

Bowls Nationals – Parking Options Appraisal

Principles of Parking Options

- Proximity to Victoria Park
- Capacity on a single site
- Access from main roads
- Safe pedestrian routes
- Minimal displacement of existing parking
- Meets the needs of the National Championships
- Meets the needs of local residents and park users

CAR PARK	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OWNER • PROXIMITY • CAPACITY • AVERAGE FILL 	PROS	CONS	NEXT STEPS
WARWICKSHIRE COLLEGE	OWNER: Warwickshire College DISTANCE: 970m CAPACITY: TBC AVERAGE FILL: UNKNOWN	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing car park with marked bays • College willing to consider/discuss • All weather, hard-standing surfaces • May feasibly fit all cars in one location (making it easy to manage and to direct people to) • Easy access from main road • Assume vacant capacity (no displacement) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current pedestrian routes not suitable • Is there sufficient capacity to cope at peak times? • Alternative pedestrian route would require a bridge and new exit from college to riverside; this has no overall reduction to the walking distance • Would need a significant investment to add a bridge (bailey or otherwise) and improved access/breakthrough points • Opposition from Bowls England to shuttle bus option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm capacity • Engage with senior management team at the College (8th Oct) • Feasibility of upgrading exit route and bridge access to VP • Consider bridge options for Riverside Walk • Develop outline cost plan • Investigate option of shuttle bus
RIVERSIDE HOUSE (7 days a week)	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 425m CAPACITY: 200 (less visitor area) AVERAGE FILL: 90%	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to greens • Owned by WDC • Possibility of a bridge (but see cons) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Potentially not a long term option • Need to retain parking for R/Ho visitors • Significant cost to consider a bridge option, especially as may not be available long term • Challenges presented for the differential signage needed (if only weekend use) • Whilst closing the car park to staff is possible, it causes displacement; creating a problem elsewhere in the town 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm capacity required for office visitors and RSH lease holders • Consider bridge options for Riverside Walk • Engage senior management team and leaseholders to discuss weekday feasibility
ADELAIDE ROAD	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 250m CAPACITY: 44 AVERAGE FILL: 57% (25 of 44)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity to greens • Easy to close and redirect regular users to St. Peters if needed • Confined area • Easy to manage • Not full disabled bays but could be allocated to specific groups. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The limited capacity of this car park means can only ever be part of the solution which poses logistical challenges • Other Permit Holders/Season Tickets holders will be displaced (20 season tickets) • Does not include the club land area as this is private parking and cannot be used for public use • 20-30 WDC staff use daily so adds to the displacement issue • Not full disabled bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider as a potential part of other options / solutions • Investigate potential to differentiate between categories of driver / visitor

ST. PETERS	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 520m CAPACITY: 376 AVERAGE FILL: 74% (276 of 376)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to greens Open late Close to town Manned; so easy to manage 100 useable spaces without displacement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well used for town – large numbers of shoppers and regular users would be displaced Only a partial solution park means can only ever be part of the solution which poses logistical challenges The above leads to the same issue of directing people to different locations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider as potential part of solution with other options
STATION APPROACH	OWNER: Private Owner DISTANCE: 425m (?) CAPACITY: 350 AVERAGE FILL: TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity to greens Capacity Currently managed by WDC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Housing site/development from 2014/15 No long term option No pedestrian route to V. Park No marked bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not available after '14 No safe pedestrian access
PRINCES DRIVE/VICTORIA PARK CAR PARK	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: N/A CAPACITY: 55 AVERAGE FILL: 49% (27 of 55)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adjacent Safe vehicle access from main road Safe pedestrian route into park Obvious option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Would displace park Limited capacity Survey highlighted that the lack of parking available to park users and families is already an area of complaint 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Need to retain flexible parking for park users
BEDFORD STREET	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 600m CAPACITY: 49 AVERAGE FILL: 72% (35 of 49)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not appropriate as is a short stay car park and the charge too high for this use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Short stay only
PRIORS	OWNER: Royal Priors (private) DISTANCE: 690m CAPACITY: 389 AVERAGE FILL: 52%/78% (200 weekday/ 300 weekend)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Large capacity Central location Open late 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shoppers car park Huge impact on town with displacement Distance from park Will <i>not</i> get permission from the Priors to use this – it is shoppers' parking, and to change this would be against their entire remit 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Shoppers' car park
COVENT GARDEN Multi-storey only	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 870m CAPACITY: 550 AVERAGE FILL: 36% (200 of 550)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Cheap Plenty of capacity Safe walking route to Park if absolutely needed Shuttle buses would be run as a pair between 8:30 to 09:00 due to peak arrival times 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Too far without a shuttle bus Opposition from Bowls England to shuttle bus option 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Consider feasibility of a shuttle bus option
CHANDOS STREET	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: 1100m CAPACITY: 154 AVERAGE FILL: 97% (150 of 154)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WDC owned 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No long term option No spare capacity, therefore 100% displacement Too far Not appropriate as is a short stay car park and the charge too high for this use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 100% displacement Limited spaces Short stay only
FORD'S OLD CAR PARK	OWNER: Trilogy DISTANCE: TBC CAPACITY: 350 AVERAGE FILL: N/A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Capacity Fairly close 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> No long term option; trailer park is a temporary option No longer a pedestrian access (bridge closed) Cost attached to use Have discussed with officers working with Trilogy for the development and they are <i>highly</i> unlikely to agree to anything Is planned to be passed over to a separate developer for use 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not possible to secure No long term option
MORRISONS	OWNER: Morrisons DISTANCE: TBC CAPACITY: TBC AVERAGE FILL: TBC	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Proximity Capacity Safe walking route All weather, hard-standing surface Marked bays 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Privately owned with no previous contact Shoppers' car parking 'Unknown quantity' 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Seek contact with Morrisons

VICTORIA PARK – EXISTING ARRANGEMENTS	OWNER: WDC DISTANCE: N/A CAPACITY: 350 AVERAGE FILL: 34%/58% (120 daily average over past 4 years / 202 on peak 2013 day) (Plus up to 100 free passes and disabled)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On site • Temporary disruption to park • No displacement so minimal impact on town and wider resident/visitor groups • Established • Managed • Minimal cost to Council • Integrated part of offer to BE 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Perception of negative visual impact • Perception of safety concerns • Established campaign group • Resource intensive to manage 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continue to consider alongside other options • Review on site arrangements re use of the space, signage, and traffic management
EDMONSCOTE FIELDS	OWNER: DISTANCE: CAPACITY: AVERAGE FILL:	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proximity • Used in the past for caravans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Known security issues • Difficult site to manage • Poor pedestrian access • Flood Risk • Vehicle access not good within housing area 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reject: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poor pedestrian access ○ Poor vehicle flow ○ Anti social behaviour impacts

OTHER PARKING CONSIDERATIONS:

OLD TENNIS COURTS

- No budget to surface the old courts at the moment. Planning permission will *not* be needed for this should we secure funding.
- If it is to be operated as a proper car park (i.e. enforcement) then it would *need* to be surfaced, properly lined and lit.
- Planning *would* be needed for the relevant lighting.
- Option of a pay and display machine is preferable for enforcement; without it the investment in enforcement officer time would make it unviable.
- This would be combined with passes to exempt certain users as needed.
- With or without a pay and display machine, the old tennis courts would need *some* sort of restriction to prevent them from being filled by commuters all day long.

ARCHERY ROAD

- The issue with 4hr parking is unlikely to change in the short to medium term. This is explained further below, but is due to the County Council processes that are beyond the control of the District Council.
- WCC follow a defined process to change on-street parking orders;
 - Unless for defined safety reasons, any proposal of changes to on-street regulations will need to have local support. It would require a large number of residents, a County Cllr and a District Cllr to support such a change. They would need to lobby WCC. All proposals for changes to on-street regulations across the County are then considered by officers / members who select those changes which are to go out for consultation.
 - The normal WCC consultation process then takes place. If a request was accepted by WCC members to go out for consultation we would not expect that consultation to happen before the end of 2014 or be in place before April 2015.
 - If objections were then received from others to the proposals (as is likely) then the County would have to assess the option of either changing to a 2hr parking rule, or maintaining the 4hr rule.
- Potential objections to reduce from 4 – 2hrs from bowls users, publican and users, other park users.