanted to be brought direct into the home.

Thought should also be given to the possibility of the co-location of disabled car and cycle parking bays, as well as family car and cycle parking bays.
Review of Accessible Cycle Parking Standards

Summary of recommendations:

- Inclusive high density cycle parking provision: two tier racks are the only form of cycle parking which requires (partially) lifting a bike that should be acceptable and even then the quality of such parking is vital (good quality lifting mechanisms etc.). To provide inclusive parking in mass provision, two-tier racks are only acceptable when complemented by clearly marked and reserved accessible cycle parking spaces.
- We support efforts to ensure that a minimum of 5% of all spaces in new cycle parking facilities are allocated for use by Disabled cyclists. We recommend these be clearly marked as reserved for Disabled cyclists and a Disabled cyclists’ “Blue Badge” equivalent scheme is developed.
- Consideration should be given to providing higher proportions of accessible spaces demand from Disabled cyclists comes with particular peaks (e.g. a hospital with an out-patients clinic or a special session at a swimming pool).
- We recommend that all parking facilities display clear contact details of their management, inviting users to request reasonable adjustments where main facilities are not accessible to them.

Recommendations:

Table 6.1 Minimum cycle parking standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Spaces Per</th>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 per 60m</td>
<td>A1</td>
<td>Retail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 60m</td>
<td>A2</td>
<td>Financial and professional services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 60m</td>
<td>A3</td>
<td>Restaurants and cafés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 60m</td>
<td>A4</td>
<td>Drinking establishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 50m</td>
<td>A5</td>
<td>Hot food takeaways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 80m</td>
<td>B1(a)</td>
<td>Offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 250m</td>
<td>B1</td>
<td>other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 400m</td>
<td>B2</td>
<td>General industry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 400m</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>Storage and distribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 14 bedrooms</td>
<td>C1</td>
<td>Hotels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 4 beds</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hostels (Sui Generis)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 3 staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Care homes (for staff and visitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 3 employees</td>
<td></td>
<td>Hospitals (for staff and visitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 2 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Student accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per bedroom</td>
<td>C3</td>
<td>Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 7 staff plus 1 per 10 students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 7 staff plus 1 per 7 peak time students</td>
<td></td>
<td>Higher education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 per 4 staff</td>
<td></td>
<td>Libraries (for staff and visitors)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health facilities / clinics (for staff and visitors)</td>
<td>Community centres (for staff and visitors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theatres and cinemas</td>
<td>Leisure and sports</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Areas refer to Gross Internal Area floorspace. Proposals for uses not specifically covered by the cycle parking standards will be required to provide cycle parking in accordance with the most appropriate classification. Separate parking shall be provided for employee and visitor/public use. Where only a small quantity of cycle parking is provided care should be taken to ensure a suitable minimum of parking for non-standard cycles is provided e.g. by providing space around parking at the end of a rack of Sheffield stands to provide at least one below 20 spaces, then 5% of provision above 20 spaces. Clear contact details should be provided for the manager of the facility for users of them to be able to raise queries.

Staff parking is required to be located on site. Visitor parking may be appropriate within the public realm. Mixed-use developments shall provide separate cycle parking for the different uses. Housing refers to conventional housing, student housing and Houses in Multiple Occupation. For publicly accessible developments, cycle parking for the public may be provided either through on-site provision and/or through a financial contribution to allow the council to install off-site parking in the public realm. The appropriate provision of cycling parking shall be discussed on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with the cycle parking standards. The amount of off-site parking required will be related to the need for publicly-accessible parking and to site characteristics, with a requirement for all parking to be conveniently located for the intended users. **Accessible cycle parking should be located next or just as close to a destination as accessible car parking is.** Publicly accessible cycle parking will be credited towards the minimum visitor parking requirement.

Publicly-accessible cycle parking is intended to be used for visitors to the development, but shall be open to all members of the public to use.

On-site cycle parking is required in addition to any minimum floorspace requirements. Any area to be used for cycle parking must be in addition to minimum residential space standards (including storage and amenity space) and requirements for employment floorspace.

End-of-trip facilities are required to include at least accessible changing facilities, showers, lockers and clothes drying facilities and are required to be sufficient to meet the peak needs of the development, based on the occupancy of the development and the amount of cycle parking required.

Cycle parking shall accommodate accessible cycle parking spaces for all types of non-standard cycle, such as tricycles and recumbents, which are most commonly used by **Disabled cyclists.** All cycle parking facilities in new developments shall be step-free. **Major developments, minor developments creating new residential and/or commercial units, and extensions of 100m² or greater shall provide at least one accessible cycle parking space designated for a non-standard cycle** (such as a tricycle), where the rider has priority use. In
major schemes an additional accessible cycle parking space shall be provided for every 25 cycle parking spaces (or part thereof) and at least 1 space shall be provided as a minimum.

Accessible cycle parking spaces shall be served by a route at least 1,500mm in width and the spaces shall be wider than standard cycle parking spaces. Such spaces should be provided at the end of a rack of cycle parking, in order to accommodate the wider turning circles of non-standard cycles and to allow for dismounting. Where possible, install cycle parking bays that people on non-standard cycles can ride into and out of (meaning no need for reversing, turning or lifting a cycle). Signage should be put in place that clearly denotes cycle parking allocated for non-standard cycles (e.g. “Reserved for cargo and non-standard cycles. Priority to disabled cyclists”). Signs should be on a vertical pole. Blue and white paint should be used to delineate the area of a non-standard cycle bay (which could also feature a logo that depicts a disabled cyclist and cargo cycle). Where no inclusive cycle parking spaces have been provided, a notice should be appended that acknowledges this issue and signposts the user to a designated contact person.

Residential schemes are required to provide accessible cycle parking for all wheelchair housing. Cycle parking suitable for families should also be provided. This may include parking that can accommodate trailers for children, and is required at least in relation to family-sized units i.e. residential units with three or more bedrooms.

Developers should consider a more intensive approach to meeting cycle parking standards than standard approaches. Two-tier cycle parking and vertical/semi-vertical solutions are available and enable a more efficient use of land. In addition, there are a range of alternative intelligent cycle storage solutions available. Where developers submit that there are difficulties in complying with cycle parking standards they must demonstrate that all options have been investigated.

The council has worked with Wheels for Wellbeing, a charity which supports disabled people to cycle in London and campaigns for the rights and needs of disabled cyclists nationally. A survey of urban cycle usage was undertaken in which 13% of respondents have a disability (and use their bike as an effective mobility aid). This percentage is greater than the national average, which may be because driving in London is difficult and, whilst the buses are accessible to mobility impaired users, many London Underground stations are not and many journeys will involve a combination of the two. 44% of Disabled respondents and 20% of non-Disabled people cannot use stepped parking facilities. 4% of respondents use tricycles.

Figure 6.1 shows the borough’s cycle network. This network is the priority for any off-site investment in cycling infrastructure. This network consists of strategic, major and local routes. The strategic route consists largely of the proposed Cycle Superhighway. This hierarchy is not necessarily indicative of higher or lower priorities for investment but is an indication that different levels of the hierarchy may be more suitable for a different range of investment measures. The council also aims to invest in roads that are unallocated as cycle routes, to ensure that all roads are suitable for cycling and have good facilities for pedestrians. This map is to be used for the purposes of investment and includes both existing and proposed routes.
Figure 6.1 Islington's Cycle Network
Inclusive cycling imagery for the Borough’s future Inclusive Design Supplementary Planning Document

The following imagery are samples of potential imagery for your future document. Obviously ahead of seeing text it is hard to know quite which images are most useful but here are some of our most useful images.

**Photos**

We have a range of photos in our existing photo bank. We also have a planned photoshoot to provide more imagery in the coming months.
Infographics

For our annual survey we have produced infographics to help disseminate the statistics, this may be something we can either provide basic ideas for others to work up or where we could provide updated graphics for a modest fee.
Diagrams

For an extra fee it may be possible to get diagrams such as the below (from Transport Initiatives guidance to a number of councils on parking) updated to incorporate the needs of people cycling a tricycle used as a mobility aid rather than pushing a dismounted bicycle. A diagram like this, perhaps supplemented with others about vertical clearance and doors may be particularly helpful in explaining the concepts of inclusive design for access to cycle parking.