

<p>London Transport Users Committee</p> <p>Service Development and Planning Sub-committee</p>	<p>SD&P</p>
<p>Secretariat's Memorandum</p> <p>Author: Tim Bellenger</p>	<p>Agenda No: 8 SD: 278 Date: 15/12/2004</p>

Getting to the station.

1. **Purpose of report**

- 1.1 This report is a discussion paper seeking to clarify and enhance the Committee's policies and thinking around access to rail stations within the Committee's area, but particularly focusing on availability and pricing of parking space at or near rail stations.
- 1.2 Members are asked to consider and receive this report, make comments about its contents and to agree that a consultation be undertaken with rail user groups, adjacent Rail Passengers Committees, local authorities, the Automobile Association, the RAC Foundation, Commission for Integrated Transport, British Parking Association, Cycle Touring Club, the London Cycling Campaign, the British Motorcyclists Federation, the London Taxi Drivers Association, Transport for London, the London Assembly, Train Operating Companies, the Strategic Rail Authority, the British Transport Police and other police forces before a final document is prepared for adoption as Committee policy.

2. **Background**

- 2.1 Members will be aware that car parking standards are becoming an increasing part of the Committee's correspondence workload both in the casework area and in policy development in response to consultations from outside bodies. It is therefore appropriate to consider this issue in a more general sense – encompassing all the ways of reaching rail stations, so that the principles can be applied to the specific instances when these arise in casework and policy issues.
- 2.2 Parking at railway stations has traditionally been provided on the basis of the availability of railway land not required for other railway purposes or suitable for redevelopment. As such station parking (with the exception of dedicated 'Parkway' type stations) has not been considered as part of an overall transport planning strategy. This has resulted in an ad-hoc approach to providing car parking, largely favouring locations where some form of rail activity has ceased e.g. former goods yards, engine sheds, carriage sidings, junctions for closed rail routes etc. Constant change of management of the rail network has added a further malaise, with varying levels of security, pricing and quality of provision across the network.

2.3 The SRA requires that station car parks should meet the standards of the Secure Car Parks scheme run by the Association of Chief Police Officers and other bodies. However, there are no set standards with regard to

- pricing (as station operators revenue from car parking does not form part of their franchise payments)
- enforcement (of parking payment, abandoned vehicles etc.)
- what facilities are provided at each car park
- how car parks impact on the surrounding road network or environment.

There is no timescale attached to the implementation of these standards to existing car parks. Casework highlights a great deal of inconsistency across the rail network often characterised by a 'feast and famine' approach to the enforcement of parking charges and regulations with the result that passengers are often penalised when there is a sudden 'purge' of activity.

Questions to rail operators and the Strategic Rail Authority.

How many car parks currently comply with the secure car park standards and would it be possible to attach a timescale to plans to achieve this?

Should any proportion of revenue from car parking be included in rail operators franchise payments/income?

Should revenue from car parking be 'ring fenced' to improving car park and station access infrastructure?

What standards do you currently have with regard to pricing, enforcement, facilities provided and impact on surrounding road network and environment?

Should there be a railway industry wide standard for these?

2.4 Other issues include:-

- spaces not marked out clearly (leading to clamping and fines)
- poor surfaces
- accumulated rubbish
- poor lighting
- lack of information on prices and time limits
- poor quality tickets that fade or curl up after a few hours
- lack of 'ownership' of complaints by parking operators and train operating companies alike
- use of car parks for anti-social behaviour
- damage to vehicles by car park infrastructure
- faulty ticket machines / machines unable to give change.

Question to rail operators and the Strategic Rail Authority.

Should there be rail industry standards for these items and how easy would it be to implement them?

Question to local authorities.

In your area do you know of any poorly maintained rail car parks, and have you had any difficulties in persuading operators to keep their car parks in good order or to police them against anti-social behaviour?

2.5 An interesting situation which came to light as a result of a piece of casework, is that crime committed on railway property (and not just against cars) is not

included in the crime statistics for local police forces as it is considered to be a British Transport Police matter. This could mean a considerable under reporting of car crime in certain areas where rail station car parks form a large proportion of car parking places and where naturally criminals would go to commit their crimes.

Questions to the British Transport Police and other Police authorities.

Is there an easy way of recording and reporting crime statistics on railway property alongside that of local police forces, so as to give a more accurate area crime statistics?

3. The purpose of car parking at stations.

- 3.1 The purpose of car parking at rail stations is to allow interchange between car and rail travel, and to encourage the use of rail for the journeys to which it is most appropriate i.e. long distance journeys to and from major centres of population and activity. Providing car parking at rail stations is an important means of reducing road traffic levels and encouraging the use of sustainable transport. However, car parking should be viewed as only part of the range of options for access to the railway and not as the sole means of access. Obviously in some areas car parking will have greater importance than in others.

Question to local authorities.

In your Local Transport Plan what importance do you give to improving car parking at Rail Stations as a means of reducing overall car trip length? Should this be considered more important than improving access to rail stations by other forms of travel?

4. Sustainable access to stations.

- 4.1 All stations have by definition a catchment area from which their customers are drawn. These customers will make their way to or from the station by a variety of modes. The provision of particular types of accessibility or not will either increase or reduce the potential catchment area accordingly. Similarly enhancing one modal choice may impact on the use of others e.g. increasing the number of car spaces may result in fewer trips by foot, cycle or public transport. Train operators should know where from and how their passengers are arriving at each station they operate.

Question to rail operators and the Strategic Rail Authority?

Do you know the current catchment areas of the stations for which you are responsible for, and the approximate modal share of passengers arriving there? What use do you make of this information in planning services?

- 4.2 In recent years planning requirements for new developments have increasingly required the use of 'Travel Plans' to reduce the impact of developments on local roads and transport by encouraging the use where possible of sustainable transport. It would be possible to adapt this methodology easily to do a similar plan for an existing station. The Committee would want to see a travel plan for any station where there is a significant shortage of available car parking, in the

first instance before consideration is given to expanding the number of spaces available.

Question to operators and local authorities.

Do you see any merit in extending the 'Travel Plan' concept to existing stations, and would you be prepared to co-operate with other bodies in preparing and implementing such plans? Would the addition of 'Travel Plans' for rail stations add value to a local authorities Local Transport Plan/Local Implementation Plan?

4.3 In terms of sustainability it is clear that modes of transport other than the private car should take priority in importance of access or alternative forms of land use should be considered before a decision is taken to use or continue to use land for car parking. This would suggest a sequential test, which could also be the basis of 'Travel Plans' for individual stations along the following lines: -

4.3.1 Pedestrian (and wheelchair) access – safe and direct walking routes to and from points within the walking distance of the station. Our casework highlights poor lighting, un-cleared rubbish, overgrown vegetation and poor road/pavement surfaces outside stations as often in need of improvement. All these give little incentive for passengers to arrive by foot.

4.3.2 Cycle access – safe and direct cycling routes to and from points within cycling distance of the station and appropriate secure cycle storage at the station. Ideally cycle storage at stations should be within the sight of the public and station staff to minimise the risk of theft and vandalism. Our casework highlights that there is a lack of cycle storage facilities at many stations – especially at central London termini.

Questions to local authorities and Transport for London.

Do your walking and cycling strategies include rail stations in the strategic network of cycle routes and footpaths?

For stations in your area, are there any simple small scale schemes which could extend the walking/cycling catchment area? (e.g. Foot and cycle path links, extension of footways on roads currently without them).

4.3.3 Public transport interchange – local public transport provides an important means of access to rail stations if it is properly planned and delivered. Within this a hierarchy of service should be pursued

- There is a maximum use of rail for the length of journey, so that at main stations for example passengers are encouraged to use their local station by a connecting service rather than by driving to the main station. (e.g. passengers from North West London using Watford Junction to go the Midlands, could travel from intermediate stations between Euston and Watford Junction)
- That the use of buses and light rail services is encouraged (e.g. East Croydon) and integrated ticketing such as the Bus Plus initiative
- Demand Responsive Transport services should be encouraged (e.g. Bicester North Taxibus service)
- Taxis and Private Hire vehicles enable access to and continuation from stations to and from places, which are inaccessible by other modes.

Our casework highlights poor integration with bus service particularly outside Greater London, and there is some evidence that car parking has to be provided to substitute for poor evening (post 1800) bus services. This might suggest that better evening bus services in these areas could encourage modal shift in the journey to the rail station. A way to achieve this might be to include in franchise specifications, a requirement to secure bus services where no or inadequate commercial services exists at present. This may also need measures to reduce perceived personal safety risks on local public transport (such as recent projects co-ordinated by Transport for London at Clapham North/High Street, Seven Sisters and Lambeth North).

Question to local authorities outside of Greater London.

Do you feel it is more important to promote local employment opportunities than to accommodate commuting to Greater London? If so, does this affect your prioritisation of tendered bus services, which connect into rail services linking to the capital? As part of a 'Travel Plan' process for stations in your area, would you consider tendering for additional connecting bus services? Have you considered or developed a Demand Responsive Transport service based on a station in your area, if not would this be something you'd be interested in developing?

Question to 'Inter City and Main Line' train operators.

What barriers are there to promoting train to train connections to/from more local services? (e.g. competition considerations, agreement on fares, space in publicity)

- 4.3.4 Another area of complaint concerns the conflict between taxis and other vehicles parked on station forecourts. This highlights the need for greater enforcement of both taxi rank provision and of casual illegal use of taxi facilities by other car drivers, and the appropriateness of the location of the taxi rank.

Question to local authorities.

Are taxi ranks at stations in your area controlled by the Highway authority in your area or by the train operating company? Would handing control to the Highway authority enable better enforcement action to be taken against vehicles which should not be there or for breaches of discipline by taxi drivers? Would a common national standard for Taxi and Private Hire licensing be beneficial to passengers? Would placing taxi ranks within the public highway increase the supply of taxis, by removing restrictive agreements with train operating companies? What proportion of the taxi/private hire fleet licensed in your area is accessible, and are you proposing to increase this proportion? Would provision of 'Kiss and Ride' facilities reduce casual illegal use of taxi ranks by other drivers?

- 4.3.5 Car parking for people with disabilities – We recognise that the private car will sometimes be the most appropriate means for people with disabilities to access a rail station. Therefore, priority should be given to the design and allocation of station car parking to reflect this. The recommended standards are set out in Appendix A.

Where operators wish to make an exception to these rules, then they will need to make a demonstrable case that the needs of people with disabilities are being reasonably met by their proposals.

Operators should also be encouraged to pro-actively promote the existence of car parking for people with disabilities. This should be seen in the light of low expectations of people with disabilities about the availability of facilities and their ability to make use of them.

The pricing of disabled parking spaces should reflect the fact that people with disabilities are a) likely to have less disposable income than ordinary rail users and b) are more likely to use a car to access a rail station for journeys which an able bodied person might more reasonably walk or cycle. Therefore, it is recommended that either free or substantially reduced charges be applied to these types of spaces. As there is an already recognised national scheme for disabled car parking spaces – the Blue Badge Scheme, it is recommended that this system should be the means of implementation and recognition at rail stations. However, it is recognised that in some locations demand will need to be managed to prevent abuse of the system. Our casework highlights poor enforcement of existing parking for people with disabilities and abuse by other customers and even railway staff.

Question to operators, interest groups and local authorities.

Are the standards suggested in Appendix A too generous, insufficient or about right? Would operators have difficulty in complying with these standards? Should the Blue Badge Scheme be the definition of persons eligible to use a designated parking space? Are there any circumstances where the use of such a space could be permitted without showing a Blue Badge?

- 4.3.6 Operational parking. The safe and efficient operation and maintenance of the railway will require the use of land for vehicles used to service the railway. This may also include providing car parking for staff who are required to work outside of the normal operational day, i.e. before first train arrival and after last train departure. In areas of inner London where all-night bus services are commonplace this may not be necessary.

Question to operators and Network Rail

Do you have a company 'Travel Plan', and has this identified areas in which the use of road vehicles could be reduced? Are there measures, which at little or no cost could encourage staff to use more sustainable means of travel? (e.g. providing secure cycle storage, or making available to staff (and the public?) vehicle movements currently not available to the public). Would any reduction in operational parking make a significant contribution to the supply of parking spaces available to passengers?

- 4.3.7 Alternative land use. Use of land for non-car parking purposes such as housing, employment or retail development may be more sustainable and more profitable for the rail operator. This can take the form of either encouraging the use of rail for journeys by the users of the new development (and its closeness to the railway will enhance its attractiveness) or by some other use, which benefits the railway indirectly. For example use for social housing for key workers employed by the railway industry. This may be of more importance in areas close to major operating depots, especially in areas where it is difficult to retain or recruit staff and where property may be expensive or in short supply.

Question to operators.

Has your company experienced recruitment difficulties as a result of a lack of affordable/social housing? If so, would making available redundant railway land for housing development allocated to railway workers be of benefit?

Question to local authorities.

Have you identified transport workers as 'key' workers in your housing strategy for affordable/social housing?

What barriers are there to the development of railway land for non-railway uses e.g. residential, employment or retail? (noise, conformity with local plan?).

Question to Network Rail.

Would you welcome this approach as a means of managing your estate portfolio? Would you be willing to consider release of land for 'key' worker housing at less than the current market rate?

- 4.3.8 'Kiss and Ride'. All stations should have some short term parking for people dropping off and collecting passengers from the railway. Typically this should be of duration of no more than 20 minutes. This enables a rapid throughput of vehicles using a minimum amount of space. This does not have to be a 'free' facility – a small charge may be enough to divert some journeys to other modes. The committee recognises that in Central London (say zone 1 Travelcard stations or those within the Congestion Charge area) that providing this type of short stay parking may not be desirable or feasible.

Question to operators and local authorities.

Is it feasible or desirable for every station to have short term parking nearby? Does this necessarily have to be off-road? How easy would it be to enforce a 'Kiss and Ride' rule of 20 minutes without introducing a minimum charge?

- 4.3.9 General car parking. For journeys where a walking, cycling or other mode trip to the station is not feasible, it is recognised that car trips should be provided for whether this is for a long term stay or short 'Kiss and Ride' pick up/set down operations. Station car parking can provide an effective means of encouraging the use of rail for the journeys to which it is most appropriate i.e. long distance journeys to and from major centres of population and activity and thus reducing overall road traffic levels. Under the heading of general car parking it may be helpful for car repair and servicing activities to be available not only for the convenience of existing rail users but also as a means of subliminally attracting non-rail users by emphasising the convenience of the alternative means of travel other than by the car.
- 4.3.10 This sequential test is consistent with Transport for London's Interchange Plan (Policy 4P.2) and Park and Ride policy principles, the Strategic Rail Authority's interchange standards and the Mayor's Transport and Spatial Development Strategies.

Question to all.

Does this sequential test add value as a tool to your existing plans and procedures?

5. Development and Planning Issues

- 5.1 Having said that there has traditionally been an ad-hoc approach to providing car parking, there is no reason why the planning system should not seek to bring station car parking within the remit of local transport plans and the SRA's franchise replacement programme. Local Authorities in the LTUC area could be encouraged to adopt the 'Zonal' approach outlined in paragraph 6.3.6 in their local transport and local development plan frameworks. This would certainly bring a more rational approach to car park planning and property management and development. It may be that certain car parks could be closed, whilst allowing for the expansion or provision of others. For example, in Luton, under the proposed regeneration of the town centre, a new bus station and road will replace the existing station car parks, and an existing under-used bus station made into the station car park.

Question to TfL and London boroughs.

Should rail stations with car parks within Greater London be reassessed for development potential?

6. What do passengers want from their car park?

- 6.1 Security, safety, space and value for money describe the four main themes of customer aspirations for car parking.
- 6.2. Security and safety
- 6.2.1 Customers have an expectation that their personal safety is assured between parking their vehicle and catching their train and vice versa. In addition they expect their vehicle whilst left at the station at their own risk is secure from theft, damage or vandalism during the time that it is parked at the car park.
- 6.2.2 The Secure Car Park Scheme operated by the Association of Chief Police Officers, the Home Office, the Automobile Association and the British Parking Association has produced self-assessment guidelines for car parks covering issues such as surveillance, boundary treatment, lighting, vehicle access, parking area design, pedestrian access, security, signage and management practice. As these are established standards for car park operators in general, and the SRA has a duty to ensure that railway car parks are to these standards it is not proposed here to restate them. However, there is no programme to ensure that they are implemented across the network in a consistent manner.
- 6.2.3 Whilst accepting that there is an industry standard in place, there is a case for modifications to deal with some of the side of effects of railway operations. These could be that delays and disruptions to services could result in passengers arriving at stations on their return journey later than anticipated – so flexibility needs to be in place with enforcement, so as not to penalise passengers delayed through no fault of their own. In addition normal railway operations may require location specific conditions e.g. where the last train of the day arrives after midnight or by offering 24-hour tickets where train services run 24 hours per day. As a minimum parking ticket validity should be in line with rail day ticket validity.

Question to operators.

How easy would it be to switch to 24 hour rather than day of issue validity only or to train service operational day rather than 12midnight?

- 6.2.4 Enforcement however, does need to be consistent, regular and fair. Rail companies should make it their business to ensure that competent persons inspect each car park at regular intervals either daily or at minimum weekly at various times of day. Increasingly, car park enforcement is being contracted out to specialised car parking contractors such as Central Parking Systems and Meteor – these companies will need to be made aware of the special requirements of rail car parking and this will need to be reflected in their policies and staff training.
- 6.2.5 Special attention should be paid to ensure that vehicles (including bicycles) are not abandoned at stations, and where this has obviously happened swift action should be taken to remove these. Station/Enquiry staff must be notified of any such removal and keep a record.
- 6.3 Space and value for money.
- 6.3.1 Who should pay? Ultimately the users of the railway pay for providing car parking as for any other facility on the railway in some way, because there is a cost in providing it. These costs can range from opportunity costs (revenue foregone if the land were used for another activity) to security, maintenance and train fare revenue foregone (if pricing at one station encourages longer car journeys to another). Recouping this expenditure can take various courses depending on the outcome desired.
- 6.3.2 It costs the rail industry less to provide for users who walk, cycle or use public transport to reach the station, and these forms of travel are the most environmentally sustainable. So there is a case for charging rail car park users for using the spaces that they occupy.
- 6.3.3 Traditionally the pricing of car parks at rail stations has been geared to either recovering the costs of operation of the car park or as a means of attracting custom to the railway. The costs of providing car parking will vary on a site by site basis depending on the size of the facility, the level of security etc. and also on the opportunity costs that might be incurred. For instance the rail property owner may find that redevelopment for residential or commercial use may be a more profitable activity than its use as a car park.
- 6.3.4 Rail operators may in certain circumstances wish to reduce the price of parking or provide free parking for rail users as a means of encouraging the use of the railway. This may also reflect funding from outside bodies such as Local Authorities for providing or upgrading parking facilities either as part of a wider transport strategy of modal shift, or to address a local problem such as commuters' cars filling side streets near to rail stations with consequent difficulties for local residents. Conversely, the location of railway stations in city or town centres may result in use of any car park by non-rail users, to the detriment of people wishing to use the railway, who may as a result find no space available. The pricing of the car park in this case needs to work in favour of the rail user either by means of a rebate on purchase of a rail ticket or of a

pricing or length of stay structure, which would deter but not prohibit use by non-rail users. If the operator is to capture the benefit of income from a car park account should be taken of the availability of 'competing' car parking facilities nearby such as those owned by local authorities or private companies, or the availability of on street parking whether paid for or freely available. The availability of such facilities if there is an excess of space over demand could enable rail companies to use their spaces more profitably for the railway.

Question to local authorities.

In setting your car park charges do you take account of rates charged at nearby rail stations? Do you operate any car parks, which are primarily used by rail passengers? Are there any particular reasons for this?

- 6.3.5 Having said all of the above it has to be recognised that the price of car parking should be recognised as part of a 'whole travel cost' including the price of the rail journey. Where train services are less frequent, there is an argument for reducing the price of car parking at stations, with the converse that a higher frequency of service could merit higher parking charges.

Questions to operators.

Is it feasible to introduce combined parking and rail tickets on a wider scale? Good practice suggests that lower prices for evening and weekend times would increase usage – what barriers are there to introducing such differential pricing? Our casework highlights that often finding a space at railway car parks is a problem – what level of occupancy do you plan for your car parks to recover your costs? If you were required to plan for a minimum of 10% space availability what effect would this have on parking prices?

- 6.3.6 Taking all these factors into account a framework for providing car parks and their pricing in the London (LTUC) area could be based around the principles of the Travelcard zoning system.

Zone 1. 6 major stations have car parks¹. Given that these are in the centre of London and have extensive all-night and all-day public transport serving them and they are within or on the edge of the congestion charging zone, it is difficult to understand why except in the case of parking for operational reasons and for people with disabilities, parking is provided at all at these locations. There may be an argument for providing car parking as a perk for first class travellers, as this may encourage long distance travel by rail as opposed to air. However, the cost of this provision may be outweighed by for example making through rail fares for first class ticket holders from all stations within Greater London the same as from the main London terminals, or by providing a free taxi service to and from destinations in Zones 1 and 2. It is recommended that the current provision be reviewed at these locations with a view to finding alternative uses for the sites concerned.

Zone 2. The only station in this zone with significant parking provision is North Greenwich. This performs an important function in that it provides a park and ride facility for the Docklands area, thereby reducing the throughput of the nearby Blackwall Tunnel. This facility also acts to relieve pressure on South Eastern Trains routes for journeys into central London, but it could be argued

¹ (Paddington, Euston, Kings Cross, St.Pancras, Victoria and Waterloo)

that better provision in the South Eastern Trains area might be a more sustainable alternative. At North Greenwich the pricing structure should aim to minimise the amount of diversion of passengers from long distance rail services.

Question to London Underground.

Have you conducted any research on the origin and destination of car park users at North Greenwich to see whether there is any scope for encouraging modal change at other places to enable the use of rail for a greater part of the journey?

Zones 3 to 6. There are 144 stations with parking, of which 24 are 'Town Centre' stations². The pricing structure for all these stations should aim to minimise the amount of revenue abstraction from stations in the outer zones and beyond, with those 'Town Centre' stations priced to reflect that status. Similarly stations³ with easy access to the trunk road and motorway networks should be priced to reduce the diversion of passengers from long distance rail services, and to enable local residents to use the facilities on offer. In zone 6 however, there may be an argument for encouraging Park'n Ride at these stations if appropriate levels of service, sufficient parking and highway capacity can be provided. Epping, Theydon Bois, Debden, Loughton and Moor Park are stations which have Zone 6 status but which are geographically outside Greater London. These stations should be priced in a similar way to other stations outside Greater London, but with appropriate incentives to Travelcard purchase.

Stations outside Greater London. Pricing at these stations should be geared towards the encouragement of Travelcard 'add-on' fares for journeys toward London and this should be reflected in the prices paid, so that the first station with a car park outside Travelcard zone 6 (i.e. Dunton Green, Upper Warlingham, Whyteleafe, Earlswood, Chipstead etc) has a car park price which is lower than the equivalent Zone 6 station, and is linked to the Travelcard price, to give the incentive for passengers to buy a Travelcard from this station rather than drive to stations within Greater London. In certain cases account will also have to be taken of their 'Town Centre' status. This could take the form of adjustments to charging levels at other more distant but non-town centre stations such as Eynsford, Boxhill & West Humble, Virginia Water, Wraysbury, Roydon and Chalfont & Latimer etc.

Question to operators, local authorities and TfL.

Is this kind of structure feasible or desirable, and what sort of problems do you foresee? (need for exceptions etc.)

- 6.4 Means of payment and display of tickets. Our casework has highlighted this as an area where rail companies need to be aware and be apart of developments in car park management. For example payment of charges can now be achieved by WAP mobile phones or via the Internet. This could potentially mean

² (Zone 3 Lewisham, Greenwich, Forest Hill, Wimbledon, Mortlake, East Finchley ,Tottenham Hale, Zone 4 Woolwich Arsenal, Eltham, Bromley North, Beckenham Junction, Richmond, Brentford, Hounslow East, Wembley Park and Finchley Central, Zone 5 Bexleyheath, Sutton, Hounslow, Hayes and Harlington, Harrow -on-the-Hill and Chingford, Zone 6 Orpington and Surbiton)

³ (Zone 3 Kidbrooke, Lee, Chiswick, North Ealing, Brent Cross, Highgate and Leytonstone, Zone 4Welling, Mottingham, New Malden, Isleworth, Osterley, Greenford, Perivale, Sudbury Town, Queensbury, Colindale, Mill Hill East, New Southgate, Arnos Grove, Palmers Green, Woodford, South Woodford, Snaresbrook, Wanstead, Redbridge and Newbury Park, Zone 5 Sidcup, Tolworth, Berrylands, Twickenham, Hatton Cross, Hounslow West, South Ruislip, Ruislip Gardens, Stanmore, New Barnet, High Barnet, Cockfosters, Oakwood, Gordon Hill, Bush Hill Park, Buckhurst Hill, Hainault, Fairlop, Barkingside and Dagenham Dock, Zone 6 Slade Green, Crayford, Bexley, Knockholt, Chelsfield, Kenley, Coulsdon South, Woodmansterne, Smitham, Cheam, Chessington South, Chessington North, Hampton Court, Feltham, Hillingdon, Ickenham, Ruislip, West Ruislip, Northwood, Gidea Park, Harold Wood, Upminster and Rainham)

that the need for tickets to be issued and displayed within a vehicle might be avoided. This has a number of advantages not least that as railway car parks are more likely to be in the open and have vehicles staying for long periods, that problems of tickets fading and 'curling up' in bright sunlight could be eliminated. Potentially this could reduce the number of disputes with car owners, who may be wrongly clamped or charged as a result. Similarly in an increasingly cashless society, ticket machines should be capable of accepting debit or credit cards, or stored value cards such as Oystercard as a means of payment. This would also allow car park season tickets to be purchased from machines rather than booking offices, with consequent reductions for the need for customer's to queue. Customers are also increasingly looking for flexibility in the products that they purchase – being able to purchase tickets for 2 to 3 days in advance for example or differential charging rates for off-peak, evening and weekend parking.

Question to operators and TfL.

Are these suggested developments feasible and/or desirable? How feasible would it be for Season Ticket holders to be guaranteed a parking space, and if one is not available should compensation be payable?

7. Should there be any expansion of car parking? If so, where?

7.1 It is accepted that the growth of the economy and the continued growth of car ownership outside of Greater London, requires some growth in car parking at rail stations where this is the only way of achieving greater use of public transport for most of each journey.

7.2 Where should this growth be targeted?

7.3 Providing car parks' at rail stations enables the growth of passengers on rail services. However, this growth needs to be managed in relation to the capacity of train services to carry the additional business generated as part of an overall plan to grow the rail business as a whole. This lends itself to a sequential test of where such growth could occur. This could be:-

1. Is the location of the car park within easy access of the rail station?
2. Does the train service have the capacity to carry additional passengers to the various destinations en route?
3. Will extra train services be required to cater for the growth?
4. Would providing a car park lead to abstraction from other rail services with a net reduction in rail passenger miles travelled?
5. Would implementation of a 'Travel Plan' for the station reduce or eliminate the need for expansion of car parking space?

7.4 In the case of the items one and two a yes answer and for items three and four a no answer would indicate that provision of car parking is worthwhile. Train operating companies already have commercial incentives to expand car parks in places where demand is already proven, and in which case plans for expansion should be supported. However, there is also a case for some creative thinking about providing car parks in areas where at present a commercial case may not be justified, but which may add value as part an overall package to improve transport facilities and which could bring benefits to the railway. Potential areas where extra car parking might be explored in this vein could be

- The use of Kempton Park Racecourse station (on non-race days) as a Park'n Ride station for Kingston and Wimbledon shopping centres (this may require the agreement of the racecourse operator to provide land on non-race days, and additional highway capacity between the M3 junction and the station).
- South Greenford as a Park'n Ride station for West Ealing and Ealing Broadway shopping areas from the A40.
- Oxshott, Tolworth, Morden South and St.Helier as Park'n Ride stations for Wimbledon shopping centre.
- Bickley as a Park'n Ride station for Bromley perhaps at weekends. The current car park / station yard is underused and with a redevelopment of the station yard, improved signage from the nearby A222 this could be better used. The current 4 trains per hour, 3-minute journey time to Bromley South on a daily basis would allow for a 'quick win' for a minimum amount of expenditure.
- Knockholt as a Park'n Ride station for Orpington and central London from the M25 and A21.
- Belmont, Banstead and Epsom Downs as Park'n Ride stations for Sutton and Croydon from the A217.
- Whyteleafe South as a Park'n Ride station for Croydon from the A22.
- Datchet as a Park'n Ride station for Windsor from the M4 and M25.
- local stations on the St.Albans Abbey – Watford Junction branch (subject of a potential Community Rail Partnership).

Members are invited to suggest other locations from their local knowledge.

Questions to local authorities, TfL, SRA and operators.

Have these ideas been considered before? Do they have any merit? Are they practical? What problems do you foresee in implementing these? (e.g. station is outside of area for the authority, which would benefit, extra spaces provided might be used for Central London commuting?) Do you have any other alternative schemes that would merit LTUC's support?

8. **Conclusions.**

- 8.1 Car parking will continue to play a significant role in enabling and maintaining access to the rail network for a significant proportion of rail's passenger customers.
- 8.2. Retaining and growing this customer base (whilst at the same time encouraging the use of sustainable modes to access stations) will be a significant challenge in the coming years as public expectation of the level of service at rail station car parks increases.
- 8.3. A coherent and planned policy towards providing car parking at rail stations is an essential part of growing the rail passenger business as a whole.

Appendix A.

Table of recommended number of 'Blue Badge' car parking spaces to accord with standards set by the Disability Discrimination Act 1992. (Source Cambridge City Council. Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Guidance 2003)

Total number of car parking spaces to be provided on-site	Minimum number of spaces for people with disabilities
< 20	At least 1, more depending on specific needs
21-30	2
31-40	3
41-60	4
> 61	6% rounded up to the nearest whole place.

The location of these spaces should be as close as possible to the accessible entrances to the station, and be capable of close supervision by staff.