**B&NES Parking Standards Accessibility Assessment**

**Stage 1:**

Identify basic parking standard for the land use based on the quantum of development. Complete key details about the proposed development below.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposed Development** | |
| Name of development |  |
| Development location |  |
| Parking Standard Zone |  |
| Does the site location broadly reflect the characteristics of the Zone to which it falls into? If no, please provide a reason |  |
| Brief description of development including land use and quantum of development |  |
| Does the development comprise origin or destination parking\*? |  |
| Car parking provision based on standards set out in Chapter 5 |  |

*\*Where a proposed mixed-use development comprises both origin and destination parking (i.e. residential and non-residential elements), a separate Accessibility Assessment should be completed for each.*

**Stage 2:**

Complete all questions put forward in the questionnaire below.

*A guide for the scoring criteria for completing the Accessibility Assessment questionnaire is provided for each mode of travel. This is not exhaustive for all questions, but is designed to provide some examples against which to score the proposed development in terms of accessibility. Where questions are deemed to require a binary response, the score should reflect the extent to which the site is accessible relevant to the question.*

*Where a future transport scheme has been commissioned and its delivery is guaranteed, this should be accounted for as part of the appropriate section within this Accessibility Assessment dependent on the impacted mode of travel.*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Walking** | | | | | | |
|  | *Score 1* | *2* | *Score 3* | *4* | *Score 5* | |
| *Poor Accessibility* |  | *Moderate Accessibility* |  | *Good Accessibility* | |
| ***Criteria*** | * *No footways or pedestrian crossings adjacent to the site* * *Pedestrians use an access where vehicles have priority* * *No access provided for all users, including wheelchair / pushchair users or those with mobility impairments* * *Access to the site is indirect from the wider off-site active travel network* * *No street lighting of disabled access* * *Limited number of and access to local facilities\** |  | * *Footways present are of an adequate width, typically with a width of around 1.5m* * *Some pedestrian crossing facilities provided* * *Access to the site partially aligns with the wider off-site active travel network* * *Access for all users provided is adequate, including wheelchair / pushchair users or those with mobility impairments* * *Pedestrian routes are maintained to a reasonable standard, with some street lighting, reasonable surface conditions and disabled facilities* * *Limited number of local facilities\* but with good access, or adequate access but to a good range of facilities* |  | * *Footways present and of a comfortable width, typically at least 2.0m wide* * *Pedestrian crossings provided at appropriate place on pedestrian desire lines* * *Access to the site aligns well with the wider off-site active travel network* * *Good access for all users provided, including wheelchair / pushchair users or those with mobility impairments* * *Pedestrian routes are well maintained, well lit, surfacing is up to standard and there is designated wheelchair / pushchair access* * *Access to and range of local facilities\* is good* | |
| *\* Consideration should be given to access to facilities including employment, food outlets, education, places of worship, and healthcare facilities* | | | | | |
|  | Is there good accessibility to education facilities on foot? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to employment facilities on foot? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to retail facilities on foot? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to healthcare facilities on foot? (e.g. GP, Pharmacy) | | | | | / 5 |
| In relation to the type of proposed development, is the footway provision adequate, in terms of the presence of footways and their width? | | | | | / 5 |
| Are suitable pedestrian crossing points provided to accommodate pedestrian desire lines to and from the site to key attractions? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there a safe, suitable, and sufficient level of access provided for pedestrians between the site and wider off-site active travel network? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there suitable access provided to the site, for those with mobility impairments? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is the pedestrian infrastructure well maintained? | | | | | / 5 |
| Are pedestrian facilities both safe and perceived to be safe, benefitting from natural surveillance, good sight lines and well lit, with street lighting provided along key routes? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to local facilities on foot, relevant to the proposed development? | | | | | / 5 |
| Are suitable walking facilities provided e.g. conveniently located benches, on-site showers, and changing facilities? | | | | | / 5 |
| Total Walking | | | | | / 60 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Cycling** | | | | | | |
|  | *Score 1* | *2* | *Score 3* | *4* | *Score 5* | |
| *Poor Accessibility* |  | *Moderate Accessibility* |  | *Good Accessibility* | |
| ***Criteria*** | * *Cycle parking provided but may be poor quality, or in a less suitable location to the proposed development site* * *Poor on road cycle facilities and surfaces* * *Limited choice of safe access routes for cyclists, or routes do not align with the wider off-site active travel network* * *Limited number of and access to local facilities\** |  | * *Cycle parking provided to standard, in good condition.* * *On-road facilities and surfaces are adequate for competent cyclists.* * *Alternative cycle routes may exist which are suitable for 8-80 cycling, but these routes will be significantly less direct than vehicle routes.* * *Some choice of safe access routes for cyclists, or routes only partially align with the wider off-site active travel network* * *Limited number of local facilities\* but with good access, or adequate access but to a good range of facilities* |  | * *Choice of cycle parking types, in good condition, exceeding the standards.* * *Good choice of safe access routes for cyclists that align well with the wider off-site active travel network* * *Design and maintenance of surrounding area is sympathetic to cyclists, in line with guidance in LTN1/20* * *Access to and range of local facilities\* is good* | |
| *\* Consideration should be given to access to facilities including food outlets, education, places of worship, and healthcare facilities* | | | | | |
|  | Is there good accessibility to education facilities by cycle? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to employment facilities by cycle? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to retail facilities by cycle? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to healthcare facilities by cycle? (e.g. GP, Pharmacy) | | | | | / 5 |
| Is the quantity of cycle parking on site acceptable, including to accommodate non-standard cycles? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is cycle parking of good quality (i.e. covered, secure, weatherproof, robust and in good condition)? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is cycle parking provided in a suitable location, in line with the requirements set out in Chapter 7 of the Transport and Development SPD and in line with LTN1/20? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is safe access for cyclists provided into the site? | | | | | / 5 |
| Are safe and inclusive access routes for cyclists provided to and from the site, to accommodate all cycling competencies and non-standard cycles, allowing integration into the wider off-site active travel network? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is there good accessibility to local facilities by bicycle? | | | | | / 5 |
| Total Cycling | | | | | / 50 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Bus** | | | | | | |
|  | *Score 1* | *2* | *Score 3* | *4* | *Score 5* | |
| *Poor Accessibility* |  | *Moderate Accessibility* |  | *Good Accessibility* | |
| ***Criteria*** | * *Walking distance to nearest bus stop >800m* * *Frequency of principle bus service is likely, >60 mins, or does not offer services at times suitable to proposed site users\*\** * *Distance to nearest interchange with 5 or more routes is >1200m* * *Nearest bus stop is marked only by a flag and pole, limited or no timetable information, little or no street lighting, <1.5m wide footway* |  | * *Walking distance to nearest bus stop 400-800m* * *Frequency of principle bus service at nearest bus stop aligns with requirements of proposed site users\*\* but is likely <30 mins* * *Distance to nearest bus station / major interchange with 5 or more routes is 800-1,200m* * *Nearest bus stop is marked by a bus shelter and flag, with timetable information, and adequate footway and lighting provision* |  | * *Walking distance to nearest bus stop <400m* * *Frequency of principle bus service aligns well with requirements of proposed site users\*\* and is likely <15 mins* * *Distance to nearest bus station / major interchange with 5 or more routes is <800m* * *Nearest bus stop has a shelter, seating and flag, timetable information, raised kerbs, adequate footway width and street lighting and has CCTV or is overlooked by buildings* | |
| *\*\*Bus service provision should ensure that timings will align with the intended development purpose such as in time for staff to arrive with sufficient time before registration in the case of a school, or at suitable shift changeover or commuter times for non-residential developments.* | | | | | |
|  | Is a bus stop provided within an acceptable walking distance? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is bus service provision at a suitable frequency and time to serve the proposed development? | | | | | / 5 |
| Is a bus interchange (with 5 or more routes) provided within an acceptable walking distance? | | | | | / 5 |
| Are bus stop facilities provided at the nearest stop of a good standard? | | | | | / 5 |
| Total Bus | | | | | / 20 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Rail** | | | | | | |
|  | *Score 1* | *2* | *Score 3* | *4* | *Score 5* | |
| *Poor Accessibility* |  | *Moderate Accessibility* |  | *Good Accessibility* | |
| ***Criteria*** | * *Walking distance to nearest rail station >2,000m* * *Services per hour per direction from nearest station within 1.2km walking distance is 1-2 services* * *Nearest rail station has few facilities with no waiting facilities, no toilets, timetables only, unstaffed, no security measures, no retail facilities, no disabled accessibility and no taxi rank* |  | * *Walking distance to nearest rail station <1,200m* * *Services per hour per direction from nearest station within 1.2km walking distance is 3 to 4 services* * *Nearest rail station has part enclosed waiting facilities, toilets, timetables and real time information, ability to purchase tickets part-time staffing, CCTV and other security measures, some retail facilities, some disabled accessibility and taxi rank* |  | * *Walking distance to nearest rail station <800m* * *Services per hour per direction from nearest station within 1.2km walking distance is 5 or more services* * *Nearest rail station has heated and enclosed waiting facilities, toilets, timetables and real time information, ticket office and machines, staffed the majority of the day, CCTV and other security measures, good range of retail facilities, fully accessible with lifts and ramps, bus and taxi interchange within close proximity* | |
|  | Is a rail station provided within an acceptable walking distance? | | | | | / 5 |
| How extensive is the rail service provision per direction per hour? | | | | | / 5 |
| What level of rail station facilities are provided? | | | | | / 5 |
| Total Rail | | | | | / 15 |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Additional Considerations** | | | | | | |
|  | *Score 1* | *2* | *Score 3* | *4* | *Score 5* | |
| *Poor Accessibility* |  | *Moderate Accessibility* |  | *Good Accessibility* | |
| * ***Criteria*** | *\*\*\*Future transport schemes should significantly enhance accessibility to the site, in a way that hasn’t already been accounted for within this Accessibility Assessment.* | | | | | |
| * *Site users will not have access to a car club* |  |  |  | * *All site users will have access to a car club* | |
| * *The roads within ~400m of the site are not part of a CPZ. As such vehicles associated with the site could park on surrounding roads. Significant risk that over-spill parking could result in issues such as pavement parking, or impeding emergency, delivery and refuse vehicles.* |  | * *Some or all of the roads within ~400m of the site are not part of a CPZ. As such vehicles associated with the site could park on some of the surrounding roads. However, there is a low risk that overspill parking would result in issues such as pavement parking, or impeding emergency, delivery and refuse vehicles.* |  | * *The majority of roads within ~400m of the site are part of a CPZ. As such it is highly unlikely that vehicles associated with the site would be able to park on surrounding roads* | |
|  | How many roads within ~400m of the site are subject to CPZs? | | | | | / 5 |
| What level of car club service is available for site users? | | | | | / 5 |
| Total Additional Considerations | | | | | / 10 |

**Stage 3:**

Calculate the accessibility score as a percentage for: Active Travel (walking and cycling sections); and Public Transport & Additional Considerations (bus, rail and additional considerations sections). Convert these scores into a percentage.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | Active Travel | | Public Transport and Additional Considerations | | |
| Walking | Cycling | Bus | Rail | Additional Considerations |
| Scores | / 60 | / 50 | / 20 | / 15 | / 10 |
| Sum all scores | / 110 | | / 45 | | |
| **Combined Accessibility Score (%)** | **%** | | **%** | | |

**Stage 4:**

Identify the potential appropriate parking reduction based on the questionnaire scores, using the accessibility matrix. Complete the key outcomes from this assessment in the Accessibility Assessment Stage 4 – Summary table.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | Active Travel Accessibility Score | | | |
| 0-25% | 25-50% | 50-75% | 75-100% |
| Public Transport and Additional Considerations Accessibility Score | 0-25% | No discount from standards permitted | | No discount from standards permitted | |
| 25-50% | Up to 30% reduction. | Up to 30% reduction. |
| 50-75% | No discount from standards permitted | Up to 15% reduction. | Up to 25% reduction. | Up to 35% reduction. |
| 75-100% | Up to 20% reduction. | Up to 35% reduction. | Up to 100% reduction - Scope for a car free development. |

Notes:

* Discounts to the maximum car parking provision apply to standard car parking spaces only. The provision of disabled parking spaces should be calculated based on the parking standards set out in the Transport and Development SPD, prior to any discounts being applied.
* Similarly, the requirement for cycle, scooter and PTWs should be based on the development quantum or car parking prior to any discount being applied to the maximum car parking provision. Where significantly reduced levels of parking are proposed, sufficient levels of cycle parking will need to be provided.
* Should a parking discount be proposed by the developer, it is required to demonstrate how on-road parking will be managed within the vicinity of the site, to ensure that parking pressure is not simply offset to another area.

Accessibility Assessment Stage 4 – Summary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Proposed Development** | |
| Brief description of development including land use and quantum of development |  |
| Car parking provision based on standards set out in Chapter 5 (spaces) |  |
| Active Travel Accessibility Score |  |
| Public Transport and Additional Considerations Accessibility Score |  |
| Potential discount from standards (%) |  |
| Proposed discount from standards for development (%) |  |
| Proposed parking provision after accessibility discount (spaces) |  |

**Stage 5:**

Following completion of this Accessibility Assessment, the findings should be shared with the Local Highway Officer to initiate further discussion regarding the parking provision for a proposed site.