

# **Barnet Local Plan EIP – Note on Parking Management (Policy TRC03)**

## **Reason for producing this note**

On Day 6 (Thursday 6<sup>th</sup> October) at the hearing session's, consideration of Matter 6 – Transport, Communications and Infrastructure, Inspector Philpott requested provision of a Note covering the following:

Barnet to produce a note on policy TRC03 (Parking Management) covering the following and proposing any necessary modifications:

1. Reviewing the approach to orbital accessibility, explaining the current approach and moving away from the concept of “orbital PTAL”. Reflect on TfL’s objections and propose modifications. Work on resolving this issue with TfL and provide update on/reflect agreement in the SoCG.
2. Whether modification is required to ensure that MM297 and the requirements in the footnote to Table 23 are reflected in the policy. Clarify the relationship with the London Plan, and make the footnote more Borough specific. Clarify the position on Opportunity Areas as well as PTAL levels below 5 and 6 in relation to the asterisk to Table 23.
3. Clarify the position on assessing parking requirements and para 11.12.4. Consider whether there needs to be a distinction between transport statements and/or assessments or introduction of separate parking statements
4. Clarify the position on parking requirements and supporting statements, making clear that the parking requirements are “maximum parking standards”.
5. Considering the position on CPZs in TRC03(b) and MM299, whether any further changes are needed. Explain the process for creating and extending CPZs together with costs and contributions, the approach to delivery and draw together any links to T6(C) of the London Plan.
6. Explain the approach to car-free development(s), including where the Council allows permits for applications, the approaches taken and whether they differ in terms of locations that are inside and outside of CPZs. Explain the extent of the use of legal agreements in the context of para 11.12.6.
7. Explain the proposed scope for flexibility and then potential scenarios to be applied for the purposes of para 11.12.6.
8. Modify TRC03 to include paras 11.12.3, 11.12.7 and 11.12.8 within the policy.
9. Look again at on-street parking in TRC03(d) and ensure consistency with London Plan Policy T6(L).
10. Explain the requirement for parking surveys for small developments and its proportionality.
11. Explain the position on residential motorcycle parking and whether that counts towards maximum car parking levels.
12. Explain how car clubs will work in respect of different types of development, whether existing car club provision is taken into account in terms of meeting demand/providing capacity. Explain the extent to which the scale of development is taken into account in that regard.
13. Review Part S of the Building Regulations and any necessary modifications.

The following format has been used in this Note to denote further proposed modifications to the submission version of plan as revised by the proposed modifications listed in EXAM 4.

- ~~Strikethrough text~~ to indicate text proposed for removal.
- Underlined text to indicate additional text.

## Background

As an outer London Borough vehicle parking provision can be an important consideration for securing the vitality of town centres and access to services, which developments need to address. This note sets out explanations for aspects of the wording of the policy and supporting text for TRC03 in the draft Barnet Local Plan, further proposed modifications seeking to ensure clarity and consistency with the London Plan and the NPPF.

## Considerations

- 1 Reviewing the approach to orbital accessibility, explaining the current approach and moving away from the concept of “orbital PTAL”. Reflect on TfL’s objections and propose modifications. Work on resolving issue TfL and provide update on/reflect agreement in SoCG.**

Barnet’s Draft Local Plan, in line with the London Plan (March 2021), (Core\_Gen\_16) sets out maximum residential parking standards which are based on both Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL), a measure of connectivity by public transport (i.e. how close a place is to public transport and how frequent services are in the area), and the number of beds per dwelling.

Local Plan para 11.12.2 highlights, in assessing the application of parking standards the need to consider sensitivity to local circumstances and identifies the level of public transport accessibility and on-street parking controls as key factors.

Barnet is typified by areas of high PTAL around the route of the Northern line. Both arms of the Northern Line go beyond the Borough boundary then pass-through Euston Station before moving on to destinations south of the river Thames. In addition, the Midland Main Line from Sheffield to London St Pancras and the Great Northern line, which terminates at Moorgate Underground Station, also pass through the Borough. Both these national rail lines have a north-west to south-east alignment where they pass through Barnet, thereby serving the radial (towards London) accessibility but with minimal impact to the orbital (across London) provision.

The Long-Term Transport Strategy [Exam 15] explains the low orbital accessibility in the Borough in more detail.

As reflected in the revised SoCG with TfL the Council has moved away from reference to ‘orbital PTAL’ in favour of the term ‘orbital accessibility’. Therefore, for PTAL 5 locations where orbital ‘accessibility’ is not deemed to be adequate, the Council intends to grant a relaxation to the parking standards by allowing minimal parking provision for car club schemes to be considered where suitable. The relaxation in parking standards (as shown in the footnotes to Table 23) is only to allow for car club provision which would allow occupants to access a wider range of orbital locations without the need to own a private vehicle. More sustainable alternative modes for orbital access would also be encouraged in terms of public and active

travel services and infrastructure such as cycle routes. It is considered that this would assist movement around the Borough without encouraging higher vehicle ownership.

In addition to the changes to Table 23 footnote ! for the reasons set out above the Council also proposes a clarification to footnote ^ and footnote \* to ensure more consistency with London Plan Policy T6.1 Residential parking and Table 10.3 - Maximum residential parking standards.

The proposed change in terminology refers to the footnote for Table 23 and Paragraph 11.12.2 and 11.12.3. The proposed changes were agreed with TfL at a meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> October 2022 and have all been incorporated into the modifications set out in this Note.

### **Proposed Modifications to Policy TRC03 – Parking Management – Supporting Text – Paras 11.12.2 and 11.12.3**

11.12.2 Barnet's Car Parking Study sets out the basis for a locally specific approach to parking provision. The Council accepts the need for restraint in terms of car parking management, but intends to apply the standards set out in Table 23 for residential developments with sensitivity to local circumstances. The accessibility of individual locations will be taken into consideration, based on:

- The public transport accessibility level (PTAL);
- Travel Time Mapping (TIM);
- Opportunities for sustainable orbital travel
- ~~Orbital access by~~ public transport connectivity;
- Parking stress including the level of on-street parking control;
- Population density and parking ownership of surrounding areas;
- Location and proximity to local services (i.e. is it in a town centre);
- Ease of access by cycling and walking; and
- Other relevant planning or highways considerations, such as to whether the proposal is a conversion of an existing use.

11.12.3 The improvement of orbital connectivity of bus services within Barnet is vital if suitable alternatives to the private vehicle are to be effective. ~~For this reason a method to calculate the level of orbital access by public transport has been developed. This is available in Appendix A of the Car Parking Standards Report 2021. Developers in PTALs 5 and 6 need to determine the level of orbital access for their site to determine the car parking requirements. In instances where orbital connectivity is considered to be inadequate, the Council will request developer contributions in order to improve orbital public transport services. Developments in PTAL5 may also be allowed to allocate minimal car parking spaces for the provision of car clubs.~~

### **Proposed Modifications to Table 23 – Residential Car Parking Standards and MM298-Footnote**

\*Metropolitan and Major Town Centres to be Car Free ~; and Up to 0.5 spaces per dwelling be allowed for developments within Opportunity Areas (except for areas with PTAL 5 or 6 which should be car free)

! Where the orbital access a development proposal is less well connected orbitally by public transport is calculated as a 4 or less, minimum parking for car club schemes will to be considered along with contributions towards improving bus services and CPZs. (This does not preclude the Council from requesting contributions towards other appropriate transport related projects in the area or override the CPZ requirements for other parts of the Borough).

~~^ The Council Boroughs should will consider standards that will~~ allows for higher levels of provision where there is clear evidence that this would support additional family housing

~

- 2 Whether modification is required to ensure that MM297 and the requirements in the footnote to Table 23 are reflected in the policy. Clarify the relationship with the London Plan, and make the footnote more Borough specific. Clarify the position on Opportunity Areas as well as PTAL levels below 5 and 6 in relation to the asterisk to Table 23.**

Footnote ^ has been amended as set out above. Clarification to \* has been made as above with specific reference to London Plan Policy T6.1 Residential parking and Table 10.3 - Maximum residential parking standards.

The Opportunity Areas (OAs) in Barnet are Brent Cross-Cricklewood, Colindale and New Southgate. The draft Local Plan states up to 0.5 spaces per dwelling will be allowed for developments within OAs. This will apply unless the OAs are in Metropolitan and Major Town Centres or in PTAL areas 5 and 6 where the development will be expected to be car free. A change to footnote 23 has been proposed above to clarify this.

### **3 Clarify the position on assessing parking requirements and para 11.12.4. Consider whether there needs to be a distinction between transport statements and/or assessments or introduction of separate parking statements.**

For all land uses that do not have parking standards set out within the London Plan an assessment specific to the proposals would need to be undertaken. This assessment would consider issues such as accessibility, type of staff / visitors using the site, operational times, operational requirements, anticipated travel demand profile, sustainable travel measures etc. The assessment could take the form of a Transport Assessment report. For developments it is common for the parking assessment to be included in the Transport Assessment. The detail provided should be proportionate to the size of development. This has been clarified through a proposed modification to para 11.11.1

#### **Proposed Modifications to Paras 11.11.1 and 11.12.4**

11.11.1 Major growth across Barnet provides opportunities to deliver high quality transport improvements in a planned and structured manner, and closely co-ordinated with other transport authorities, including adjacent boroughs. Barnet's Growth Areas are supported by a range of planning documents including area action plans, development frameworks, transport assessments/~~statements~~, Travel Plans, negotiated planning (S106) and highway agreements (S278), planning conditions and delivery plans. These tools enable developments to be appropriately phased and aligned with investment to deliver proposed improvements to transport and the public realm. Outside these areas the Council requires Transport Assessments /~~Statements~~ and Travel Plans as set out in Policy TRC01.

11.12.4 Appropriate parking levels for disabled people, which meets London Plan standards, should always be provided in developments. This may include visitors parking for disabled residents who may have regular visitors such as carers and provision should also be made for motorcycle parking. Parking requirements for the emergency services which have particular operational needs will need to be assessed on an individual basis. All other uses except residential should ~~limit provide~~ parking in accordance with the relevant London Plan parking standards. Uses which don't have parking standards set out in the London Plan

will be required to be assessed by the developer as part of the Transport Assessment. Transport Assessments should contain a parking assessment demonstrating compliance with Table 23 and be submitted with the application. It is expected that the level of detail contained in the document will be proportionate to the size of the development.

**4 Clarify the position on parking requirements and supporting statements, making clear that the parking requirements are “maximum parking standards”.**

The Council acknowledges that parking standards (rather than parking requirements) are the correct terminology. Table 23 states “Maximum spaces per unit” within the column headings. The car parking standards set out within the draft Local Plan can therefore be read as ‘maximum standards.’ This is consistent with the London Plan. Proposed modifications to para 11.12.6 are set out at Point 6.

**5 Considering the position on CPZs in TRC03(b) and MM299, whether any further changes are needed. Explain the process for creating and extending CPZs together with costs and contributions, the approach to delivery and draw together any links to T6(C) of the London Plan.**

The Council’s Environment and Climate Change Committee in March 2022 agreed a policy approach for future developments and Controlled Parking Zones in Barnet. [Agenda for Environment and Climate Change Committee on Tuesday 8th March, 2022, 7.00 pm \(moderngov.co.uk\)](#) The basis for this approach was to better protect parking for residents within Controlled Parking Zones, ensure that associated planning conditions in relation to parking are implemented and support the delivery of Barnet’s Long Term Transport Strategy and Growth Strategy. This report also recommends the introduction of an administration charge to be passed on to developers to cover the cost of implementing a cap on the number of parking permits in relation to individual developments.

The Council has a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) Programme which aims to address long standing requests from residents to review parking restrictions. The Council’s Parking Team liaise with the Council’s Planning Service on major planning applications. This includes consideration of appropriate section 106 contributions to mitigate any impact from the development on parking in the local area. For major or large-scale schemes S106 contributions may be secured for a feasibility study for a potential CPZ. If the study recommends a CPZ then contributions towards implementation will be required. The Council estimates that costs will vary between £20,000 to £40,000 for feasibility studies, and around £50,000 for implementation. However the cost of implementation will depend on the size of the CPZ. On smaller schemes S106 contributions of circa £2500 will be secured for any costs associated with a revision of an existing (or production of a new) Traffic Management Order for the CPZ. This is required in order to mitigate against traffic impacts arising from the consented scheme such as preventing future occupiers of the development from being entitled to an on street parking permit within the CPZ. Where it is agreed through the planning process that new residents would be entitled to permits, the Council has set an administrative charge of £25 per property/unit to be paid by the developer. The Council will set these costs out in the Planning Contributions SPD.

The Council proposes a further modification to MM299 in Policy TRC03(b).

**Proposed Modification to Policy TRC03(b) (MM299)**

Where development is proposed, and the Council decides that it is deemed a CPZ is necessary, the developer will need to make a contribution towards the implementation and

monitoring of the CPZ in order that the Council can seek to ensure that it is ~~should be~~ in place within the surrounding area of the development before occupation. ~~A~~The developer contribution towards the implementation and monitoring of the CPZ will be agreed as part of the planning permission. ...

London Plan Policy T6(C) – Car Parking states that ‘An absence of local on-street parking controls should not be a barrier to new development, and boroughs should look to implement these controls wherever necessary to allow existing residents to maintain safe and efficient use of their streets.’

The Council considers that its approach to CPZs is consistent with London Plan Policy T6(C)

**6 Explain the approach to car-free development(s), including where the Council allows permits for applications, the approaches taken and whether they differ in terms of locations that are inside and outside of CPZs. Explain the extent of the use of legal agreements in the context of para 11.12.6.**

Generally, the Council would not expect occupants of new car free developments to be able to apply for on-street parking permits. This would militate against the principles of designing sustainable car free development encouraging the use of more sustainable modes of travel. However, if it can be demonstrated that a new development requires a level of car parking provision, such as disabled person parking, the proposal should provide for its requirements within the confines of the development site. In circumstances where this needs to be supplemented by the provision of on-street permits, the Council as part of the S106 legal agreement will consider this on a site-specific basis, using the Lambeth Transport Parking Survey Methodology, which is an industry accepted method of making such assessments. The intention is that any eligibility for permits and parking spaces on site would be managed by the Council and developer by agreement in accordance with Table 23.

The Council has added [LAMBETH TRANSPORT PARKING SURVEY METHODOLOGY](#) to the EIP Library

**Proposed Modifications to para 11.12.6 and (MM296) para 11.12.7A**

~~11.12.6 Some developments however, may have difficulty meeting parking requirements, particularly in town centres. In these situations and when public transport and active travel is available, the Council will show flexibility in the assessment of parking requirements. Where necessary within CPZs the Council will restrict new residential occupiers from obtaining car parking permits through a S106 legal agreement. The specific approach in the S106 will depend on the PTAL of the site and whether the site is within a Metropolitan or Major Town Centre or in an Opportunity Area, as the Council will apply the standards set out in Table 23, as a cap on the number of CPZ permits able to be applied for per property. The cap in the S106 will also depend on the number of spaces that are provided within the development itself. In some cases it could be appropriate to block the occupiers from obtaining CPZ permits through a S106 legal agreement, in other cases it may be appropriate to impose a cap per dwelling which is aligned to the standards in Table 23, also enforced through a S106 legal agreement. This will help reduce parking congestion in town centres for other users. The specific approach on each site would be informed by the Council using the Lambeth Transport Parking Survey Methodology, which is an industry accepted method of making such assessments.~~

11.12.7A With regards to larger scale phased development, particularly within Growth Areas, the Council will take a flexible approach to parking ratios in the early phases as long as the overall quantum does not exceed the maximum car parking standards. This would be on the basis that sufficient alternative and more sustainable travel options are provided for each

phase of development. Phased development should also ensure that appropriate active and public transport measures are provided for each phase in order to encourage sustainable travel whilst protecting the surrounding local amenity (e.g. CPZ protections).

## **7 Explain the proposed scope for flexibility and then potential scenarios to be applied for the purposes of para 11.12.6.**

Flexibility may be a consideration with regards to uses such as health centres where there is a need to provide parking provision for essential staff or to fulfil disabled parking provision standards for various land uses (as set out in para 10.6.10 of the London Plan). The suitability of the approach set out in para 11.12.6 would be determined by decision makers on a site-specific basis.

## **8 Modify TRC03 to include paras 11.12.3, 11.12.7 and 11.12.8 within the policy.**

The Council acknowledges the merits of showing all proposed modifications to Policy TRC03 in response to this Action. TRC03 as shown below includes all modifications to Policy TRC03 justified elsewhere in this Note.

### **Proposed Modifications to Policy TRC03 – Parking Management**

The Council will expect development to provide car and motorcycle parking in accordance with the London Plan standards (Policy T6. Car Parking and Policies T6.2-T6.5.), except in the case of residential development (Policy T6.1).

a) The Council will expect residential development to provide parking in accordance with Table 23.

b) Where development is proposed, and the Council decides ~~that it is deemed~~ a Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) is necessary, the developer will be required to make a contribution towards the implementation and monitoring of the CPZ in order that the Council can seek to ensure that it is ~~should be~~ in place within the surrounding area of the development before occupation. ~~A~~ The developer contribution towards the implementation and monitoring of the CPZ will be agreed as part of the planning permission.

c) Residential parking permits will only be available to Blue Badge holders in car free developments. Disabled Persons parking should be provided in accordance with London Plan Policies T6.1 and T6.5.

d) ~~Where development proposals involve a reduction of existing off-street car parking spaces, the developer must demonstrate that sufficient parking will remain in the area to serve local needs.~~ The Council, with regards to Policy GSS12, will accept the loss of off street short-term publicly available parking only where this would not lead to under-provision in the locality.

e) Cycle parking is to be delivered in accordance with London Plan Standards set out in Policy T5 Cycling.

f) Electric Vehicle charging points to be delivered in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations ~~London Plan Standards~~ as appropriate for the use.

g) Where appropriate spaces should be available for car club vehicle parking along with car club membership for future residents of the development within the agreed car parking provision. In Car Free developments in PTAL 5 where orbital connectivity is not deemed to be adequate, minimal car parking spaces may be provided for car clubs. Car club spaces and contributions towards improving overall sustainable accessibility and CPZs will be considered where a development is less well connected orbitally by public transport.

h) Appropriate provision should be made for efficient deliveries and servicing.

i) The Council will normally require a Parking Design and Management Plan for all applications which include car parking. The extent of the Design and Management Plan should be proportionate to the scale and type of development proposed and would follow the principles set out within the widely accepted 'Lambeth Council Parking Survey Guidance Note.'

j) Where on-street parking surveys are required, the scope of the survey must be agreed in advance with the Council.

## **9 Look again at on-street parking in TRC03(d) and ensure consistency with London Plan Policy T6(L).** (Note that TRC03(d) refers to off-street parking)

London Plan Policy T6L states that where sites are redeveloped, parking provision should reflect the current approach and not be re-provided at previous levels where this exceeds the standards set out in this policy. The Council acknowledges that as currently worded TRC03(d) implies that the off-street spaces don't need to be publicly available. i.e. they are just buildings with existing on site spaces and that occupiers of the development can use. The Council's objective as reflected in Policy GSS12 – Redevelopment of Car Parks is to ensure retention of short term publicly available parking spaces where they are needed to support town centre vitality and viability or serve an identified need. Town centre development will be required to make available to the public any parking provided. New public off-street parking will be subject to a S106 legal agreement to control the layout of the parking spaces, the nature of the users and the pricing structure. Where parking is created or reallocated, the Council will encourage the allocation of spaces for low emission vehicles, car clubs, pool cars, cycle hire and parking, and electric vehicle charging equipment.

The Council therefore proposes a modification to TRC03(d)

~~Where development proposals involve a reduction of existing off-street car parking spaces, the developer must demonstrate that sufficient parking will remain in the area to serve local needs.~~

The Council, with regards to Policy GSS12, will accept the loss of off street short-term publicly available parking only where this would not lead to under-provision in the locality.

This will be supported by a new para at 11.2.6A

The Council's objective as reflected in Policy GSS12 – Redevelopment of Car Parks is to ensure retention of short term publicly available parking spaces where they are needed to support town centre vitality and viability or serve an identified need. Town centre development will be required to make available to the public any parking provided. New public off-street parking will be subject to a S106 legal agreement to control the layout of the parking spaces, the nature of the users and the pricing structure. Where parking is created or reallocated, the Council will encourage the allocation of spaces for low emission vehicles, car clubs, pool cars, cycle hire and parking, and electric vehicle charging equipment. In accepting the loss of parking that the Council will have due regard to the need for continued parking provision whilst taking into account the Borough mode share targets and the availability of active travel means and public transport provision.

## **10 Explain the requirement for parking surveys for small developments and its proportionality.**



An on-street parking survey / study may be required depending on the potential impacts of a proposed development. The extent of the study would be proportionate to the scale and type of development proposed and would follow the principles set out within the widely accepted 'Lambeth Council Parking Survey Guidance Note.' These guidelines set out the general survey scope for a development based on its proposed land use and location. Depending on the proposals it would be advised that the applicant agree the scope of the study with the Council prior to undertaking the survey.

As an example, for a residential use the guidelines suggest the '*parking survey to cover the area where residents of a proposed development may want to park. This generally covers an area of 200m (or a 2-minute walk) around a site.*' It also states that '*the survey should be undertaken when the highest number of residents are at home; generally late at night during the week. A snapshot survey between the hours of 0030-0530 should be undertaken on two separate weekday nights (i.e. Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday).*'

The Lambeth Guidance does set out survey specifications based on the scale of development. The Guidance states that, 'common sense should be applied in all cases and the extent of the survey area and justification for any amendments should be included in the survey. If inadequate justification is provided for a survey area, then amendments may be required, or a recommendation made accordingly.'

Proposed modification to TRC3(i)

The Council will normally require a Parking Design and Management Plan for all applications which include car parking. The extent of the Design and Management Plan should be proportionate to the scale and type of development proposed.

#### **11 Explain the position on residential motorcycle parking and whether that counts towards maximum car parking levels.**

Motorcycle parking counts towards maximum car parking levels. This is consistent with Policy T6(f) of the London Plan which states that '*where provided, each motorcycle parking space should count towards the maximum for car parking spaces at all use classes.*'

Proposed modification to opening statement of TRC03 :

The Council will expect development to provide car and motorcycle parking in accordance with the London Plan standards (Policy T6. Car Parking and Policies T6.2-T6.5.), except in the case of residential development.

#### **12 Explain how car clubs will work in respect of different types of development, whether existing car club provision is taken into account in terms of meeting demand/providing capacity. Explain the extent to which the scale of development is taken into account in that regard.**

The inclusion of a car club scheme and the number of spaces sought is on the proviso that the car club provider determines that there is a positive business case for the scheme being implemented (this could be pump-primed by the developer in the first instance to help stimulate and sustain a sufficient customer base). If there is already existing nearby car club provision in place with spare capacity, it may not be suitable to provide additional car club spaces and this would need to be considered as part of the assessment of the application.

For a mixed-use development office and residential development for example the car club scheme may generate users as a result of the officer operations during the weekday working periods, whilst the residential use would provide a customer base for the off-peak weekday and weekend periods. A car club scheme may not be suitable or sustainable for all land use

types or scales of development and would therefore need to be determined on a site-specific basis. It is noted that the provision of a car club scheme may not be indefinite, for example after a few years of a development's operation it may be found that there is insufficient take up of the car club scheme for it to be sustained as occupants may take up other modes of travel. Conversely, if it is found that there is a full take up of the scheme and demand exceeds capacity the number of car club spaces provided in an area may need to be increased over time.

TRC03(g) states that car club spaces should be available within the agreed car parking provision. Therefore it is considered that the policy is clear that car club spaces would form part of the parking provision of a scheme and wouldn't be additional to the maximum standard.

### **Proposed Modifications to Policy TRC03(g)**

TRC03 (g) Where appropriate spaces should be available for car club vehicle parking along with car club membership for future residents of the development within the agreed car parking provision. In Car Free developments in PTAL 5 where orbital connectivity is not deemed to be adequate, minimal car parking spaces may be provided for car clubs. Car club spaces and contributions towards improving overall sustainable accessibility and CPZs will be considered where a development is less well connected orbitally by public transport.

### **13 Review Part S of the Building Regulations and any necessary modifications.**

Part S of the Building Regulations came into effect on 15 June 2022. London Plan Policy T6.1C states "All residential car parking spaces must provide infrastructure for electric or Ultra-Low Emission vehicles. At least 20 per cent of spaces should have active charging facilities, with passive provision for all remaining spaces."

This and the other electric vehicle parking requirements of the London Plan have now been superseded by Building Regulations Part S. The Local Plan should therefore be updated to reflect the requirements for Part S.

### **Proposed Modifications to Policy TRC03(f), para 11.11.7 and para 11.12.10**

**TRC03 (f)** Electric Vehicle charging points to be delivered in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations London Plan Standards as appropriate for the use.

11.11.7 To help keep Barnet moving whilst minimising carbon emissions the Council will encourage greater numbers of electric vehicles. New development is required to provide car parks with electric vehicle charging points in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations including a proportion of the car parking spaces in the development with charging points for electric vehicles in accordance with London Plan Policy T6, with at least 20 per cent of spaces for new residential development having active charging facilities, and passive provision for all remaining spaces, i.e. the infrastructure should be in place to ensure they can be made into active spaces in the future. All car club parking spaces. ~~should be supplied with an active charging point for electric vehicles.~~ Charging facilities are now also available from some on street car parking spaces and car parks. For more detail on electric car charging points see <https://tfl.gov.uk/modes/driving/electric-vehicles-and-rapid-charging> or Electric vehicles in Barnet | Barnet Council.

11.12.10 Electric vehicle charging points should be delivered in accordance with Part S of the Building Regulations. Parking for bicycles and ~~electric vehicle charging points~~ will

generally be provided in accordance with the London Plan<sup>69</sup>, and meet the London Cycling Design Standards for all new development...

## **Conclusion**

The Council invites the Inspectors to consider and recommend that the Council makes the additional further modifications set out in this paper recognising that those considered to be Main Modifications will need to be formally consulted upon following the examination hearing sessions.