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Preface

This development brief was formally adopted by Elmbridge Borough Council Town Planning Committee on 2 November 1999, following a period of public consultation on a draft development brief prepared for the Borough Council by planning consultants Llewlyn-Davies.

The brief provides Supplementary Planning Guidance pursuant to Policy GS2 (as amplified at paragraph 2.12) of the Elmbridge Borough Local Plan, 1993, and to Policy GEN8 (as amplified at paragraph 2.21) of the Replacement Elmbridge Borough Local Plan Deposit Draft, November 1997, and will be taken into account as a material consideration with regard to any proposals for development of or affecting the sites.

The Town Planning Committee also agreed in principle the extension of the East Molesey (Kent Town) Conservation Area to include within its boundary the whole of the Hampton Court Station site and the adjoining Cigarette Island Park.
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Hampton Court Station and The Jolly Boatman Development Brief

1 Purpose of the Brief

1.1 A Planning Brief for the Hampton Court Station and Jolly Boatman sites was jointly prepared by Elmbridge Borough Council and Surrey County Council in November 1986 and was subsequently amended in February 1996. The brief was amended in 1996 to allow "a small element of residential development at the site, such an element to be limited to a scale which would not prejudice the provision of the principal uses suggested by the original planning brief". Whilst there has been development interest in the site since 1986, the schemes which have been promoted have either been unviable or unacceptable in planning terms.

1.2 Since the 1986 brief there have been a number of specific changes which might affect the development of the site including; changes in land ownership and the operational requirements of the landowners; more detailed information regarding the cost of relocating the railway station and significant changes in national, strategic and local planning policy.

1.3 The Council is very keen to encourage a sensitive and comprehensive development of this site and the primary purpose of this brief is to update the 1986 brief, taking into account recent changes, in order to stimulate and guide new development.

1.4 The Council employed consultants Llewelyn-Davies to revise the 1986 brief. Their remit was to devise a brief which would provide a framework for a commercially viable scheme, concordant with national and local planning policy and the aspirations of relevant interested parties. The consultants were also charged with providing guidance on design issues.

1.5 The aims of the brief can be summarised as follows:

1. To promote a comprehensive development of the site, to include a comprehensive solution to access.

2. To enhance the site's role as a transport interchange.

3. To ensure that the development enhances the East Molesey Conservation Area and provides a scheme of the highest architectural
quality which respects its location opposite Hampton Court Palace and adjacent to Hampton Court bridge.

4. To ensure that development maximises the opportunity to improve the frontage of the River Thames and to encourage a range of uses which promote the enjoyment of the River.

5. To encourage environmental improvement of the site and the immediately adjacent highway.

6. To enhance the site as a gateway to the borough, particularly for tourists visiting Hampton Court.

7. To encourage a mix of uses appropriate to the site's location.

1.6 As Planning Policy Guidance Note 12 (Para. 3.18) sets out, Supplementary Planning Guidance will comprise a material consideration in determining applications for the development of sites subject to such guidance. However, this brief is not intended to be exhaustive in its consideration of the options for the future development of the site. It outlines the Borough Council's preferred requirements for the future development of the site. This brief does not waive the requirements for an application for detailed planning permission being submitted to the Local Planning Authority, Elmbridge Borough Council.

1.7 This brief has been prepared as a result of wide ranging public consultation and in conjunction with various key consultees. A list of the key consultees with whom any future developer of the site is advised to liaise are set out in Appendix A to this brief.

2 Planning History

2.1 A summary of the complex planning history of the two sites is attached as Appendix B to this brief.

3 Site Description

3.1 The total site area of the combined Jolly Boatman and Hampton Court Station sites comprises approximately 1.42 hectares (3.5 acres). The site is shown in its local context on Plan 1. 0.2 hectares (0.5 acres) are owned by Whitbread PLC and 1.22 hectares (3.0 acres) are owned by Railtrack. Details regarding the ownership of the two sites are shown on Plan 2. The land ownership plan also shows highway land owned by Surrey County Council (site C).
Plan 1
Local Context Plan
Plan 2
Land Ownership Plan

[Diagram showing land ownership plan with labeled areas and locations such as Site A, Site B, Jolly Boatman site, Hampton Court Station, River Thames, and other geographical markers.]
3.2 The site is broadly rectangular and is bounded to the north by the vehicular and pedestrian access to Cigarette Island Park. The Park itself forms the eastern flank to the site. The A309 Hampton Court Way forms the western boundary to the site and the southern boundary is the River Mole.

3.3 Cigarette Island Park comprises public open space, owned by Elmbridge Borough Council. On the western side of Hampton Court Way is the East Molesey Local Centre which accommodates a mixture of local convenience shops, restaurants, bars, antique shops and art galleries. Beyond the access road to Cigarette Island Park, to the north, the river embankment falls steeply away to the River Thames, where there is a public walkway and a landing stage for pleasure cruisers.

3.4 The site currently has four separate vehicular access points onto Hampton Court Way. There is one signal controlled pedestrian crossing which traverses Hampton Court Way opposite the railway station. On the western side there are two T-junctions with Hampton Court Way; from Creek Road and from Riverbank. The existing access points are shown on Plan3 (existing access plan).

3.5 Site A, owned by Whitbread Plc, accommodates the former Jolly Boatman restaurant, a single storey building comprising 491sqm of timber construction, in a state of disrepair and unsightly. There is a large paved outdoor seating area on which there are two freestanding kiosks. Hoardings have been erected around the Jolly Boatman site. Along the western flank of the site there are two bus stops for the 68, 411, 513 and 267 services.

3.6 The 68 is a daily service originating in Richmond and terminating at Hampton Court Station. The 411 is also daily and travels from Kingston to West Molesey via the site. The 513 is less frequent and travels from Cobham to Kingston via the site. The 267 is operated only on summer Sundays as an extension to the Hammersmith to Fulwell service.

3.7 Site B, owned by Railtrack, comprises the Hampton Court Station, associated buildings and pay and display car parking for 209 cars (3 disabled), all of which are available for public use. In front of the station building there is a tarmaced area of 0.1 hectares (0.25 acres) which is used as coach parking space, capable of accommodating approximately 15-20 coaches, and as a coach drop off area. None of the coach parking spaces are formally laid out and there is no landscaping in this area.

3.8 In the south west corner of the Railtrack site an area of approximately 0.08 hectares (0.2 acres) is let to Hampton Court Motors on a short lease for use as a car sales operation. It currently accommodates a single storey brick built building and a forecourt for approximately 20 cars.
Plan 3
Existing Access Plan

1. Service access to Cigarette Island Park
2. Main Vehicular Access
3. Pedestrian Access across Hampton Court Way
4. Access to Coach Parking
5. Vehicular Access to Hampton Court Motors
3.9 The station building is locally listed by Elmbridge Borough Council. The two storey building was designed by Sir William Tite in 1849 and is currently in a poor state of repair. At ground floor level it is used partly as a newsagents, partly for station administration and a ticket office and is partly vacant. The upper floor is entirely vacant.

3.10 There is a covered open sided waiting area immediately to the north of the railway tracks and platforms with seating and ticket machines. To the north of this area is a painted brick wall with entrances onto the platform punctured through it. This wall connects the station building to a single storey brick built building used as offices for a minicab company.

3.11 The site lies 800 metres to south and west of Hampton Court Palace and Home Park. Hampton Court Palace is listed Grade 1 and is a Scheduled Ancient Monument of international significance. Home Park is Grade 1 registered and is included in the National Register of Parks and Gardens. The site is also very prominent from the River Thames. The northern part of the site falls within the East Molesey Conservation Area, designated in 1973. To the north west of the site, the Hampton Court Bridge, designed by Sir Edward Lutyens is listed Grade II. Given the importance of the setting of Hampton Court Palace and the of the Thames river frontage, the site is extremely architecturally sensitive.

4 A Comprehensive Approach

4.1 The opportunity to create the most efficient and effective transportation and movement solution, to include the rationalisation and co-ordination of access to the site, integration of transportation modes (road, rail, river, cycle and pedestrian), sharing of car parking between uses and optimal pedestrian routes should not be prejudiced by ownership constraints. Accordingly, A comprehensive approach to the development of both sites is required. The principle reasons are as follows:

1. A co-ordinated solution for access to the site is essential. At the present there are 4 separate access points from the site onto Hampton Court Way (see Plan 3). This results in confusion to those arriving at the site by car and for those using Hampton Court Way, which can be potentially dangerous. There is also the potential for pedestrian/vehicle conflict, particularly for those visiting Hampton Court Palace who are unfamiliar with the area.

2. The site is extremely visually sensitive and a co-ordinated approach to design, to achieve a development of quality given the prominent location, within a conservation area and opposite Hampton Court Palace is essential.
3. The necessity to achieve optimal pedestrian routes between the station and Hampton Court Palace through the site.

4. The desire to share car parking between the sites.

4.2 It is accepted that a comprehensive scheme could be implemented in different phases, by the different owners. This brief does not seek to control the phasing of development but rather to ensure that the development of any part of the site does not adversely affect or prejudice a comprehensive solution for the larger whole.

5 **Planning Policy**

5.1 Since the 1986 brief was published there have been a number of important changes to Government Policy. The most significant of these, of relevance to the Hampton Court Station site, is the policy to reduce reliance on the private car and promote the use of public transport. Planning Policy Guidance Note 13 Transport was published in 1994. It states that local authorities should influence the location of different types of development relative to transport provision and foster forms of development which encourage walking, cycling and public transport use. To meet these aims Local Planning Authorities are encouraged to promote development within urban areas at locations highly accessible by means other than the private car. This policy stance is reflected in the Surrey Structure Plan. The Hampton Court Station site serves as an important transport interchange between the rail service, local buses, taxis, coaches and private cars parking at the station car park. It is a fundamental objective of this brief to retain, and enhance this function of the site, whilst at the same time reducing car parking to that which is strictly necessary and encouraging shared use of parking.

5.2 Planning Policy Guidance Note 1, General Policy and Principles was published in February 1997. The guidance highlighted a number of themes, including an emphasis on sustainable development, the promotion of mixed use development and guidance on the operation of the plan led system. The guidance also stressed the importance to be attached to the design of new buildings and urban design issues generally.

5.3 Planning Policy Guidance Note 15 relates to Planning and the Historic Environment. It is particularly relevant as it gives advice regarding development in Conservation Areas and within the setting of listed buildings. The guidance requires consultation with English Heritage for development in conservation areas and for that which affects the setting of Grade 1 Listed buildings. The guidance also advises consulting the Royal Fine Arts Commission (now the Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment) on schemes which raise conservation issues of
greater than local importance. The Garden History Society should be consulted given the proximity to Home Park.

5.4 Development of the site will also have to have regard to guidance contained in Regional Planning Guidance Note 3 (Annex B) relating to Strategic Planning for the River Thames. This guidance sets out a number of objectives and principles many of which are directly relevant to the site. These include; to secure special quality for new development on the River; to protect and enhance historic buildings; to promote a range of uses which encourage enjoyment of the River; to improve the quality of open space; to protect and enhance landscapes, views and skylines; to harness the transport potential of the River and to maintain and enhance public access along and across the River.

5.5 The site is not specifically allocated in either the Adopted Elmbridge Local Plan (1993) nor the Deposit Draft Local Plan (1997). However, a number of general policies will apply to the development of the site. These policies are not repeated in full here but are reflected in the content of the brief. A list of policies which will be applied by the Council in considering applications are set out in Appendix C to this brief. An extract from the Deposit Draft Local Plan Proposals Map is shown on Plan 4 overleaf.

5.6 The site is specifically referred to in the Thames Landscape Strategy (adopted as supplementary planning guidance by Elmbridge Borough Council in 1994) relating to the river frontage in this area (the Hampton to Kew section). The main landscape “factors for consideration” are highlighted as:

- Importance of public transport access point;
- Views from Hampton Court Bridge and Palace; and
- Relationship with Cigarette Island open space.

5.7 In 1995 the Thames Landscape Strategy and Elmbridge Borough Council co-ordinated the submission of a bid for Millennium Commission Funding for the site involving refurbishing the Thames waterfront, the creation of a visitor centre in the station building and opening the area as a gateway to the River landscape. The proposal involved improving routes from the station to Hampton Court Palace, but was unfortunately unsuccessful in attracting funding.

6  

**Design Issues**

6.1 A high standard of design in architecture, landscape and layout will be sought over the whole site, given its location at a major gateway to the
A full statement on design issues should be submitted in support of a detailed planning application. This should address impact on townscape, settings of Hampton Court Palace and the Thames as well as site specific design issues. A site analysis plan detailing key features of the site and highlighting opportunities for improvement and sensitive design are shown on Plan 5.

6.2 However, as Plan 5 shows, the Jolly Boatman site is highly visible and therefore particular regard will be paid to the Jolly Boatman site and that part of the site fronting the Cigarette Island Park, given its location opposite Hampton Court Palace, adjacent to the Grade II Lutyens Listed Bridge, on the River Thames and within the East Molesey Conservation Area. Buildings of the highest quality of design will be required for these prominent locations and the applicants are encouraged to employ the services of architects who have a track record of designing excellent buildings in historic settings. The Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment (CABE) and English Heritage should be contacted for their views at an early stage in the design process. The Borough Council will refer any application to the CABE for consideration. In addition, the East Molesey Conservation Area Advisory Committee, the Council's Conservation Officer, the Garden History Society and the Thames Landscape Strategy Co-ordinator should also be consulted.

6.3 The South Western Railway Act of 1913 prohibits the development of any buildings of greater than 15.2m (50 ft) within a one and a half mile radius of Hampton Court Palace. However, whilst this may control development to an extent it is the Council's view that no building anywhere on the site should exceed three storeys plus a pitched roof, which is likely to be substantially less than the 50 ft. limit. This is to ensure that development does not dominate the existing station building, is below the tree canopy of the park and masses appropriately with the East Molesey Conservation Area buildings.

6.4 Materials and detailing for both buildings and frontage should of a quality appropriate to the setting, and should be robust and durable. There is a wide variety of building materials used in the vicinity; stone, brick, tile, slate, timber frame and render, any of which could be appropriate if sensitively used.

6.5 A comprehensive landscape scheme should form part of any proposal, which should demonstrate an integrated landscape strategy for both sites and the adjacent highway corridor. Particular attention should be paid to the river frontage, the park perimeter and the Hampton Court Way frontage as well as the routes from the station to the Bridge and East Molesey. The applicants should liaise with the Thames Landscape Strategy Co-ordinator so that proposals can dovetail with this initiative.
Plan 5
Site Analysis Plan

Detailed map of the site analysis plan showing various features:
- View of Tijou Screen of Privy Garden
- Cigarette Island Park
- New Station highly visible from Hampton Court
- Poorly landscaped islands detract from Conservation Area
- Buildings of 2, 3, and 4 stories
- Poorly defined edge
- Boundary of site may be adjusted to suit new highway improvements
- Listed Lutyens Bridge
- Conservation Area Boundary
- Epsting Station Building sets scale of new development
Development Issues

7.1 Having regard to national and strategic policy guidance and the adopted and draft local plans, the Council’s preferred uses for the site are set out below by site.

The Jolly Boatman Site – Preferred Land Use Mix

8.1 The extent of the Jolly Boatman site is shown on Plan 2 relating to land ownership. In the context of a comprehensive access solution for the whole site the service access between the site and the Thames footpath which is used to serve Cigarette Island Park and is owned by Surrey County Council (see plan 6) could be incorporated into the Whitbread site and be assimilated into any development proposal. This would be subject to agreement with the County Council, alternative provision for emergency and service vehicle access to Cigarette Island Park being made elsewhere within the development and satisfactory pedestrian access to Cigarette Island Park along the Thames frontage being retained. Subject to these criteria being satisfied and the County Council declaring the land surplus to requirements, a Stopping-up Order would have to be prepared by the County Council. The developer should contact the County Council’s Environment Department regarding the necessary procedures (see appendix 1).

8.2 The Jolly Boatman site is extremely architecturally sensitive given its location in the Conservation Area and opposite Hampton Court Palace. Quality of design will be key in respect of this site and design issues are discussed in greater detail in Paragraph 1.6 above. Any scheme should have regard to the Council’s Supplementary Planning Guidance on “Waterside Development”.

8.3 Subject to design, the Jolly Boatman site is considered appropriate for a mixture of high quality leisure uses. Elements to be encouraged would be a public house, restaurant or café, taking advantage of the riverside frontage. These should be of a quality of design which are commensurate with the location on the Thames and opposite Hampton Court Palace. Any development of this nature will have to respect the location immediately adjacent to the Thames riverside walkway. A small hotel (probably no greater than 40 bedrooms) of a high quality of design would also be appropriate, although because of design constraints this should not be greater than 3 storeys high. Servicing access should be discretely provided to the rear of the site away from the Thames frontage and must be designed to minimise pedestrian and service vehicle conflict. Car parking should be provided to comply with Surrey County...
Plan 6
Potential Site Expansion Area
Council’s standards. The opportunity for commuter car parking and that required for the hotel/restaurant uses to be shared should be fully explored.

9 **Hampton Court Station Site**

9.1 *Development Options*

9.2 The 1986 brief proposed shortening the rail tracks and building a new railway station on the south of the site, thus clearing a greater area of the site for development. The costs associated with moving the station and building a new station of real design quality are potentially substantial. The quantity of value generating uses required to ensure that development is viable might render a scheme unacceptable in visual and qualitative terms, given the site’s sensitive location and the height restriction placed on development.

In order to avoid the circumstance in which high levels of development are required to fund the costs of building a new station, this brief allows for two scenarios:

1. Retention of the station and tracks in their existing location; and

2. Moving the railway station and tracks to the south.

9.3 The Council will consider alternative development options which either retain or move the railway station, provided they demonstrate the highest standard of design (see section 6 above) and an acceptable land use mix (see 11 below). Two options are briefly described below, but there may be others which are acceptable to the Council.

*Option 1 - Retention of the station in situ*

9.4 This option as shown on Plan 7 retains and refurbishes the station in situ, with interchange facilities in front of, and beside, the station building. There is scope to improve the Hampton Court Way frontage by appropriately scaled street tree planting and possibly by built development (in particular to form a gateway opposite the Hampton Court Parade flats).

9.5 The most important building frontage is along the Thames, where the site is particularly visually prominent when viewed from Hampton Court Bridge and Palace. The entire waterfront site should be designed as a landmark which addresses the river and its landing stage and also encloses the incomplete square opposite the ‘Streets of London’. Particular care should be given to the design of the skyline.
Development Option 1 - Retention of station in situ
9.6 The Cigarette Island Park frontage is also visually prominent, but it is partially screened by tree and hedge planting. It will need careful design handling of elevations and skyline to ensure that it is acceptable from park, River and Palace. Development should be designed so that buildings front onto the Park. Along the Park frontage, the suggested building line shown set back from the site boundary. The building line should not be taken to imply that continuous built development is desirable along the Park boundary, rather it should be punctuated for visual variety and to allow pedestrian accesses to the Park. Any new route across the site into the Park should be well designed and safely overlooked.

Option 2 - Moving station and tracks to the South

9.7 This option shown on Plan 8 assumes the building of a new station in the Southernmost part of the site, where an enhanced transport interchange facility can be designed. Such an interchange might take the form of an urban square fronting a mixed-use station development. The station building should be a landmark in its own right, not just because it would form a gateway from the South, but also because it will be visible from Hampton Court gardens and the open space to the South.

9.8 Guidance for the key riverside and parkside sites is as for Option 1, and there is a similar need for enclosure along the Hampton Court Way frontage (preferably by buildings). Thus the principal difference between the two options is that the removal of the station reduces the severance of the railway lines. This in turn allows greater flexibility in site planning and may allow a more intense development of the site, with a variety of internal vehicular and pedestrian routes.

9.9 In both options the Council will be expecting outstanding quality urban design with a commensurate quality of public realm and landscape and with particular care being given to the setting of the refurbished station building.

9.10 The Council's strong preference is for the option which retains the railway lines in their existing location, primarily because this would enable the existing station building to continue to be used for its designed purpose and would result in a shorter walk for visitors to Hampton Court Palace. However, in planning terms neither of these issues are considered to be overriding if a robust case can be made for relocating the station and tracks to the south, particularly if it can be shown that this would enable a better transport interchange to be created. The rationale for two options is to allow the site owners flexibility in promoting a scheme, but also sets out the local authority's stance that proposals for insensitive over-development of the site will not be permitted in order to fund the costs associated with moving the rail lines and building a new station.
Plan 8
Development Option 2 -
Move railway station and tracks to the south
9.11 Since one of the fundamental aims of this brief is to achieve an improved transport interchange, to the benefit of all users of the station, if a new station is built to the south of the site, the applicant will have to demonstrate that passengers will not be disadvantaged.

10 Hampton Court Station Site - Preferred Land Use Mix

10.1 Transport Interchange

10.2 The site is an important transport interchange, serving commuters and local residents together with visitors to Hampton Court Palace and East Molesey. The site's current operation as a transport interchange could be significantly improved to enable it to function much more efficiently. One of the Council's key objectives for the redevelopment of the site is to enhance the site's role as a transport interchange. The improvements sought in any development are as follows:

1. To provide an upgraded station, complete with associated facilities, including public conveniences, Tourist Information facilities and improved signage to Hampton Court Palace and East Molesey;

2. Improved passenger and pedestrian safety by means such as clearly defined pedestrian routes, which do not conflict with vehicle routes and environmental enhancements;

3. Bus stopping facilities which are better related to the railway station;

4. Provision of waiting facilities for buses terminating at the site;

5. Provision of cycle routes and enhanced facilities for cyclists;

6. Provision of "kiss and ride " facilities;

7. Provision of drop off facilities for taxis and minicabs;

8. Provision of drop off facilities for coaches;

9. Improved pedestrian access to the station from East Molesey and to and from Hampton Court Palace;

10. Commensurate with the site's location in a Conservation Area, upgraded signage, both within the site advertising the surrounding tourist facilities and in the vicinity of the site advertising commuter car parking and the station; and
11. Whilst not within the site itself, the River ferries which travel between Thames Ditton and Kingston moor at the landing stage on the Thames immediately adjacent to the site. These should be integrated as far as possible, by signage and pedestrian routes with the transport interchange function of the site.

10.3 The remainder of the station site is considered appropriate for a range of uses. As set out above, the Council’s primary objective for the site is to achieve an improved transport interchange. Irrespective of whether the railway tracks are moved or remain in their current location, the Council will require the retention of the existing Station building given its inclusion on the Local Historic Buildings List, historic connections with Hampton Court Palace and location in a conservation area.

10.4 Small retail units, specifically associated with the use of the station and to serve commuters or the tourist facilities at Hampton Court will be acceptable in the existing station building and/or new station building or other new development. The applicants should explore the potential to incorporate the Tourist Information facilities currently located in the Post Office in East Molesey within a new/retained station building. Small scale café and restaurant uses will also be appropriate.

10.5 The site is not considered appropriate for large scale office development. However, small suites of offices designed to serve local or small business’s needs may be appropriate.

10.6 Irrespective of whether the station and tracks are moved or remain in situ, there are potentially a number of environmental and infrastructure improvements which must be funded by a redevelopment of the sites. Accordingly, in order to provide the incentive for the site owners to redevelop, an element of value generating development will be permitted. Residential development on the balance of the station site which is not required for operational purposes (including as part of a transport interchange) will be acceptable in principle.

10.7 The most appropriate locations for residential development are considered to be the southern and eastern parts. None of the residential development should be greater than 3 storeys in height and the overall area of the site devoted to residential use should not exceed 25% of the total site area. The design quality of residential development is key given the prominence of this area of the site from views of Hampton Court Palace.

10.8 The Council’s appointed consultants estimate that at the time of preparation of the brief the levels of development provided for in the two
options detailed above would be financially viable making allowance for the costs of estimated infrastructure and environmental improvements.

11 **Car Parking**

11.1 The redevelopment of the site should provide car parking commensurate with Surrey County Council’s standards pertaining at the time of the submission of a planning application. The adopted parking standards are currently subject to review and the County Council’s policy is currently to consider each site on its merits having regard to matters such as proximity to public transport, the characteristics of the development and the potential for shared use of parking. A copy of both the adopted and the recently reviewed standards are contained in Appendices D and E to this brief. The County Council are now using the reviewed standards for development control purposes (subject to negotiation until the standards are formally adopted).

11.2 Given the mixture of uses envisaged in this brief there are likely to be different demands on car parking at different times of the day. Accordingly, a comprehensive scheme for the whole site should explore the possibility to introduce shared car parking between uses.

12 **Commuter Car Parking**

12.1 The site currently accommodates around 210 commuter car parking spaces which are also extensively used by visitors to Hampton Court Palace. As with car parking associated with other elements of the development, the Council’s policy will be to restrict commuter car parking to the minimum levels required to serve the requirements of the rail operator whilst at the same time ensuring that this does not create pressure for additional parking in East Molesey. It is understood that the rail operator’s requirement for commuter car parking is of the order of 160 spaces. However, the applicant will be required to justify the levels of commuter parking sought, by reference to historic surveys and demand analysis, taking into account the likely increase in the use of the site as a result of the improved facilities.

13 **Coach Parking**

13.1 Coach Parking is currently permitted on the station forecourt. Although spaces are not formally laid out, the area designated can accommodate approximately 15-20 coaches. Coach parking in this area is visually
unattractive at this gateway to the Borough. Retention of coach parking on the site, other than for “drop off” facilities as part of the transport interchange is not a prerequisite of the development of the site. The opportunity for use of commuter car parking for coach parking to cater for peak demand should be explored.

14 **Highways Access**

14.1 There are four separate access points from the site into Hampton Court Way. These arrangements are both confusing, particularly for those unfamiliar with the area, and potentially dangerous.

14.2 A comprehensive access solution for both sites will be required as part of any redevelopment proposal. As the highways authority, Surrey County Council will determine the acceptability of any access proposals. The County Council will require access to the site to be considered as part of a wider traffic management scheme for the surrounding area.

14.3 Access to the site needs to be considered in the context of the wider area, having regard to the following issues:-

1. The County Council’s desire to rationalise turning movements and improve traffic flows in Hampton Court Way.

2. The relationship between access to and from the site and the junctions of Creek Road and Riverbank with Hampton Court Way. The potential for signalisation in Hampton Court Way should be explored.

3. Facilities for pedestrian and cycle crossing in Hampton Court Way

4. Avoidance of pedestrian/vehicle conflict

5. Provision of appropriate signage to complement the proposed access solution

14.4 Surrey County Council advise that it is expected that the only way of comprehensively addressing these issues is through the provision of a development funded junction improvement.

14.5 A transportation assessment to include an analysis of traffic impact will be required in support of any scheme for the redevelopment of the site.
15 Pedestrian Access

15.1 Enhanced pedestrian access should form part of any redevelopment scheme. In particular, pedestrian links through the site to Hampton Court Palace should be improved, avoiding conflict with vehicles and cyclists. All pedestrian routes should be designed so as to be fully accessible to disabled users. The opportunity should also be taken to improve public access through the site to Cigarette Island Park. As indicated above, any scheme should improve pedestrian crossing facilities from the station to East Molesey in order that the site is better integrated with facilities in the local centre.

15.2 The Thames river frontage and walkway is a key local feature and accordingly in accordance with policy RTT4 of the Local Plan a 20m (65ft) strip of land, measured from the waters edge must be kept free from development. Pedestrian access to Cigarette Island Park must be maintained along the Thames frontage, although alternative arrangements for service vehicle access could be made through the site, releasing land on the Thames frontage currently used for this purpose for development.

15.3 Cigarette Island Park is currently isolated by the Rivers Thames and Mole. As part of a redevelopment of the Station site, the developers should explore the potential to bridge over the River Mole to provide pedestrian access from Cigarette Island Park to the open areas of Albany Reach to the south.

15.4 In addition the potential to extend the Thames footpath underneath Hampton Court Bridge to better integrate the footpath on the western side of the bridge with the site should be explored.

16 Percent for Art

16.1 Given the site's size and prominence and as part of the "Arts Strategy for Elmbridge", the Council will encourage the inclusion of an element of public art into any development proposal.

17 Services

17.1 The Council is not aware of the location of any services on the site which might act as a barrier to development. However, the developer should make their own enquiries of all relevant statutory undertakers and service providers.
17.2 With regard to the sewerage system, an impact study of the existing infrastructure will be required to determine the magnitude of spare capacity in the system and a suitable connection point. The developer will be required to fund this and any necessary upgrading. The developer should consult with Thames Water (see Appendix A).

18 Requirements of a Planning Application

18.1 For the reasons expressed in paragraph 4.1 of this brief, a comprehensive application for the two sites should be submitted in detailed form, given the site's location opposite Hampton Court Palace, within a Conservation Area and along the Thames frontage. An exception to this requirement for a comprehensive detailed application for both sites will only be allowed if the Council is satisfied that the alternative means proposed are sufficient to ensure the comprehensive development of the site. A full statement on design issues should accompany such an application. A detailed statement on transportation issues should be submitted, to include an explanation of improvements to the operation of the site as a transport interchange, a statement on highways impact, justification of parking provision an explanation of pedestrian routes and means incorporated into the scheme to encourage forms of transport other than by the car. A landscape appraisal and fully illustrated landscape scheme will be required. In view of the historic nature of the site, its proximity to the Thames and Hampton Court Palace, an archaeological assessment will be required. The site developers should liaise closely with the County Archaeologist in this connection.
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List of Useful Contacts and Addresses

1. **David Wiltshire** - *Director of Planning and Environmental Services*
   Elmbridge Borough Council
   Civic Centre
   High Street
   Esher  Surrey  KT10 9SD
   Tel: 01372 474700 (Direct Line)
   E-mail: dpes@elmbridge.gov.uk

   Mrs H Thwaites - *Head of Town Planning* - 01372 474702
   (Direct Line)

   Ms J Farquharson - *Principal Planning Officer* (Development
   Control) - 01372 474811 (Direct Line)

   Mr P Haynes - *Principal Planning Officer* (Policy & Environmental
   Planning) - 01372 474826 (Direct Line)

   Mr A Hall - *Design and Conservation Officer* - 01372 474833
   (Direct Line)

   Mrs C Smith - *Landscape Architect* - 01372 474824 (Direct Line)

   Elmbridge Borough Council Fax: 01372 474910
   E-mail: tplan@elmbridge.gov.uk

2. **Engineering Division**
   Elmbridge Borough Council
   Civic Centre
   High Street
   Esher  Surrey  KT10 9SD

   *Chief Engineer* - Mr C E Marsh 01372 474706 (Direct Line)
   *Principal Assistant (Traffic)* Mr C Paisley 01372 474737
3. **Leisure Services**
Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre
High Street
Esher  Surrey  KT10 9SD

*Head of Leisure Services* - Mrs Ivy Harris - 01372 474572

4. **Environmental Health Division**
Elmbridge Borough Council
Civic Centre
High Street
Esher  Surrey  KT10 9 SD

*Head of Environmental Health* - Mr T Deag - 01372 474741

5. **Surrey County Council**
Dr R Shaw - Director for the Environment
County Hall
Kingston Upon Thames
Surrey KT1 2DT

*County Engineer’s Department* - Mr R Heslop - 0181 541 9837

*County Archaeologist* - Dr R Bird – 0181 541 8991

6. **East Molesey Conservation Area Advisory Committee**
Mr A R Osborne
144 Bridge Road
East Molesey
Surrey  KT8 9HW
Tel : 0181 224 6396
7. **Commission For Architecture And The Built Environment**
   7 St James Square
   London
   SW1Y 4JU
   Tel: 0171 839 6537

8. **Railtrack PLC**
   Mr A Murphy
   Railtrack Property West Wing
   The Hop Exchange
   26 Southwalk Street
   London
   SE1 1TU
   Tel: 0171 645 3012

9. **Whitbread PLC**
   Brian Owen - Whitbread Property
   2 The Herculean
   Houghton Hall Park
   Dunstable
   LU5 5XE
   Tel: 01582 499499

10. **Hampton Court Palace**
    Dennis McGuinnes - Acting Director
    Hampton Court Palace
    East Moseley
    Surrey
    KT8 9AV
    Tel 0181 781 9500
11. **Thames Landscape Strategy**  
Donna Clack - Coordinator  
The Royal Parks  
Holly Lodge  
Richmond Park  
Richmond  
TW10 5HS  
Tel: 0181 940 0654  
Fax: 0181 332 2730

12. **Thames Water Utilities Ltd**  
Developer Services Waste  
Kew Business Centre  
Brentford  
Middlesex  
TW8 0EE  
Tel: 0171 713 3892  
Fax: 0171 713 3875

13. **Garden History Society**  
David Lambert  
Conservation Officer  
Station House  
Wickwar  
Gloucestershire  
GL12 8LE  
Tel/Fax: 01454 294888
14. **English Heritage**
Mr C Sumner
Historic Buildings & Areas Inspector
22 Savile Row
London
W1X 1AB
Tel: 0171 973 3000
Fax: 0171 973 3001

15. **London Transport Buses**
Mr P Bradley
Planning & Performance Manager (south-west)
172 Buckingham Palace Road
London
SW1W 9TN
Tel: 0171 918 4001
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Summary of Planning History of the Hampton Court Station Site and the 'Jolly Boatman' Restaurant Site

The Jolly Boatman Site

1. The planning history of this site goes back to 1948 where there is a series of applications for the "erection of refreshment pavilion and ice cream kiosk" which were given conditional approval.

2. Associated with the site and use were conditional approvals for kiosk and extension to kiosk in 1949 and 1951. An approval was also given for a store room at the refreshment pavilion in 1949.

3. Further additions were permitted to the refreshment pavilion in 1951 and installation of boiler house and chimney in 1953.

4. In 1955 an extension to the pavilion was refused as an outline application. Three further applications for extensions were submitted in 1956, one was conditionally approved, one refused and one approved.

5. In 1960 planning permission was refused for the erection of an ice cream kiosk and in the same year an approval was given for a further extension to the pavilion.

6. In 1961 an application for three advert signs for a limited period of 3 years was refused whilst two applications for advertisements were later approved.

7. In 1964 approval was given for the erection of a men's lavatory and covered area.

8. An application for the installation and erection of a single-storey extension, the provision of car parking area and erection of a canopy was submitted and later withdrawn in 1966. In the same year an application for the display of an illuminated fascia sign was refused as were alterations to the front elevation of the building.

9. In 1967 conditional approval was given for external alterations and refacing the existing main building, the erection of two kiosks following the demolition of the existing kiosk and ARP shelter at the front and store building at the rear. Conditional approval was also given for the display of 4 illuminated fascia signs, one on each elevation of the building.
10. In 1968 approval was given for the formation of a sales point in the rear boundary wall with Cigarette Island Park.

11. In 1970 a display of illuminated box signs and two menu signs over the pathway entrance to the restaurant were refused. Conditional approval was subsequently given in 1971 for similar proposals.

12. In 1980 consent was given for the display of two illuminated box signs.

13. The siting of an ice cream van was refused planning permission in 1981.

14. As can be seen from the above, all of the above history refers to relatively minor extensions and additions which has consolidated the restaurant use for over 30 years. Perhaps the most significant application that alerted the Council's attention to the owner's intention to develop was the following one that, whilst submitted on 18 September 1984, was subsequently withdrawn:

15. "The erection of a four-storey building providing 81 car spaces on lower and upper ground floors, two restaurants, bar and ancillary facilities on first-floor and two self-contained flats on second floor (EL.8411043)."

**Hampton Court Station - British Rail Terminal Station**

16. The existing station was built to the design of Sir William Tite in c.1849. The building is not statutorily listed but in the Council's opinion is worthy of retention and refurbishment.

17. In 1946 permission to use the station yard as builders yard was refused.

18. In 1950 permission was refused for the display of an advertisement on a signal box.

19. In 1951 conditional permission was granted for the change of use of part of the land from builders yard to standing and display of cars for sale and use of building on that part of the land as an ancillary office. This permission was subsequently renewed in 1956, 1963 (after an appeal was withdrawn against a refusal in 1961), 1969, 1974, 1979, 1980, 1981, 1982 and 1983, 1988, 1993 and 1998. The current permission is due to expire in 2003.

20. Conditional approval was granted for advertisements on the building in 1951.
21. In 1954 conditional approval was given for red neon tubing to be superimposed on existing letters relating to display of motor vehicles. A further application for illuminated neon tubing was withdrawn in 1954.

22. In 1960 permission was refused for an advertisement hoarding at the rear of a signal box facing Hampton Court Way.

23. In 1961 an outline application was refused for the erection of show rooms for the sale of new and secondhand cars.

24. Also in 1961 refusal was given for the erection of advertisement hoarding and a subsequent appeal in the same year was dismissed. An appeal was also lodged but subsequently withdrawn against a refusal for the demolition of the building used as offices for car sales for the erection of a single-storey building for a showroom and the sale of cars.

25. In 1963 conditional approval was given for a mobile coal office for one year.

26. In 1964 and 1965 refusals were given for the continued display of illuminated sign and board and part non-illuminated fascia board.

27. In 1966 conditional approval was given for the use of the Station Masters rooms as the model club headquarters of the Hampton/Teddington Model Rail Society.

28. In 1967 permission was refused for the erection of a sun hut on part of the site.

29. Also in 1967 an application for the formation of a new car park for 113 cars to be used in connection with the "Jolly Boatman" restaurant was deferred indefinitely (ESH.67/166) and later deemed to be withdrawn.

30. On 6 July 1978 conditional permission was given for the change of use of part of the station building to restaurant together with alterations and extensions (EL.78/379).

31. On 6th January 1992 the Town Planning Committee refused to vary the planning brief to include provision of any residential content.

The recent planning history for both sites can be summarised as follows:

32. On 6 August 1984, a planning application was submitted by Gala Properties Limited for the erection of a three-storey office block (27,621 square feet), a new station, the conversion of the existing
station into offices, associated car and coach parking and a new access from Hampton Court Way. The Council refused planning consent on 25 July 1985 and the matter was taken to appeal. The Council's objections to the scheme were based on conflict with office policies, adverse effect on the local environment and failure to achieve a comprehensive development jointly with the Jolly Boatman site, considered necessary to resolve traffic problems. The scheme was dismissed at appeal on 4 November 1987, on grounds including conflict with the Planning Brief which promoted tour related uses rather than offices (84/901).

33. On 8 September 1984, a planning application was submitted by Berni Inns for redevelopment of the Jolly Boatman site with a four storey building to provide two restaurants, bar, two flats and ancillary accommodation and parking. This application was later withdrawn (84/1043).

34. On 6th November 1986 Listed Building Consent was granted for the partial demolition of Hampton Court Station subject to conditions. One of the conditions imposed required that none of the works of demolition shall be commenced or undertaken in the absence of evidence of a valid contract for redevelopment of the site in accordance with a valid planning permission granted in that regard. EL/LBC/25/86).

35. On 3 August 1987, an outline planning application was submitted for a three-storey 76-bedroom hotel, retention of the existing station building and parking. The Planning Committee found the application to be in compliance with the Brief and resolved to grant planning consent subject to legal agreements relating to highway and access matters. The permission was never issued, however, as the applicant had no interest in the land and was, therefore, unable to finalise the legal agreements (87/1180).

36. On 9 October 1987, an outline planning application was submitted for timeshare accommodation plus hotel, restaurant and car parking. This was refused permission on 18 July 1988, on the grounds that the Council considered the timeshare accommodation too similar to conventional residential use and, therefore, to be in conflict with the Brief (87/1430).

37. On 3 January 1990, Raglan Properties submitted a planning application for a heritage centre, restaurants (including the use of the existing station building with flats over), new relocated station, boathouse, office/studio buildings and car parking. The application was withdrawn on 24 April 1991, following criticisms of the scheme by the Council, due to the inclusion of a significant amount of office accommodation (90/0024)
38. On 11 January 1990, a conservation area consent application was submitted for the demolition of Jolly Boatman restaurant, but later withdrawn on 24 April 1991.

39. On 3 August 1995, a planning application was submitted by Whitbread PLC for the Jolly Boatman site only, for a new part two/part single-storey building for use as restaurant/bar. The application was refused on 3 October 1995, on grounds of uncoordinated and non-comprehensive redevelopment, poor design, inadequate parking and potential confusion and inconvenience in respect of access from Hampton Court Way (95/1003).

40. On 26 January 1996, a planning application was submitted to retain the 1.8 m high boarding around the Jolly Boatman site. This was approved on 19 March 1996 (96/0 1 19).

41. On 6 January 1992, the Town Planning Committee refused to vary the planning brief to include provision of any residential content.

42. On 6 February 1996, the Town Planning Committee agreed to vary the planning brief to allow a small element of residential development at the site, such an element to be limited to a scale which would not prejudice the provision of the principal uses suggested by the original Planning brief.
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Hampton Court Railway Station and Jolly Boatman
Development Brief

List of Relevant Local Plan Policies: Replacement Elmbridge
Borough Local Plan Deposit Draft (November 1997)

HSG1 Proposed housing and local infrastructure
HSG2 Housing provision
HSG5 Full use of land suitable for housing
HSG9 Housing needs
HSG10 Affordable housing
HSG12 Small units on larger sites
HSG14 Accommodation for elderly persons
HSG16 Design and layout in residential areas
HSG19 Garaging and car parking
HSG22 Non residential sites

EMP1 Elmbridge as an area of restraint
EMP2 Employment development
EMP3 Location of employment development
EMP5 Mixed use schemes

STC1 The role and character of town and village centres
STC3 Hierarchy of centres
STC4 New retail floorspace
STC10 Local shops
STC11 Miscellaneous shop uses
STC12 Vehicle hire uses
STC 15 Amusement Arcades
STC17 Shopfront Security

ENV1 General environmental matters
ENV2 Design
ENV3 High standard of design
ENV4 Environment impact
ENV5 Planning applications for parts of sites
ENV6 Recycling
ENV7 Environmental improvement schemes
ENV8 Landscaping
ENV9 Landscape schemes
ENV10 Trees
ENV 11 Tree planting
ENV 15 Advertisements
ENV 16 Impact of advertisements
ENV 18 Environmental pollution
ENV 20 Light pollution
ENV 22 Environmental pollution
ENV 26 Transmitting development
ENV 27 External staircases
ENV 28 Strategic views and landmarks

HEN 1 Historic buildings
HEN 16 Buildings of local interest
HEN 17 Conservation areas
HEN 18 Improvement of conservation areas
HEN 19 Demolition in conservation areas
HEN 20 Detailed application in conservation areas
HEN 21 Development in conservation areas
HEN 22 Alterations or extensions in conservation areas
HEN 24 Shop fronts in conservation areas
HEN 25 Advertisements in conservation areas
HEN 26 Article four directions
HEN 27 Areas of archaeological interest
HEN 29 Archaeological assessment
HEN 30 Parks and gardens of special historic interest

RIT 1 Protection of riverside views and features
RIT 2 Environmental improvement to the Thames
RIT 3 Setting of River Thames
RIT 4 Development free land adjacent to Thames
RIT 5 Loss of riverside uses
RIT 6 Waterside development
RIT 7 Riverside development
RIT 8 Recreational opportunities
RIT 10 Public access to the riverside
RIT 13 Land use and development

LER 8 Footpaths and bridleways
LER 13 Arts and cultural facilities
LER 14 Visitor facilities
LER 16 Hotels and guests houses

COM 1 General provision

MOV 1 Movement and development
MOV 3 Movement implications of development
MOV 5 Transport network capacity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MOV6</th>
<th>Traffic impact minimisation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MOV9</td>
<td>Off street car parking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV10</td>
<td>Servicing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV11</td>
<td>Pedestrian facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV12</td>
<td>Cycling facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV13</td>
<td>Integration of public transport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV14</td>
<td>Rail services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV15</td>
<td>Traffic calming</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOV22</td>
<td>Minor highway and transport improvements</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix D

### Elmbridge Borough Council Adopted Parking Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Vehicle Parking Space Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Class A1 - Shops</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supermarkets and Self-Service Variety Stores</td>
<td>1 car space per 18 sq m (194 sq ft) GFA to include 1 space per 200 sq m (2 150 sq ft) for operational use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus a guide figure of 1 lorry space per 500 sq m (5 380 sq ft) GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Shops</td>
<td>1 car space per 30 sq m (323 sq ft) GFA to include one space per 200 sq (2 150 sq ft) for operational use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Plus a guide figure of 1 lorry space per 500 sq m (5 380 sq ft) GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks, Building Societies</td>
<td>1 car space per 30 sq m (323 sq ft) GFA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estate and Other Agencies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betting Office:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Use Class A3 - Food and Drink</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurants and Cafes:</td>
<td>1 car space per 4 sq m (43 sq ft) of net dining floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wine Bars:</td>
<td>1 car space per 3 sq m (32 sq ft) of net floor area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Houses and Licensed Clubs:</td>
<td>1 car space per 2 sq m (21.5 sq ft) of net bar floor area available to customers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use Class B1 - Offices

Offices

1 car space per 20 sq m (215 sq ft) GFA to include 1 space per 200 sq m (2 150 sq ft) for operational use

Use Class C1 - Hotels and Motels

Hotels and Motels

1 car space per bedroom (including staff accommodation)

Plus allowance for bars, restaurants and other facilities available to the public based on the relevant standards

Plus coach parking of 1 space per 100 bedrooms

Use Class C3 - Residential

These standards are a guide to the provision of unassigned parking spaces in residential developments. They apply to all dwellings and form a basis from which an appropriate number of parking spaces can be agreed with the District Planning Authority. The Table below lists types of parking layout that are commonly used in residential developments. The layouts are categorised by the location and number of assigned parking spaces which are allocated to the dwelling. To use these standards determine the appropriate type of parking layout and then read the required number of unassigned spaces from the right hand column of the table.

The final allocation for each dwelling must be agreed with the District Authority. Calculations of unassigned spaces for a single dwelling or groups of dwellings should be rounded up to the next whole number.

The District Planning Authority may decide that one or more of the layout types are appropriate in any given situation. They may decide that some sites are special cases, and that a reduced allocation is acceptable.

Carriageway spaces may count towards unassigned spaces in access roads. For details of the circumstances where this applies see the Surrey Design Guide Volume 4.
### Type of Parking Layout

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Assigned Car Spaces Allocated per Dwelling</th>
<th>Unassigned Car Spaces Required per Dwelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. FAMILY DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Only</td>
<td>3 or more</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near and Distant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant Only</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Assigned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. ONE BEDROOM DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near Only</td>
<td>2 or more</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Near and Distant</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distant Only</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None Assigned</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. ELDERLY PERSONS' DWELLINGS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheltered Housing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Surrey County Council Interim Parking Standards

Adopted 10 November 1999

County Parking Standards

Description of restraint-based standards

1 The numerical standards set out in this annex replace the existing minimum standards last reviewed in full in 1989. The new standards will be operated as maximum standards for all new developments, with the exception of residential standards which will only be maximum in town centres. In general, however, lower standards of parking provision will be applied in zones other than those with the lowest level of public transport accessibility. The standards have been reviewed so as to comply with national policy guidance, including the draft review of Planning Policy Guidance 13 Transport.

2 The standards are based on extensive research involving surveys and interrogation of databases such as TRICS, traffic impact assessment reports, the County planning appeals system and other literature on specific parking issues and studies undertaken.

3 If a development is permitted within an area defined as zone 4 (lowest public transport accessibility), the maximum parking provision would be within the range 75% to 100% of the full standard. Where a permitted development falls within zones 1 to 3, a higher level of parking restraint will be applied consistent with better public transport accessibility. In zone 1 the range would be 0% to 25% of the full standard, equating to a maximum of 1 car space per 140m² for a B1 office use rather than the full standard of 1 space per 35m². The actual numerical provision of spaces within a range will be subject to negotiation and depend upon factors such as the level of public transport accessibility, operational needs, design and site constraints.

Minimum operational parking standards

4 Minimum operational levels of parking are required to cater for essential trips which cannot be made by public transport, including provision for essential building maintenance and security staff. The applicant for planning consent must demonstrate a special need for such parking provision, which will not include commuter or visitor parking. In addition, parking spaces should be designated specifically for disabled drivers. In general, 5% of the parking spaces determined by the zonal standard should be allocated for use by the disabled, although in areas of high restraint a minimum standard has been set. In all cases at least one space for the disabled must be provided.
the definition of operational parking for Surrey should include the following:

- provision for people with disabilities
- provision for servicing (to include maintenance & deliveries)
- provision for pool cars (if necessary for the operation of the activity)
- an allowance for the special needs of particular car-based activities (e.g. vehicle repair garages, tyre centres)
- an allowance for people working unsocial hours (i.e. security guards)

Parking for visitors (other than those with disabilities) and employees (other than those with disabilities and those working unsocial hours) should not be considered operational.

Residential standards

6 Residential standards were last reviewed in 1992. The new standards have been simplified and near and distant categories have been deleted. The standards comply with the general guidance set out in revised draft PPG3: Housing.

7 It is not considered appropriate to define maximum standards for housing accommodation except in town centres, given the potential implications for unacceptable on-street parking. The minimum standards have been defined to produce overall levels of provision consistent with draft PPG3 and relaxations will be permitted to support higher densities in urban areas.

8 Whilst the residential standards will apply equally in all parking management zones, there is scope to relax the minimum requirements in certain circumstances. Local area parking management plans should identify zones with characteristics appropriate for reduced parking standards. Lower provision is likely to be applicable in the following circumstances:

   a) Town centre locations with good public transport accessibility and where a controlled parking zone is in operation.

   b) Conversions of properties over shops where parking might be limited.

   c) Affordable housing with a registered social landlord, where significantly lower levels of car ownership can be demonstrated.
Parking standards for new developments

9 The level of car parking to be provided for a new development or change of use is set out in the following Schedule of Parking Standards. For non-residential developments, parking spaces should be provided either on-site or in marked bays on roads constructed within the development. Parking spaces in public car parks may be utilised subject to these not being additional to the standard and not compromising short stay availability. Residential parking spaces should be provided either in garages, on hardstanding or in marked bays adjacent to the highway. On-street spaces may be included within the standard provision provided that these do not compromise the safety or operation of the highway.

10 All standards are subject to minimum operational and disabled requirements being met. The non-residential standards should be applied to the floor area or part thereof. The minimum requirement in all cases is therefore one space.

11 Standards for lorry spaces are given as indicative figures and actual provision should meet minimum operational requirements.

12 Cycle standards are given for individual land use classes. For the design and layout of cycle parking facilities refer to the Surrey County Council Guide to Designing Cycle Facilities (draft).

13 Floor areas referred to throughout these standards relate to the gross floor area (GFA) in square metres as ascertained by external measurement of the building unless otherwise stated (eg ‘shops’ include their own storage areas). Reference to the types of development conforms to the Use Classes specified in the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987 as amended by the General (Amended) Development Order 1995.
Schedule of Surrey Parking Standards

All standards relate to gross floor area and are maxima unless otherwise stated.

A1 Shops

Individual shop units - up to 500m² (e.g. small parades of shops serving the local community)
1 car space per 30m²
1 lorry space per 500m²

Supermarkets and self-service stores (retail floor area less than 2,500m²)
1 car space per 18m²
1 lorry space per 500m²

Food retail superstores (retail floor area greater than 2,500m²)
1 car space per 18m²
1 goods bay or space per 750m² for developments up to 5,000m² or
1 goods bay or lorry space per 1,000m² for developments over 5,000m²

Open air markets
6 car spaces per vendor

DIY store without garden centre
1 car space per 25m² open and covered display area plus 1 lorry space per 500m²

Garden centres
1 car space per 25m² open and covered display area plus 1 lorry space per 500m²

Retail parks
1 car space per 25m² plus 1 lorry space per 500m²

Other uses
1 car space per 25m² plus 1 lorry space per 500m²

plus for all A1 uses a minimum of 1 cycle space per 500 sq m
A2 Financial and professional services
Banks, building societies, estate agents and other agencies, betting shops
1 car space per 30m²
plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 500 sq m.

A3 Food and drink
Restaurants and cafes, wine bars and public houses and licensed clubs
1 car space per 6m²
plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 140 sq m.

B1 Business use
Offices
1 car space per 35m²
Business parks
1 car space per 35m²
Light industrial, high technology, science parks and research parks
1 car space per 35m²
plus for all B1 uses a minimum of 1 cycle space per 700 sq m.

B2 General industrial
General industrial use
1 car space per 35m²
plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 850 sq m.

B8 Storage and distribution
Warehouse – storage
1 car space per 100m² plus 1 lorry space per 200m²
Warehouse – distribution
1 car space per 70m² plus 1 lorry space per 200m²
Cash and carry

1 car space per 25m² plus 1 lorry space per 200m³

plus for all B8 uses a minimum of 1 cycle space per 850 sq m.

C1 Hotels and hostels

Hotels and motels

1.5 car spaces per bedroom (may be reduced to 1 car space per bedroom if other facilities such as bars, restaurants and function rooms are not open to non-residents) plus 1 coach space per 100 bedrooms.

A lower standard will be expected where a hotel is close to Heathrow or Gatwick Airport and is designed to cater for air passengers without private cars.

Residential hostels

1 car space per 3 residents

C2 Residential institutions

Old people’s homes

1 car space per 5 residents

Hospital

1 car space per 4 staff plus 1 car space per 3 daily visitors

plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 700 sq m.

Student hostel

1 car space per 5 students and 1 car space per member of staff

plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 100 sq m.

Nursing homes

1 car space per 2 residents

Residential schools

1 car space per 2 members of staff
C3 Dwelling houses

New dwellings (minimum standards, except in town centres where they will be applied as maxima):

- Studio apartments per unit: 1 car space assigned plus 0.3 unassigned or 1 car space unassigned.
- 1 or 2 bedroom per unit: 1 car spaces assigned plus 0.5 unassigned or 1.5 spaces unassigned.
- 3 or more bedrooms per unit: 2 car spaces assigned plus 0.4 unassigned or 2 spaces unassigned.

Plus for all flatted developments a minimum of 1 cycle space per 150 sq m.

Elderly (sheltered)

- Self-contained 1.7 car spaces per unit
- Communal accommodation 1.5 car spaces per unit plus 1 car space per member of staff.

Plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 450 sq m.

Assigned: Dedicated spaces for a specific dwelling, normally within its curtilage, adjacent to it, or within a very short walking distance of its boundaries.

Unassigned: Communal spaces for residents and visitors, normally within, or contiguous with the highway, or in parking courts.

Parking provision should be determined for a residential development and the total rounded up to the nearest whole space. The standards are given as minima, but total provision should not exceed that calculated by more than 20%. A minimum of 20% of total spaces should be unassigned, subject to meeting acceptable layout criteria.

Guidance in respect of the design and layout of parking can be found in 'Roads and Footpaths, A Design Guide for Surrey'.

D1 Non-residential institutions

Day nurseries/creches: 0.75 car spaces per member of staff plus
0.2 spaces per child.

Doctors’ practices
1 car space per doctor, 1 car space per 2 ancillary staff and 2 spaces per consulting room

Dentists’ practices
3 car spaces per consulting room

Veterinary practices
4 car spaces per consulting room

*plus for all health centres and surgeries a minimum of 1 cycle space per 350 sq m.*

Libraries, museums and art galleries
1 car space per 30m²

Public halls licensed for entertainment.
Unlicensed youth and community centres and Scout huts etc.

1 car space per 3 persons or per 3 seats or per 20m²

Places of worship
1 car space per 10 seats (Where is likely that the congregation will be drawn from a wide area, additional spaces may be required).

Schools and Colleges

New schools or those where expansion is proposed will be requested to develop and monitor ‘School Transport and Development Plans’ with the assistance of SCC.

Car parking: only operational requirements should be provided for, together with overflow parking on hard play areas for community uses. Pupil parking and drop off/pick up areas should not be provided as this encourages car usage (except on existing sites where any further on street parking will reduce highway safety or emergency access). However, all other measures to discourage parking will be considered first and could include car sharing, staggered opening and closing times, parking restrictions etc. A parking management plan should be prepared and submitted as an integral part of any planning application.

Coach/Bus parking: on all new school sites where it is likely that pupils will travel to and from school in coaches, sufficient space should be reserved to allow coaches to enter the site, drop off and pick up pupils. Where appropriate, bus stops, bays, bus borders, seating and shelters shall be provided on the highway by the applicant.
Cycling: provision of cycle parking will be a condition of any new or expanded Secondary School but may be inappropriate for Primary Schools due to pupil age (except for staff); this would depend on site location and local safe cycle routes. Wherever possible, improvements to cycle routes/safety measures should be sought by the applicant.

Generally, provision for cycle parking should be to the following minimum standards:

- **Primary schools** - 1 space per 10 staff.
- **Secondary schools** - 1 space per 10 staff and pupils.
- **Universities and colleges** - 1 space per 8 staff and students.

### D2 Assembly and leisure

The following standards are applicable to the normal use of premises. Where special uses are intended or special circumstances apply, additional parking spaces may be required.

- Theatres, cinemas, bingo clubs, dance halls and clubs: 1 car space per 5 persons as licensed. (1 car space per 3 persons if less than 1,000 sq m.)

  plus a minimum of 1 cycle space per 450 sq m.

- Conference centres: 1 car space per 5 seats. (1 car space per 3 seats if less than 1,000 sq m.)
- Exhibition halls: 1 car space per 6 m²
- Stadia: 1 car space per 15 seats.
- Multi-activity health clubs or leisure centres: Individual assessment
- Tennis and Badminton Clubs: 4 car spaces per court
- Squash Clubs: 2 car spaces per court

plus for all indoor leisure and sports centres a minimum of 1 cycle space per 300 sq m.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Spaces per Area/Space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marinas and water sports</td>
<td>3 car spaces per hectare of water area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Field sports clubs</td>
<td>1 car space per 2 playing participants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf clubs and driving ranges</td>
<td>1 car space per 0.3 holes or per driving bay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equestrian centres</td>
<td>1 car space per stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Other uses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pick your own fruit farms</td>
<td>9 car spaces per hectare of PYO farm land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle repair, garage and spares stores</td>
<td>1 car space per 20m²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car sales establishments</td>
<td>1 car space per 50m² car display area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaust and tyre centres</td>
<td>1 car space per 0.3-0.5 bays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed uses - town centres</td>
<td>Individual assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed uses - out of town</td>
<td>Individual assessment</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Parking for disabled drivers**

General advice is included in ‘Parking for Disabled People’ and ‘PPG13 Good Practice Guide’, both published by the Department for the Environment, Transport and the Regions (DETR). Detailed advice on the preferred location and dimensions for disabled parking bays is included in ‘Roads and Footpaths - A Design Guide for Surrey’ published by SCC. Regard should also be had to advice published in ‘Reducing Mobility Handicaps’ by the Institution of Highways and Transportation.

For non-residential developments, 5% of parking spaces should be allocated for disabled persons. In areas of high parking restraint this may not give sufficient spaces, hence a minimum standard of one space per 750m² should be provided in zone types 1 and 2. In all cases, parking for the disabled should be sufficient to meet demand.

Car parking spaces for people with disabilities should be larger than usual to enable a wheelchair user to transfer easily to and from a car, and thus should have minimum...
dimensions of 5.0m x 3.6m. They should be located close to an accessible entrance, preferably the main entrance. The entrance should be ideally under cover, clearly signed and not more than 50m from the designated parking spaces.

**Cycle Parking**

In addition to the standards for the above uses, the following minimum standards should also be applied:

**Transport**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rail Stations</th>
<th>5 cycle spaces per peak period train</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bus Stations</td>
<td>2 cycle spaces per 100 peak period passengers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following guidelines should also be noted:

a) At least one ‘Sheffield’ type parking stand should be provided per 20 car parking spaces, subject to a minimum of 2 stands being provided.

b) Stands should be located within 20 metres of the access to the premises which they serve.

c) Stands provided in a group should be undercover, lit, secure and adequately signed.

d) Cycle parking may be waived for developments of less than 250m² gross floor area (GFA) if adequate provision is available within 20 metres of the building access.

e) Cycle parking is not required for petrol filling stations, motor vehicle service facilities and transport cafes.