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## Artist's impressions of public realm provision



## B\&Q Cricklewood Lane



New, high-quality links to Cricklewood Lane as part of the Gricklewood Green enhancements
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# Appendix F <br> Pedestrian desire lines 
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Cricklewood Lane

## Appendix G

Refuse collection strategy and swept path analyses


## Cricklewood Lane

Refuse collection strategy review - July 2020


## Appendix H

## Framework Travel Plan <br> [Separate document]



## Appendix I

Healthy Streets Assessment

| Metrics <br> (Click on (i) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') |  | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  |  | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | 1Total volume of two way motorised <br> traffic | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 2 | 2 | Existing = 835 at PM Peak, Proposed = 940 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the motorised traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less } \\ & \text { than } 2 \% \text { of motorised traffic, } 7 \mathrm{am} \text { to } \\ & 7 \mathrm{pm} . \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m . | 0 | 0 | Possibly slight reduction as a result of the B\&Q closure but not enough to increase score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Trafic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are eweer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $($ l. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | See Metric 1. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large venicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehides is less than } \\ & \text { 5\%/(c.to to }+308 \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is 5 to $10 \%$ (c. +3 to +5 DB ). | The eroportion of large velicices is greater than (c. $\mathrm{c}+50 \mathrm{DB}$ and over). | - | 1 | 1 | Possible reduction in large vehicle traffic could increase score to 2 but keeping 1 to be conservative | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | NO2 concentration (from London <br> Atmoshheric Emisision Inventory) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. |  |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No proposeded change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ducing private car use (1) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic vehicles. | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | $\square^{-}$ | 1 | 2 | Closure of B\&Q car park introduces some level of motor vehicle restriction | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Complor (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. or Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropeed kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | Proposed scheme does not include changes to the Southern side of the road where the side roads are | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Mid-link crosings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by lcrosingsthat are sitale some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away <br> from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Technologyto optimise efficiency y movement (pedestritins. coclists, buses and general motor trafic) (i) | All appropriate detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic techno signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technolog applied to traficis Signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 3 | 3 | ${ }^{\text {No proposed change. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for crcling (i) | Where cycles are separated from othe traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more. | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 1.5m to 2.2m (one-way) or 2.5 m to 3.5 m (two-way). (Otherwise: with of the eerside general trafic lane (inhere there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycl alane pusadidaent general traffic lane is between 4 m and 4.5 m . | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | act of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 1 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole cucling surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | Lighting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (isison of cycle parking (i) | Cyandards parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | Cycle parking to be included with improvements to Cricklewood Grn? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | Street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |



Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your not be possible, if so ustify your
$\qquad$

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \text { Layout } \\ \text { lay } \end{array}\right.$ | $\int_{\text {Proposed }}^{\text {Playout }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toon noisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

If 0 ' ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:
If 0 'scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
n overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
is not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be pel The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. $A$ proposed scheme should also aim to deliver a score increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a treet is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ incr
will delivera a $10 \%$ uplift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets Check are the best avilable
quantifiaibe and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Heathy Streets indicators are e inked to only
a few metricse.g. shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 31 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to
the whole environment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Metrics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. II it not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug

## hy you cannot get a perfect score

a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise Tomoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent mising the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check aims to hightight bese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing <br> layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | People feel safe | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | People feel relaxed | Clean Air |
|  | $1 \begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Total volume of two way motorised } \\ \text { traffic } \end{array} \end{array}$ | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 0 | 0 | Existing = 1523 <br> Proposed = 1653 (with growth and other committed dev) No proposals for hike lanes? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than $2 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater han 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to either: <br> - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m | 0 | 0 | Existing 9\%. <br> Some B\&Q large vehicles will be removed from this road but unlikely to bring total proportion below 5\%. Prehaps this score would improve if a bike lane is proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No changes to 30 mph speed restrictions are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | 4\begin{tabular}{\|l|l}
\hline
\end{tabular}Traffic noise based on peak hour <br> motorised traffic volumes$\quad$ (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are fewer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{C} 58 \mathrm{DB} \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $5{ }^{\text {Noise from large evehicles }}$ (i) | The proportion of lage ve ehictes is less than | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of flarge evinices is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \text { (10\% } \\ & \text { (c. }+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 10 \% \\ & \text { (c. }+5 \text { DB and over). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\substack{\text { NO2 concentration (from London } \\ \text { Atmoshheric Emission Inventory) }}$ <br> (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) |  | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> Side roads are on- way yut for motor <br> sehicies and have featurus to encourge | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | A-link crossings, to meet desirel lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. }}$ <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cro }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cros }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} 11 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrianss, cyclists, buses } \\ \text { and general motor traffic) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | All appropiate detection and optimistion <br> ternnology has been applied tot traffic <br> sinals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 2 | 2 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |




Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'O' scores the design whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 48 | 48 |
| Easy to cross | 53 | 53 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 33 |
| Places to stop and rest | 60 | 60 |
| Not too noisy | 40 | 40 |
| People choose to walk, cydle and use public transport | 48 | 48 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 56 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 22 |
| People feel relaxed | 49 | 49 |
| Clean Air | 33 | 33 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 49 | 49 |
| Number of '0' scores | 2 | 2 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
共

## What the numbers mea

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a street is. It it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available
quantifiable and evidence baseed standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent ese decisions so that taketaldders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | Not too noisy | People choose to walk, cycle and use PT | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewerthan 500 vehicles per hour <br> at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 3 | 3 | Existing $=149$ at PM Peak Proposed = 87 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and (i) people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 2\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm. | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . |  | 0 | 1 | 13.3\% existing, <br> Although unclear of exact number of large vehicles enterring/ exiting the site it is unlikely to be above $5 \%$. A score of 1 has been chosen as a conservative estimate. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 3 | Speed of motorised traftic (i) | 85 th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 3 | 21 mph existing Although not clear as yet it is likely that Depot Approach will have a new 20 mph speed restriction. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traffic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | There are fewert than 55 venicles per hour (c. 5880 B8). | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour (c. $58-70$ DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour $(\mathrm{c} \geqslant 70 \mathrm{DB})$ | - | 2 | 3 | see metric 1 Although proposed peak traffic is | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 5 | Noise from large venicles (i) | The proporition of large vehicles is less than 5\% (c. t to to 30 B$)$. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large velicices is greater } \\ & \text { than } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{c}+5 \text { DB and overf). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | see metric 2 | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 6 | NO2 concentration (from London Atmospheric Emission Inventor) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | See Diag. Unlikely to change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ng private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to local residents, deliveries and public service | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 3 | 3 | Currently no through road and none planned. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> $\stackrel{\text { or }}{\text { or }}$ <br> Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage Mivers to then cantiously | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for encourage drivers to turn cautiously <br> encourage drivers to turn cautiously | side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 0 | 2 | Currently no dropped kerbs. Proposed scheme has one side road between blocks $C$ and $D$. The crossing will have dropped kerbs and a raised table to encourage cautious vehicle | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Middilink crossings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but <br> the time | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 1 | 1 | Currently no desire lines or crossings. The proposed scheme doesn't encourage | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> 아 <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{11}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ \text { signals. } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No measures are in place to support } \\ & \text { controlled crossing. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Crossings at junction with A5 }} ^{\text {is controlled. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | Width of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 1 | 2 | New footways near entrance to site. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people crcing (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | Unclear at present whether proposed scheme includes a bike path on Depot Approach. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 0 | 1 | No clear mitigations either existing or proposed. The volume of large vehicle is reduced in the proposed scheme however | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for rccing (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 0 | 2 | To be confirmed after taking dims from DWG file. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 |  | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated <br> from parking or loading facilities | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or bading | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 2 | 2 | 1oading restrictions during day | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> are defects but resurfacing of the whole cvcling surface is proposed | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for cycling. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 2 | More activity on proposed scheme. Overlocken by blocks $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ C and D Open space (garden) adjacent to road will act as surveilance | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{21}$ | Lighing (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 1 | 3 | Proposed scheme will conform to standards? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (i) | Ctandards is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing cyle parking. cocle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 1 | 3 | No existing trees <br> From indicitive scheme there will be good tree planting coverage the the length of the road | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  |  | If assessing existing: There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges, hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. If assessing proposal: Existing standalone greenery is to be retained or enhanced. | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing planting. <br> From indicitive scheme there will be regular planting the full length of the road. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  | There is sless than 50 m between resting points | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between 50m and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | No existing resting places. Not clear as yet but likely to be resting places on the edges of the | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | There is less than 50 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 1 | No specific shelters existing or proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\left.{ }_{7}\right]^{\text {Fioturs influen ing time bus passenger }} \quad$ (i) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ |  | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessiblily (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop |  | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? (Y/N)If not, do not complete metrics $31-33$ |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The bus stop is within sight of another senice - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ street.to-station step.free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is not step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is availale closes to station <br> acess noints that meets existing <br> demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Elistong } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places to stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Not too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel safe | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Clean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of '0' scores | 4 | 0 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
If'0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
tis not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. A proposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is.II it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Heathy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel.

The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best avaiable quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians strom all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To tetransarent ang the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check a ims to hightight Hese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealthy' - some design s will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Easy to } \\ & \text { cross } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{array}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | Things to see and do | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel } \\ \text { relaxed } \end{gathered}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|_{1} ^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewert than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . $5 \%$ of motorised traftic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m .號 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than $5 \%$ of motorised traffic 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traficic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised trafific volumes | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { There are fewert than } 55 \text { venicices per hour } \\ \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB) } \end{array}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 588.70 DB . | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour (c. 770 OBB). | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large vehicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less than } \\ & 5 \% \text { (c. }+0 \text { to }+3 D B \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of al arge vehicles is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \begin{array}{l} 1008 \\ (c .+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The ropoprion of large evehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 1008 \text { (tan } \\ & \text { (c. } 5 \text { D } \mathrm{Band} \text { over). } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | No2 concentration (fom London Atmospheric Emission Inventory) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 with local traffic veater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ |  | 3 | Existing levels are 40, local traffic volume reduction measures are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic <br> vehicles. | There are some time or movement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are no access restrictions for } \\ & \text { motorised traffic. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{-}$ |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 | ${ }_{\text {Comfor of crossing side road for }}^{\text {people walking }}$ (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> moads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side road have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. |  | 3 | No side roads | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Midllink crosings, to met desirie lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desiere lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - |  | 3 | No need for controlled crossing conflicting traffic volume is low | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrins frcist, } \\ \text { and general motor traficic) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ & \text { signals. } \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. |  |  |  | 1 | No trafici signals. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - |  | 1 | controlled crossings | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walkings space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. walking in busy locations. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { There is less than } 1.5 \mathrm{~m} \text { clear width } \\ & \text { for walking. }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 3 | Walkways appear narrow in some locations but walking on the grass is encouraged | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Part or all of a footway wider than } 3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { with fewer than } 200 \text { pedestrians per hour } \\ & \text { is designated as shared use. } \end{aligned}$ | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or Part or all of a footway less than $3 m$ wide is designated as shared use. | - | 1 | Assuming at this stage all walkways can be cycled on? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing motor vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. | Some measures are in place to reduce turning movements by motor vehicles a priority junctions. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle mow fewe are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place | There are no restrictions on turning movements by motor vehicles at side roads and other uncontrolled accesses. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated and more are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place |  | 3 | The only way cyclists might meet venicle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effetive width for cycling (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where therer is nocyclel lane) or width of the cycl lane plus adiacent generar traffic lane is petween 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 1 | If the footway is shared, it is quite narrow. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | pact of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity. <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading | There is frequent or continuous kerbsid activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 3 | No kerbside activity | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Qualit of ycling surface (i) | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Qualit of walking surface (i) | There is an even and smooth surface for walking <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are major defects in the surface for walking. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Survellance of public spaces (i) | There is constant surveillance - because mixed use buildings overlook the street or space, or because there are many people using the space or walking through. |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 3 | High volume of other users Mixed use surrounding Residential onlookers | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | İghting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same ctandard | Street lighting meets the British Standard 54899:2003 and the European Standard ceNTT 13201 but lighting of off cearriageway spaces for walking or cycling does not. | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201 | - | 3 | New dev so assumed that the street lighting complies to standard | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | vision of crcle earking (i) | Cycle parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cycle parking does not meet existing } \\ & \text { demand. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | Some cycle parking is shown on concent images but most parking | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 23 | street trees (i) | If assessing existing <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { All }}$ <br> All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 3 | Concept images show high level of landscaping. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  | If assessing existing There is substantial planting in good condition designed to create or improve social space and/or act as a connection between other green spaces (eg pocket park, rain garden, community garden area). <br> If assessing proposal: Existing greenery is to be retained or enhanced and new greenery is proposed. | If assessing existing: <br> There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> Existing standalone greenery is to be <br> retained or enhanced | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 3 | As above | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 25 (Welking distance betwen resting points (i) | There is less than 50 m between resting points. | There is between 50 m and 150 m between resting points. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | Concept images show high level <br> of resting spots | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { There is less than } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { between sheltered } \\ \text { areas. } \end{array}$ | There is between 50 m and 150 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | As above. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | There are positive influences on bus iourney time, eg bus lane exemptions for buses from movement bans for general traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ | There are negative influences on bus <br> journey time e, eg unclear markings, <br> narrow lane widht parkingloadiing <br> issues, short cage length, mixing with | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | , | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessibility (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop. | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible but either there is limited clear space around the bus stop for boarding and dilihting or, for borough roads, there is no clearwav in place. | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ If not, do not complete metrics 31-33 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 29 [ums stop connectivity with other public (i) | The bus stop is within sight of another service - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ Street-t-s-station step-free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is no step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is available close to station access points that meets existing demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'I' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { layout } \end{array}$ | $\int_{\text {layout }}^{\text {Proposed }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of ife | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| Easy to cross | \#\#\#\#\# | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Not too noisy | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| People feel safe | \#\#\#\#\# | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \#\#\#\#\# | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \#\#\#\#\# | 75 |
| Clean Air | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of '0' scores | 0 | 0 |

If ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O}$ ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
$\qquad$

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores sive general picture of how a desing, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy $\operatorname{streets}$ Indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics antribute to multiple Indicators scores.
His not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' 'scors to be elininated. $A$ eroposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score will delivera $10 \%$ uplift in active travel.
The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.f. pedestricns.g from all walks of life, because all the emetrics contribute to
the whole envirinment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean

 Ten 2050 which means that close consideration must tee paid to ensure everry opportunity to redesign our streets seeks to eliminate these known hazards.Metrics scored 'o' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent and ese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealth' - some designs will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

## Appendix J <br> ATZ assessment

## Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood [20/3564/OUT]

TECHNICAL NOTE 4

## Healthy Streets and Active Travel Zone assessments

## 1. Introduction

1.1. This technical note (TN4) has been prepared by Entran Ltd in response to consultation responses from LBB Highways and receipt of the GLA Stage 1 report in respect of a planning application for a mixed-use development on land at Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood.
1.2. The planning application was supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) which referred throughout to the Healthy Streets objectives and included an assessment of routes to and from the Site on foot and by bike. However, LBB have asked for a more comprehensive Healthy Streets assessment and a formal ATZ assessment. The purpose of this note is to provide that information as requested.
2. Public realm improvements
2.1. The planning application is Outline with site layout and landscaping being reserved matters. However, the redevelopment of this Site will deliver extensive improvements to the public realm both within the scheme itself and to Cricklewood Green and the Cricklewood Lane frontage.
2.2. These improvements will deliver new purpose-built pedestrian and cycle links into the Site from Cricklewood Lane, and between Cricklewood Lane and Depot Approach. The development will also provide new areas of public open space and public squares. This will not only provide high quality amenity space for the new residents, but will also provide new public spaces for the benefit of the local community.

2.3. Cricklewood Green does not form part of the planning application, but the movement strategy includes new landscaped routes through Cricklewood green which are expected to be secured by means of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.4. Beyond the site boundaries, the redevelopment of the Site will reduce traffic on the surrounding highway network and will remove an existing junction onto Cricklewood Lane, both of which will improve local highway conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. The development will also make appropriate financial contributions to enhance the pedestrian route to Cricklewood Station beneath the rail bridge, and to provide a new controlled crossing across Cricklewood Lane. This is expected to be in the form of a Puffin crossing; the previse location will be determined as part of any reserved matters application for the site and once the layout has been determined.

## 3. Healthy Streets

3.1. The 'Healthy Streets Check for Designers' has been used to undertake the audit. It is noted that the Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is healthy or not, but indicates the strengths and weaknesses of a street; it is not possible to achieve an overall score of $100 \%$, as to score well against some metrics, compromises are needed in other metrics. The Healthy Streets Audit is available in Appendix TN-A for reference.
3.2. Figure 3.1 shows that the proposed arrangement of Cricklewood Lane is an improvement compared to the existing environment with the closure of an existing vehicle access, enhanced public realm, landscaping and activated frontage improving the 'quality of place to stay' clean air and levels.

Figure 3.1 - Cricklewood Lane, Healthy Streets Healthy Streets Check scores


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores
(\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \begin{array}{l} \text { layout } \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | Proposed layout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toonoisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

3．3．Depot Approach as shown in Figure 3.2 would also be improved by virtue of improved supervision， reduced vehicle speeds and enhanced pedestrian environment．

Figure 3.2 －Depot Approach，Healthy Streets

## Healthy Streets Check scores



Healthy Streets Indicators＇scores
（\％）

|  | Existing layout | Proposed layout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all wallks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to crass | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places ro stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Mas too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People droose to wirn cyle whime pithlistrensport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel sate | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Olean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of＇ 0 ＇scores | 4 | 0 |

3．4．Figure 10.3 demonstrates that the new route through the Proposed Development has been designed to reflect the Healthy Streets aspirations，with high scores in all categories．

Figure 3.3 －Internal Routes，Healthy Streets Healthy Streets Check scores


Healthy Streets Indicators＇scores
（\％）

|  | Existing layout | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 74 |
| tasy to cross | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \＃\＃\＃韦\＃ | 100 |
| Not toon nisy | 戠枟粎 | 100 |
| Peaple chouse to walk，cyde anduse public trampont | ftitita | 74 |
| People feel safe | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 75 |
| Clean Air | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of＇0＇scores | 0 | 0 |


3.5. The health streets assessment demonstrates that the existing roads in the vicinity of the site will be improved in all 10 Healthy Streets categories, and that new public realm will be delivered that complies with all Healthy Streets objectives. This demonstrates that the development of this site will have a positive, beneficial effect on the surrounding highways and public realm.
3.6. With regards to Vision Zero, the assessment was two-stage. Section 3 of the TA includes an objective appraisal of collision data and a review of the significance of those collisions on the Proposed Development. However, a series of public consultation events in Cricklewood ensured all highways and transportation issues could be discussed in full with interested members of the public and other stakeholders. Through that detailed process the development team gained very important local knowledge and were also able to establish the safety issues that were most important to the local community. On the basis of this two-tier approach, the Proposed Development includes measures to improve safety and the perception of safety at the site access and proposed public realm improvements on Cricklewood Lane. In addition, the Proposed Development will deliver and enhanced pedestrian route to Cricklewood Station and a new controlled crossing on Cricklewood Lane. This is entirely consistent with the Vision Zero principles.

## 4. Active Travel Zone (ATZ) Assessment

4.1. An accessibility audit was included as part of the TA; however, this has now been expanded to a full ATZ assessment.
4.2. An active travel zone assessment (ATZ) is an assessment of key journeys and their routes using a mapping system designed by TfL. During this assessment, the TfL guidance was followed starting with 'Map 1'. This map is to demonstrate a 20 -minute cycle catchment from the site, this was achieved using the London WebCat software. This base map illustrates all underground, overground, national rail and DLR stations. The ATZ assessment then illustrates the listed amenities surrounding the site, starting with those closest to the site and then radiating outwards. The amenities shown on this 'Map 1'are public transport stops, primary and secondary school, shopping centres, supermarkets, leisure centres, places of worship and medical centres.

4.3. The adopted methodology was to indicate the closest of each of these facilities, as well as sufficient additional amenities to inform Map 2 (local neighbourhood). A significant proportion of amenities plotted using this method are shown to be less than 10 minutes from the site, with further facilities also plotted beyond 0 minutes. This assessment also demonstrates that a large area of interest falls within a 20-minute cycle catchment.
4.4. Following the TfL guidance, a second map has been produced at a neighbourhood scale. This is presented as 'map 2'. Within this second map all the previously demonstrated amenities have been presented while also demonstrating routes to key destinations. There are five key routes from the site which have been sub-divided into links and assessed against the Healthy Streets objectives.
4.5. Map 2 is shown in Figure 4.2 below, and a commentary is included as Appendix TN-B.

Figure 4.2 - ATZ Map 2

4.6. In accordance with TfL guidance, the characteristics of a healthy neighbourhood have been mapped out, showing public transport interchanges and facilities, local green spaces, quite routes and safer junctions. These are shown on Map 3.

Figure 4.3 - ATZ Map 3.

4.7. Following completion of the desktop work, a detailed study was carried out on-site. This involved walking and cycling the key routes and identifying significant features that either enhance or detract from the journeys on foot or by bike. In each case, a detailed photographic record was kept to illustrate important elements of each route.
4.8. The results of the detailed site study are recorded in the Route Commentary in Appendix TN-C.

## 5. Gravity Model

5.1. An audit to obtain pedestrian desire lines was demonstrate in the TA, however after receiving comments from LBB this has been expanded into an in-depth assessment of pedestrian movements following the finding from the ATZ assessment.
5.2. The adopted methodology assesses the trip attracters within a close proximity to the site and assigns pedestrian and cycle movements to the appropriate key routes. Based on the location of these trip attracters the number of pedestrians and cyclists are distributed onto the identified routes demonstrated earlier on the ATZ's Map 2. Full details of the gravity model are included as Appendix TN-D. The predicted pedestrian trips are included in Section 11 of the TA. For the purpose of this exercise, pedestrian trips include all those walking to bus stops or rail stations.
5.3. This exercise demonstrates that the pedestrian route along depot approach will carry 44 pedestrians during the busiest peak hour. That equates to an average of one pedestrian in each direction every three minutes. This is the gross pedestrian movements, not the net change when compared to the existing retail park. This modest level of pedestrian movement does not necessitate improvements to this route.
5.4. The route beneath the rail bridge would carry 126 pedestrians during the busiest hour. This equates to one pedestrian in each direction per minute. Again, this is the gross pedestrian movements, not the net change when compared to the existing retail park. This route will receive a financial contribution from the development to improve the pedestrian route. Furthermore, the development will safeguard a parcel of land to the south of the rail line so as not to preclude the provision of a southern access into the station at some point in the future.
5.5. The proposed development will improve the pedestrian crossing point on Cricklewood Lane, located near the primary pedestrian access. That crossing will carry 173 pedestrians per hour during the busiest AM peak. The existing uncontrolled crossings (pedestrian refuges) will be supported by an additional controlled crossing (Puffin), the precise location of which will be determined as part of any detailed or reserved matters application for the Site, once the layout Site has been determined.

## 6. Proposed Transport Improvements

6.1. The Healthy Streets assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will result in an overall improvement to the public realm local to the site, and that the internal street has been designed in accordance with the Healthy Streets principles.
6.2. The ATZ assessment has shown that an improved form of pedestrian crossing across Cricklewood Lane would benefit the development and the local community and that routes to the Station should be improved. The proposed development will address both these issues, as well as improving facilities for cyclists.
6.3. The Proposed Development provides the opportunity for a new Car Club space to be provided onsite. If a space were to be provided on-site it would be in a location accessible to the wider public so that the new Car Club vehicle would be available to the new residents as well as the wider local community.
6.4. A Framework Travel Plan was submitted in support of the planning application which includes ambitious sustainable mode share targets and extensive measures in the form of infrastructure, information and incentives. The TA confirms that the final TP will be secured by appropriate condition.
6.5. In addition to the robust targets and measures contained in the Travel Plan, the Proposed Development will deliver a suite of transport improvements designed to promote sustainable travel behaviour. The original list of improvements were set out in full in the TP and Section 13 of the TA, but these have now been expanded following the ATZ assessment as summarised below:

- New pedestrian/cycle route between Depot Approach and Cricklewood Lane;
- Removal of an existing busy vehicle access from Cricklewood Lane;
- Extensive new public realm designed on Healthy Streets principles, including a new public square, open space and play areas;
- Extensive improvements to existing public realm, including Cricklewood Green enhancements to be secured by S106 agreement;
- New Car Club space to provide for new residents and the wider local community;
- Land safeguarded so as not to preclude future southern access into Cricklewood Station;
- Contribution towards improvements to the pedestrian route beneath the rail bridge to be secured by S106 agreement;
- Contribution to upgrade on uncontrolled crossing on Cricklewood Lane to a Puffin to be secured by S106 agreement.
6.6. The Proposed Development has been designed from the outset to encourage sustainable travel behaviour and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. This primary objective is balanced with the practical requirements of a development in this location; in particular, the proximity of existing retail stores with large car parks, and the need to avoid displaced parking.


## Appendix TN-A

Healthy Streets Assessment

| Metrics <br> (Click on (i) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') |  | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  |  | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | 1Total volume of two way motorised <br> traffic | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 2 | 2 | Existing = 835 at PM Peak, Proposed = 940 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the motorised traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less } \\ & \text { than } 2 \% \text { of motorised traffic, } 7 \mathrm{am} \text { to } \\ & 7 \mathrm{pm} . \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m . | 0 | 0 | Possibly slight reduction as a result of the B\&Q closure but not enough to increase score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Trafic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are eweer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $($ l. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | See Metric 1. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large venicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehides is less than } \\ & \text { 5\%/(c.to to }+308 \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is 5 to $10 \%$ (c. +3 to +5 DB ). | The eroportion of large velicices is greater than (c. $\mathrm{c}+50 \mathrm{DB}$ and over). | - | 1 | 1 | Possible reduction in large vehicle traffic could increase score to 2 but keeping 1 to be conservative | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | NO2 concentration (from London <br> Atmoshheric Emisision Inventory) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. |  |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No proposeded change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ducing private car use (1) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic vehicles. | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | $\square^{-}$ | 1 | 2 | Closure of B\&Q car park introduces some level of motor vehicle restriction | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Complor (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. or Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropeed kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | Proposed scheme does not include changes to the Southern side of the road where the side roads are | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Mid-link crosings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by lcrosingsthat are sitale some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away <br> from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Technologyto optimise efficiency y movement (pedestritins. coclists, buses and general motor trafic) (i) | All appropriate detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic techno signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technolog applied to traficis Signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 3 | 3 | ${ }^{\text {No proposed change. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for crcling (i) | Where cycles are separated from othe traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more. | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 1.5m to 2.2m (one-way) or 2.5 m to 3.5 m (two-way). (Otherwise: with of the eerside general trafic lane (inhere there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycl alane pusadidaent general traffic lane is between 4 m and 4.5 m . | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | act of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 1 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole cucling surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | Lighting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (isison of cycle parking (i) | Cyandards parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | Cycle parking to be included with improvements to Cricklewood Grn? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | Street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |



Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your not be possible, if so ustify your
$\qquad$

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \text { Layout } \\ \text { lay } \end{array}\right.$ | $\int_{\text {Proposed }}^{\text {Playout }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toon noisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

If 0 ' ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:
If 0 'scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
n overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
is not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be pel The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. $A$ proposed scheme should also aim to deliver a score increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a treet is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ incr
will delivera a $10 \%$ uplift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets Check are the best avilable
quantifiaibe and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Heathy Streets indicators are e inked to only
a few metricse.g. shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 31 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to
the whole environment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Metrics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. II it not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug

## hy you cannot get a perfect score

a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise Tomoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent mising the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check aims to hightight bese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing <br> layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | People feel safe | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | People feel relaxed | Clean Air |
|  | $1 \begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Total volume of two way motorised } \\ \text { traffic } \end{array} \end{array}$ | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 0 | 0 | Existing = 1523 <br> Proposed = 1653 (with growth and other committed dev) No proposals for hike lanes? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than $2 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater han 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to either: <br> - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m | 0 | 0 | Existing 9\%. <br> Some B\&Q large vehicles will be removed from this road but unlikely to bring total proportion below 5\%. Prehaps this score would improve if a bike lane is proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No changes to 30 mph speed restrictions are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | 4\begin{tabular}{\|l|l}
\hline
\end{tabular}Traffic noise based on peak hour <br> motorised traffic volumes$\quad$ (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are fewer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{C} 58 \mathrm{DB} \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $5{ }^{\text {Noise from large evehicles }}$ (i) | The proportion of lage ve ehictes is less than | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of flarge evinices is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \text { (10\% } \\ & \text { (c. }+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 10 \% \\ & \text { (c. }+5 \text { DB and over). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\substack{\text { NO2 concentration (from London } \\ \text { Atmoshheric Emission Inventory) }}$ <br> (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) |  | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> Side roads are on- way yut for motor <br> sehicies and have featurus to encourge | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | A-link crossings, to meet desirel lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. }}$ <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cro }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cros }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} 11 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrianss, cyclists, buses } \\ \text { and general motor traffic) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | All appropiate detection and optimistion <br> ternnology has been applied tot traffic <br> sinals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 2 | 2 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |




Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'O' scores the design whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 48 | 48 |
| Easy to cross | 53 | 53 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 33 |
| Places to stop and rest | 60 | 60 |
| Not too noisy | 40 | 40 |
| People choose to walk, cydle and use public transport | 48 | 48 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 56 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 22 |
| People feel relaxed | 49 | 49 |
| Clean Air | 33 | 33 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 49 | 49 |
| Number of '0' scores | 2 | 2 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
共

## What the numbers mea

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a street is. It it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available
quantifiable and evidence baseed standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent ese decisions so that taketaldders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | Not too noisy | People choose to walk, cycle and use PT | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewerthan 500 vehicles per hour <br> at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 3 | 3 | Existing $=149$ at PM Peak Proposed = 87 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and (i) people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 2\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm. | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . |  | 0 | 1 | 13.3\% existing, <br> Although unclear of exact number of large vehicles enterring/ exiting the site it is unlikely to be above $5 \%$. A score of 1 has been chosen as a conservative estimate. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 3 | Speed of motorised traftic (i) | 85 th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 3 | 21 mph existing Although not clear as yet it is likely that Depot Approach will have a new 20 mph speed restriction. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traffic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | There are fewert than 55 venicles per hour (c. 5880 B8). | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour (c. $58-70$ DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour $(\mathrm{c} \geqslant 70 \mathrm{DB})$ | - | 2 | 3 | see metric 1 Although proposed peak traffic is | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 5 | Noise from large venicles (i) | The proporition of large vehicles is less than 5\% (c. t to to 30 B$)$. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large velicices is greater } \\ & \text { than } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{c}+5 \text { DB and overf). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | see metric 2 | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 6 | NO2 concentration (from London Atmospheric Emission Inventor) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | See Diag. Unlikely to change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ng private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to local residents, deliveries and public service | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 3 | 3 | Currently no through road and none planned. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> $\stackrel{\text { or }}{\text { or }}$ <br> Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage Mivers to then cantiously | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for encourage drivers to turn cautiously <br> encourage drivers to turn cautiously | side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 0 | 2 | Currently no dropped kerbs. Proposed scheme has one side road between blocks $C$ and $D$. The crossing will have dropped kerbs and a raised table to encourage cautious vehicle | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Middilink crossings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but <br> the time | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 1 | 1 | Currently no desire lines or crossings. The proposed scheme doesn't encourage | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> 아 <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{11}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ \text { signals. } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No measures are in place to support } \\ & \text { controlled crossing. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Crossings at junction with A5 }} ^{\text {is controlled. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | Width of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 1 | 2 | New footways near entrance to site. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people crcing (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | Unclear at present whether proposed scheme includes a bike path on Depot Approach. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 0 | 1 | No clear mitigations either existing or proposed. The volume of large vehicle is reduced in the proposed scheme however | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for rccing (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 0 | 2 | To be confirmed after taking dims from DWG file. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 |  | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated <br> from parking or loading facilities | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or bading | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 2 | 2 | 1oading restrictions during day | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> are defects but resurfacing of the whole cvcling surface is proposed | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for cycling. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 2 | More activity on proposed scheme. Overlocken by blocks $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ C and D Open space (garden) adjacent to road will act as surveilance | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{21}$ | Lighing (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 1 | 3 | Proposed scheme will conform to standards? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (i) | Ctandards is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing cyle parking. cocle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 1 | 3 | No existing trees <br> From indicitive scheme there will be good tree planting coverage the the length of the road | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  |  | If assessing existing: There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges, hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. If assessing proposal: Existing standalone greenery is to be retained or enhanced. | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing planting. <br> From indicitive scheme there will be regular planting the full length of the road. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  | There is sless than 50 m between resting points | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between 50m and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | No existing resting places. Not clear as yet but likely to be resting places on the edges of the | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | There is less than 50 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 1 | No specific shelters existing or proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\left.{ }_{7}\right]^{\text {Fioturs influen ing time bus passenger }} \quad$ (i) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ |  | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessiblily (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop |  | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? (Y/N)If not, do not complete metrics $31-33$ |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The bus stop is within sight of another senice - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ street.to-station step.free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is not step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is availale closes to station <br> acess noints that meets existing <br> demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Elistong } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places to stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Not too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel safe | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Clean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of '0' scores | 4 | 0 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
If'0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
tis not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. A proposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is.II it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Heathy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel.

The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best avaiable quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians strom all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To tetransarent ang the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check a ims to hightight Hese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealthy' - some design s will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Easy to } \\ & \text { cross } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{array}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | Things to see and do | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel } \\ \text { relaxed } \end{gathered}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|_{1} ^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewert than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . $5 \%$ of motorised traftic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m .號 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than $5 \%$ of motorised traffic 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traficic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised trafific volumes | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { There are fewert than } 55 \text { venicices per hour } \\ \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB) } \end{array}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 588.70 DB . | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour (c. 770 OBB). | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large vehicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less than } \\ & 5 \% \text { (c. }+0 \text { to }+3 D B \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of al arge vehicles is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \begin{array}{l} 1008 \\ (c .+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The ropoprion of large evehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 1008 \text { (tan } \\ & \text { (c. } 5 \text { D } \mathrm{Band} \text { over). } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | No2 concentration (fom London Atmospheric Emission Inventory) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 with local traffic veater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ |  | 3 | Existing levels are 40, local traffic volume reduction measures are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic <br> vehicles. | There are some time or movement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are no access restrictions for } \\ & \text { motorised traffic. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{-}$ |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 | ${ }_{\text {Comfor of crossing side road for }}^{\text {people walking }}$ (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> moads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side road have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. |  | 3 | No side roads | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Midllink crosings, to met desirie lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desiere lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - |  | 3 | No need for controlled crossing conflicting traffic volume is low | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrins frcist, } \\ \text { and general motor traficic) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ & \text { signals. } \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. |  |  |  | 1 | No trafici signals. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - |  | 1 | controlled crossings | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walkings space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. walking in busy locations. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { There is less than } 1.5 \mathrm{~m} \text { clear width } \\ & \text { for walking. }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 3 | Walkways appear narrow in some locations but walking on the grass is encouraged | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Part or all of a footway wider than } 3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { with fewer than } 200 \text { pedestrians per hour } \\ & \text { is designated as shared use. } \end{aligned}$ | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or Part or all of a footway less than $3 m$ wide is designated as shared use. | - | 1 | Assuming at this stage all walkways can be cycled on? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing motor vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. | Some measures are in place to reduce turning movements by motor vehicles a priority junctions. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle mow fewe are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place | There are no restrictions on turning movements by motor vehicles at side roads and other uncontrolled accesses. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated and more are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place |  | 3 | The only way cyclists might meet venicle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effetive width for cycling (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where therer is nocyclel lane) or width of the cycl lane plus adiacent generar traffic lane is petween 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 1 | If the footway is shared, it is quite narrow. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | pact of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity. <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading | There is frequent or continuous kerbsid activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 3 | No kerbside activity | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Qualit of ycling surface (i) | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Qualit of walking surface (i) | There is an even and smooth surface for walking <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are major defects in the surface for walking. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Survellance of public spaces (i) | There is constant surveillance - because mixed use buildings overlook the street or space, or because there are many people using the space or walking through. |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 3 | High volume of other users Mixed use surrounding Residential onlookers | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | İghting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same ctandard | Street lighting meets the British Standard 54899:2003 and the European Standard ceNTT 13201 but lighting of off cearriageway spaces for walking or cycling does not. | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201 | - | 3 | New dev so assumed that the street lighting complies to standard | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | vision of crcle earking (i) | Cycle parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cycle parking does not meet existing } \\ & \text { demand. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | Some cycle parking is shown on concent images but most parking | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 23 | street trees (i) | If assessing existing <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { All }}$ <br> All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 3 | Concept images show high level of landscaping. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  | If assessing existing There is substantial planting in good condition designed to create or improve social space and/or act as a connection between other green spaces (eg pocket park, rain garden, community garden area). <br> If assessing proposal: Existing greenery is to be retained or enhanced and new greenery is proposed. | If assessing existing: <br> There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> Existing standalone greenery is to be <br> retained or enhanced | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 3 | As above | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 25 (Welking distance betwen resting points (i) | There is less than 50 m between resting points. | There is between 50 m and 150 m between resting points. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | Concept images show high level <br> of resting spots | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { There is less than } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { between sheltered } \\ \text { areas. } \end{array}$ | There is between 50 m and 150 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | As above. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | There are positive influences on bus iourney time, eg bus lane exemptions for buses from movement bans for general traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ | There are negative influences on bus <br> journey time e, eg unclear markings, <br> narrow lane widht parkingloadiing <br> issues, short cage length, mixing with | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | , | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessibility (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop. | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible but either there is limited clear space around the bus stop for boarding and dilihting or, for borough roads, there is no clearwav in place. | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ If not, do not complete metrics 31-33 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 29 [ums stop connectivity with other public (i) | The bus stop is within sight of another service - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ Street-t-s-station step-free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is no step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is available close to station access points that meets existing demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'I' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { layout } \end{array}$ | $\int_{\text {layout }}^{\text {Proposed }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of ife | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| Easy to cross | \#\#\#\#\# | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Not too noisy | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| People feel safe | \#\#\#\#\# | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \#\#\#\#\# | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \#\#\#\#\# | 75 |
| Clean Air | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of '0' scores | 0 | 0 |

If ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O}$ ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
$\qquad$

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores sive general picture of how a desing, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy $\operatorname{streets}$ Indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics antribute to multiple Indicators scores.
His not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' 'scors to be elininated. $A$ eroposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score will delivera $10 \%$ uplift in active travel.
The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.f. pedestricns.g from all walks of life, because all the emetrics contribute to
the whole envirinment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean

 Ten 2050 which means that close consideration must tee paid to ensure everry opportunity to redesign our streets seeks to eliminate these known hazards.Metrics scored 'o' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent and ese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealth' - some designs will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

## Appendix TN-B

Map 2 route commentary

| Route | Destination (s) | Walking route description (from site) | Cycling route description (from site) | Safety concerns and photographs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | - Kilburn Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Gesher School <br> - Mulberry House School <br> - Mapesbury Medical Group <br> - Bus stops BN, CE, CW <br> - Shops and services along Cricklewood Broadway (A5) <br> - Kilburn town centre | Leave site via Cricklewood Green, following Cricklewood Lane West A407 for 120 m to the junction with Cricklewood Broadway (A5). Turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway for local shops and services with controlled pedestrian crossings at regular intervals. Continuing 1.4 km pedestrians can reach Kilburn Underground Station. | Cyclist would follow same route as pedestrians beginning on the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green before joining the highway and turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway. | - Crossing at the junction with Cricklewood Lane and Cricklewood Broadway (Photograph 1). 5 KSI since 2015. <br> - In general pedestrian walkways ok along Cricklewood Ln and Cricklewood Broadway but unsafe for cyclists; no segregated or unsegregated cycle lane, with large proportion of large vehicles and fast traffic ( 30 mph ) Photograph 2. <br> - Cyclists will struggle joining Cricklewood Lane after using the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green Photograph 3 |
| Route2 | - Hampstead School <br> - Hampstead Underground Station (Northern) <br> - Bus stop CO <br> - Hampstead town centre | Pedestrians leave site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood lane for 200m, walking beneath the Cricklewood underpass. Pedestrians will then use the controlled crossing at the junction with Lichfield Road before walking another 500 m to the Hampstead school or another 1.8 km to Hampstead Underground station. | Cyclists would leave the site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood Lane before turning right at the junction with Lichfield Road. A short 500 m cycle will take cyclist to the Hampstead School. Hampstead Underground Station (the site's nearest Northern Line station) is within reasonable cycling distance; past the school and along lightly trafficked Frognall Lane onto Hampstead High Street to the Station. | - One KSI incident has been recorded since 2015 at the junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. Photograph 4 <br> - Cricklewood underpass is reasonably lit. Photograph 5. <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on heavily trafficked Hampstead High Street. 2 KSI have been identified here. No obvious access to the station. |
| Route 3 | - St Agnes Catholic Primary School <br> - Claremont Primary School <br> - Whitefield School <br> - Greenfield medical centre <br> - Claremont and Childs Hill Churches <br> - Cricklewood Station <br> - Temple Fortune and Hendon Central town centres | Begins same as route 2 but turning left at the junction with Lichfield Road. Pedestrians continue North to the schools, medical centres, and places of worship. Whitefield School is approximately 1.8 km along Claremont Road past the Golder's Green Estate. | Same as pedestrian route, no dedicated cycle lanes. | - Wide junction in photograph 6 could present safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly as they both house large vehicles. <br> - No significant safety concerns for cyclists given this rout is lightly trafficked residential road once turning off Cricklewood Lane. |
| Route 4 | - Anso and Ramin primary Schools <br> - Chichele Road and Wilesden Green surgeries <br> - Central Brent Mosque and St Gabriel's places of worship. <br> - Wilesden Green Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Kensal Green Underground Station (Bakerloo) <br> - Brodensbury Station. <br> - Harlesden and Wilesden Green town centres. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway at the controlled crossing 20 m South of the junction with Cricklewood Lane. Pedestrians then head South West along Chichele Road to the GP surgeries, primary schools and Wilesden Green Underground Station 800 m further on. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway. Cyclist then use Chichele Road, travelling South West along residential roads to Wilesden Underground Station ( 800 m ). Kensal Green is still within reasonable cycling distance and is the closest access to the Bakerloo line. Cyclists continue past Wilesden Green station, crossing Wilesden Lane onto Sidmouth Road/ All Souls Ave. Cyclists must then use Harrow road for 600 m before turning left onto Kensal Green. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing Photograph 7 <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on this route but mostly uses lightly trafficked residential roads, with the exception of Harrow Road, and Wilesden Lane which are both moderately trafficked. |
| Route 5 | - Mora Primary School <br> - Menorah HS <br> - The Crest Academy <br> - Burnley Practice GP <br> - St Agnes Catholic Church <br> - Bus stops BD and BP <br> - Neasden and Colindale town centres | Route 5 has been identified as the least popular pedestrian cycle route from the site; given that most local amenities, services, and public transport nodes are South of the site. To reach the Mora Primary School, pedestrians begin the same as routes 4 and 1 from Cricklewood Green and onto Cricklewood Lane. They would then walk 250 m North along Cricklewood Road, using the crossing 20 m South of Mora Road, and then walk the short distance down Mora Road to the school. | Cyclist begin the same as routes 1 and 4 , turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway and continuing North. To reach Mora Primary School, cyclist turn off Cricklewood Broadway onto Mora Road. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing. |


| Route | Destination (s) | Walking route description (from site) | Cycling route description (from site) | Safety concerns and photographs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | - Kilburn Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Gesher School <br> - Mulberry House School <br> - Mapesbury Medical Group <br> - Bus stops BN, CE, CW <br> - Shops and services along Cricklewood Broadway (A5) <br> - Kilburn town centre | Leave site via Cricklewood Green, following Cricklewood Lane West A407 for 120 m to the junction with Cricklewood Broadway (A5). Turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway for local shops and services with controlled pedestrian crossings at regular intervals. Continuing 1.4 km pedestrians can reach Kilburn Underground Station. | Cyclist would follow same route as pedestrians beginning on the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green before joining the highway and turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway. | - Crossing at the junction with Cricklewood Lane and Cricklewood Broadway (Photograph 1). 5 KSI since 2015. <br> - In general pedestrian walkways ok along Cricklewood Ln and Cricklewood Broadway but unsafe for cyclists; no segregated or unsegregated cycle lane, with large proportion of large vehicles and fast traffic ( 30 mph ) Photograph 2. <br> - Cyclists will struggle joining Cricklewood Lane after using the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green Photograph 3 |
| Route2 | - Hampstead School <br> - Hampstead Underground Station (Northern) <br> - Bus stop CO <br> - Hampstead town centre | Pedestrians leave site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood lane for 200m, walking beneath the Cricklewood underpass. Pedestrians will then use the controlled crossing at the junction with Lichfield Road before walking another 500 m to the Hampstead school or another 1.8 km to Hampstead Underground station. | Cyclists would leave the site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood Lane before turning right at the junction with Lichfield Road. A short 500 m cycle will take cyclist to the Hampstead School. Hampstead Underground Station (the site's nearest Northern Line station) is within reasonable cycling distance; past the school and along lightly trafficked Frognall Lane onto Hampstead High Street to the Station. | - One KSI incident has been recorded since 2015 at the junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. Photograph 4 <br> - Cricklewood underpass is reasonably lit. Photograph 5. <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on heavily trafficked Hampstead High Street. 2 KSI have been identified here. No obvious access to the station. |
| Route 3 | - St Agnes Catholic Primary School <br> - Claremont Primary School <br> - Whitefield School <br> - Greenfield medical centre <br> - Claremont and Childs Hill Churches <br> - Cricklewood Station <br> - Temple Fortune and Hendon Central town centres | Begins same as route 2 but turning left at the junction with Lichfield Road. Pedestrians continue North to the schools, medical centres, and places of worship. Whitefield School is approximately 1.8 km along Claremont Road past the Golder's Green Estate. | Same as pedestrian route, no dedicated cycle lanes. | - Wide junction in photograph 6 could present safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly as they both house large vehicles. <br> - No significant safety concerns for cyclists given this rout is lightly trafficked residential road once turning off Cricklewood Lane. |
| Route 4 | - Anso and Ramin primary Schools <br> - Chichele Road and Wilesden Green surgeries <br> - Central Brent Mosque and St Gabriel's places of worship. <br> - Wilesden Green Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Kensal Green Underground Station (Bakerloo) <br> - Brodensbury Station. <br> - Harlesden and Wilesden Green town centres. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway at the controlled crossing 20 m South of the junction with Cricklewood Lane. Pedestrians then head South West along Chichele Road to the GP surgeries, primary schools and Wilesden Green Underground Station 800 m further on. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway. Cyclist then use Chichele Road, travelling South West along residential roads to Wilesden Underground Station ( 800 m ). Kensal Green is still within reasonable cycling distance and is the closest access to the Bakerloo line. Cyclists continue past Wilesden Green station, crossing Wilesden Lane onto Sidmouth Road/ All Souls Ave. Cyclists must then use Harrow road for 600 m before turning left onto Kensal Green. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing Photograph 7 <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on this route but mostly uses lightly trafficked residential roads, with the exception of Harrow Road, and Wilesden Lane which are both moderately trafficked. |
| Route 5 | - Mora Primary School <br> - Menorah HS <br> - The Crest Academy <br> - Burnley Practice GP <br> - St Agnes Catholic Church <br> - Bus stops BD and BP <br> - Neasden and Colindale town centres | Route 5 has been identified as the least popular pedestrian cycle route from the site; given that most local amenities, services, and public transport nodes are South of the site. To reach the Mora Primary School, pedestrians begin the same as routes 4 and 1 from Cricklewood Green and onto Cricklewood Lane. They would then walk 250 m North along Cricklewood Road, using the crossing 20 m South of Mora Road, and then walk the short distance down Mora Road to the school. | Cyclist begin the same as routes 1 and 4 , turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway and continuing North. To reach Mora Primary School, cyclist turn off Cricklewood Broadway onto Mora Road. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing. |


| Photograph | Issue of safety | Suggestions for improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at the junction between Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane | - Busy junction with no dedicated cycle lane or early start arrangement for cyclists <br> - KSI cluster of vehicle / pedestrian incidents. | - Early start arrangement for cyclists. <br> - Cycle box at lights. <br> - Improvements to pedestrian crossing. |
| 2 - Cricklewood Broadway no cycle facilities | - Limited crossing points for pedestrians. <br> - Heavily trafficked road with no provisions for cyclists <br> - 30 mph speed restriction | - 20 mph speed restrictions on the stretch through Cricklewood neighbourhood centre. <br> - Investigate feasibility of segregated cycle lane. |
|  | - Cyclist joining carriage way from Cricklewood Lane shared path must cross the Eastbound lane to join vehicle traffic. | - Investigate continuation of path |
| 4-One KSI incident at junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road | - One KSI incident at junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. | - Investigate improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities. |
|  | - Poorly lit underpass alongside heavily trafficked fast moving ( 30 mph ) road. | - Improve lighting provisions. <br> - Investigate barriers between pedestrians and vehicle traffic for the stretch of underpass. |
| 6 - wide junction on Claremont road | - Wide junction raises safety concerns for pedestrians using Claremont road. | - Investigate ways of pedestrians crossing to other side of Claremont Road in advance of this junction. |
| 7 - Cricklewood Broadway / Chichele Road junction. | - Large, intimidating, and busy junction with no provisions for cyclists. <br> - Near KSI cluster. | - Lower speeds to 20 mph . <br> - Early start arrangements for cyclists at all four arms of junction. <br> - Cycle box at traffic lights. |

## Area: A1

## Location: Cricklewood Broadway

## Routes Affected: 1



Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 1 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Broadway and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Cricklewood Broadway is a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many places to stop and rest in Area 1; both formal and informal.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is well overlooked so people will feel relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 1 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 1 scores moderately on this indicator.

Area: A2
Location: Cricklewood Broadway North of
Cricklewood Lane junction
Routes Affected: 5


Healthy Streets indicators.
Easy to cross/ people feel safe
Area 2 does scores moderately on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity.
Things to see and do
Area 2 like are 1 is still Cricklewood Broadway; a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are few places to stop and rest in Area 2; more benches/ informal seating could improve this.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is less well
overlooked than Area 1 so people will feel less relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 2 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 2 scores less well on this indicator.

## Area: A3

## Location: Crickleway Lane

Routes Affected: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 3 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one uncontrolled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Lane and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Area 3; Cricklewood Lane forms part of the Cricklewood neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Cricklewood Green provides a good location for markets, informal performances and other "things to see and do" Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many formal and informal places to stop and rest in Area 3. More places to rest on the Southern side of the road could improve this further.
People feel relaxed
Area 3 is moderately trafficked meaning people may not feel relaxed. Cricklewood Green on the North side of the road is a place where people could relax so improves Area 3's score for this indicator.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 3 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 3 scores less well on this indicator. Planting on Cricklewood Green improves the score slightly.

Area: A4
Location: Junction Cricklewood Lane/ Lichfield
Road
Routes Affected: 2, 3


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/people feel safe

Area 4 scores well on the easy to cross indicator. Controlled crossings on all four arms of the junction means safe crossings for pedestrians; important as this junction is used for most journeys to school from the site. The poorly lit underpass scores less well, and lighting should be improved to make people feel safer.
Things to see and do
Area 4 is mostly residential so there is not much to "see or do". More planting could improve this. Places to stop and rest
As area 4 is mostly residential there are few places to stop and rest.
People feel relaxed
Area 4 is mostly lightly trafficked, and lower vehicle speeds mean people feel more relaxed.
Not too noisy
The area shown is "not too noisy" on the most part as the traffic speeds and volumes are lower. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this further.

## Clean air

Area 4 scores ok for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs from nearby Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 4 scores less well on this indicator. The underpass does provide some shade and shelter.


Photograph 3 - Cyclits will struggle to join
highway from shared path in front of

## Cricklewood green.





Photograph 6 - wide access at Claremont Road



Photograph 9 - No obvious safe way for cyclist to cross onto Chichele Road

## Appendix TN-C

Photographic record

## Area: A1

## Location: Cricklewood Broadway

## Routes Affected: 1



Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 1 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Broadway and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Cricklewood Broadway is a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many places to stop and rest in Area 1; both formal and informal.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is well overlooked so people will feel relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 1 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 1 scores moderately on this indicator.

Area: A2
Location: Cricklewood Broadway North of
Cricklewood Lane junction
Routes Affected: 5


Healthy Streets indicators.
Easy to cross/ people feel safe
Area 2 does scores moderately on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity.
Things to see and do
Area 2 like are 1 is still Cricklewood Broadway; a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are few places to stop and rest in Area 2; more benches/ informal seating could improve this.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is less well
overlooked than Area 1 so people will feel less relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 2 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 2 scores less well on this indicator.

## Area: A3

## Location: Crickleway Lane

Routes Affected: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 3 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one uncontrolled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Lane and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Area 3; Cricklewood Lane forms part of the Cricklewood neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Cricklewood Green provides a good location for markets, informal performances and other "things to see and do" Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many formal and informal places to stop and rest in Area 3. More places to rest on the Southern side of the road could improve this further.
People feel relaxed
Area 3 is moderately trafficked meaning people may not feel relaxed. Cricklewood Green on the North side of the road is a place where people could relax so improves Area 3's score for this indicator.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 3 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 3 scores less well on this indicator. Planting on Cricklewood Green improves the score slightly.

Area: A4
Location: Junction Cricklewood Lane/ Lichfield
Road
Routes Affected: 2, 3


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/people feel safe

Area 4 scores well on the easy to cross indicator. Controlled crossings on all four arms of the junction means safe crossings for pedestrians; important as this junction is used for most journeys to school from the site. The poorly lit underpass scores less well, and lighting should be improved to make people feel safer.
Things to see and do
Area 4 is mostly residential so there is not much to "see or do". More planting could improve this. Places to stop and rest
As area 4 is mostly residential there are few places to stop and rest.
People feel relaxed
Area 4 is mostly lightly trafficked, and lower vehicle speeds mean people feel more relaxed.
Not too noisy
The area shown is "not too noisy" on the most part as the traffic speeds and volumes are lower. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this further.

## Clean air

Area 4 scores ok for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs from nearby Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 4 scores less well on this indicator. The underpass does provide some shade and shelter.

## Appendix TN-D <br> Gravity model

| 10\% | Destination category | Amenity | Postcode | Distance / Km | Route from site | Proportion within destination | Proportion of total journeys | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary Schools | St Agnes' Catholic | NW2 1RG | 0.3 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% | 50\% primary Schools, 50\% secondary schools, evenly distributed |
|  |  | Childs Hill | NW2 1SL | 0.6 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Claremont | NW2 1AB | 1.0 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Anson Primary | NW26AD | 1.0 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | All Saints' CE NW2 | NW22TH | 1.1 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Rimon Jewish Primary | NW11 8AE | 1.4 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Wessex Gardens | NW11 9RR | 1.6 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Gesher School | NW23BS | 0.8 | 1 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Ramin School | NW24EX | 1.0 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Mora Primary | Mora road | 0.8 | 5A | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Gladstone Park Primary | NW101LB | 1.4 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  | Secondary Schools | Whitefield School | NW21TR | 1.8 | 3 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | Menorah HS for girls | NW27BZ | 1.8 | 5A | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | Hampstead School | NW23RT | 0.8 | 2 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | The Crest Academy | NW27SN | 2.4 | 5A | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | St Augustine's CE HS | NW65SN | 2.9 | 1 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
| 18\% | Health Centre | Cricklewood Health Centre | NW2 1DZ | 0.2 | 1 | 8\% | 1.35\% | All NHS health centres within a 1 km walking radius have been selected, with journeys distributed evenly. It is assumed that $60 \%$ of jouneys in this category are to health centres, $15 \%$ to places of worship (to include informal group meeting as well as services), and $25 \%$ to banks and post offices |
|  |  | Burnley Practice Branch | NW26TU | 0.3 | 5A | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Chichele Rd | NW23AN | 0.3 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Wilesden Green Surgery | NW23UY | 0.5 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Greenfield Medical Cnetre | NW21HS | 0.6 | 3 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Mapesbury Medical Group | NW23PS | 0.8 | 1 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Walm Lane | NW24RT | 1.0 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Oxgate Gardens | NW26EA | 1.1 | 5A | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  | Place of Worship | St Agnes Catholic Church | NW21HR | 0.3 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Claremont Free Church | NW21PY | 0.5 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% | The nearest place of worship for the most popular local faiths have been slected with the 1 km radius extended to 1.4 km to include the nearest Synagogue. |
|  |  | St. Gabriels C of E | NW24RX | 0.8 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Central Mosque of Brent | NW24PU | 1.1 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Childs Hill Baptist Church | NW22JY | 1.1 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Shree Swaminarayan Temple | NW25RG | 1.4 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Shomrei Hadath Synagogue | NW61DD | 1.4 | 2 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  | Other | Post office | NW23HR | 0.2 | 5 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Barclays | NW23HF | 0.2 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Nationwide | NW23HF | 0.2 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Santander | NW23HF | 0.3 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
| 28\% | Retail | Tesco Express | NW23DR | 0.2 | 5 | 10\% | 2.80\% | The vast majority of retail destinations are found on Cricklewoodwood Broadway. The retail destinations North of the site that would perhaps use depot Approach tend do be larger retail |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway High Street |  | 0.0 | 1 | 90\% | 25.20\% |  |
| 31\% | Leisure | The Manor Health \& Leisure Club | NW26PG | 0.5 | 5A | 10\% | 3.10\% | including DIY shops where travel by foot is less popular, with the exception of the Tesco Express included here. Assumption made: $90 \%$ to |
|  |  | Virgin active | NW2 2DS | 0.3 | 3 | 10\% | 3.10\% | Cricklewood Broadway, 10\% to Tescos Express. |
|  |  | Fitness Planet Gym | NW2 6NX | 0.2 | 5A | 10\% | 3.10\% |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Play Area | NW2 3DX | 0.1 | 5A | 15\% | 4.65\% | Leisure to include the nearest open spaces and |
|  |  | Gladstone Park Open Space and |  |  |  |  |  | playgrounds as well as gyms and eat/ drink establishments. Assumption: Gym 30\% (evenly |
|  |  |  | NW2 6NT |  |  |  |  | distributed between 3 nearest), Open Space $30 \%$, |
|  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 5A | 15\% | 4.65\% | Eat/Drink 40\% |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway High Street |  | 0.0 | 1 | 40\% | 12.40\% | The vast majority of eat and drink establishments |
| 13\% | Place of work ATZ 'town centres' (London Plan 2015) | Cricklewood - district (to become metropolitan) |  | 0.0 | 1 | 40\% | 5.200\% | destinations are found on Cricklewoodwood Broadway. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Place of work destinations are 'town centres' |
|  |  | Temple Fortune - district |  | 1.3 | 3 | 15\% | 1.950\% | taken from the London Plan (2015) with all |
|  |  | Wilesden Green - district |  | 1.3 | 4 | 15\% | 1.950\% | within a 2 km walking radius included here. Crciklewood 40\%, Even distribution between |
|  |  | West Hampstead - district |  | 1.9 | 2 | 15\% | 1.950\% | others. |
|  |  | Golder's Green - district |  | 2.1 | 3 | 15\% | 1.950\% |  |


|  |  | Station / Stop |  |  |  | Number of trips |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mode |  |  | AM Peak |  | Daily |  | Higher proportional split asigned to the nearer station. Other UG |
| 26\% | Rail | Wilensden Green (jubilee) | UG | 1.1 | 4 | 40\% | 53 | 45 | 421 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood (Thameslink) | overground | 0.2 | 3 | 60\% | 80 | 67 | 631 |  |
|  | Bus | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 16, 32,245,266,31 | 3.2 | 5 | 25\% | 32 | 30 | 32 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown (BN) | 32,322 | 0.2 | 1 | 15\% | 19 | 18 | 19 |  |
| 13\% |  | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 189,226,245,260 | 0.2 | 1 | 20\% | 25 | 24 | 25 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 189,226,260, 460 | 0.2 | 1 | 20\% | 25 | 24 | 25 | The distribution of journeys to bus stations |
|  |  | Cricklewood Ln stop BP | 266 | 0.2 | 5 | 10\% | 13 | 12 | 13 | is |
|  |  | Cricklewood Ln stop CO | C11 | 0.2 | 2 | 10\% | 13 | 12 | 13 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Total trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | No. of destinations. | Proportion of total journeys |  |  | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  | Daily |  |  |
|  |  | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total |
| 1 | 13 | 48.8\% | 1.5\% | 50\% | 173 | 0 | 173 | 173 | 0 | 173 | 112 | 1 | 113 |
| 2 | 4 | 3.2\% | 0.1\% | 3\% | 19 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 97 | 0 | 97 |
| 3 | 15 | 12.8\% | 0.4\% | 13\% | 107 | 0 | 107 | 95 | 0 | 95 | 967 | 0 | 967 |
| 4 | 11 | 8.3\% | 0.3\% | 9\% | 71 | 0 | 71 | 63 | 0 | 63 | 637 | 0 | 637 |
| 5 | 13 | 3.8\% | 0.1\% | 4\% | 52 | 0 | 52 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 144 | 0 | 144 |
| 5A | 9 | 20.0\% | 0.6\% | 21\% | 43 | 0 | 43 | 44 | 0 | 44 | 524 | 1 | 524 |

## Bus stops

| Bus Route | Direction | Nearest Stop | Stop Name | Route no. from site |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Victoria | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 32 | Edgeware | BN | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Kilburn Park | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 189 | Brent Cross | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Oxford Circus | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 226 | Ealing Broadway | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Golder's Green | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 245 | Aplerton | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 260 | Golders Green | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 266 | Brent Cross | BP | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Hammersmith | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BP | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 316 | White City | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 332 | Neasdon | BN | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown | 5 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Paddington | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 460 | North Finchley | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| C11 | Willesden | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Archway | CO | Cricklewood Ln stop CO | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  |  |  | 2 Cricklewood Green |  |



| Bus route | Towards | Bus stops |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | Victoria | (1®(1)(1) |
| 32 | Edgware | -®@(®®®1) |
|  | Kilburn Park | (๑®(ฺ)(1) |
| 189 (1)w | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | -(1)ฺ¢ |
|  | Oxford Clicus | -(1)(®®ฺ\| |
| 226 | Ealing Broadway | (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Golders Green | ๑やฺฺ( |
| 245 | Alperton | (®®(๑) |
|  | Golders Green | (1)(¢)(9) |
| 260 | Golders Green | (๑๑) |
|  | White City | (1)(3) |
| 266 | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | (10)®® |
|  | Hammersmith | (1)(¢)(3) |
| 316 | White City | ©®(®)(1) |
| 332 | Neasden | -லவ®®(6) |
|  | Paddington | -®®®®®(1) |
| 460 | North Finchley | -(ִ) |
|  | Willesden | (1)( |
| CII | Archway | ๑๑ฺ๑๑๑ |
|  | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | ๑@๑๑๑๑ |

## Journeys by purpose

Travel in London Report 12 (TfL)
Figure 4.4 Trips per person per day

| Usual workplace | 0.39 | $18 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Other work | 0.16 | $7 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ |
| Education | 0.19 | $9 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ |
| Shopping | 0.51 | $24 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ |
| Leisure | 0.57 | $27 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ |
| Other | 0.32 | $15 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ |

2.14

TA - Table 11.11 B1 office trip rates


* adjusted figure represents walking and cycling by journey purpose (i.e. bus and rail journeys to work removed)



## Appendix K

TRICS® data

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 01-RETAIL
Category : K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL VEHICLES
```


## Selected regions and areas:

## 03 SOUTH WEST

GS GLOUCESTERSHIRE
1 days
This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 8687 to 8687 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 2575 to 16150 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: 01/01/12 to 15/07/17
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:
Thursday 1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
No Sub Category
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
A1
1 days

This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

Population within 500m Range:
All Surveys Included

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
10,001 to 15,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
25,001 to 50,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:
1.1 to $1.5 \quad 1$ days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

Petrol filling station:
Included in the survey count 0 days
Excluded from count or no filling station 1 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that include petrol filling station activity, and the number of surveys that do not.

Travel Plan:
No 1 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

## PTAL Rating:

No PTAL Present 1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 GS-01-K-02 RETAI L PARK EASTERN AVENUE GLOUCESTER BARNWOOD Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area: Survey date: THURSDAY 28/11/13

## GLOUCESTERSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.150 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 | 1 | 8687 | 0.185 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.472 | 1 | 8687 | 0.345 | 1 | 8687 | 0.817 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.495 | 1 | 8687 | 0.414 | 1 | 8687 | 0.909 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.345 | 1 | 8687 | 0.368 | 1 | 8687 | 0.713 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 | 1 | 8687 | 0.530 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.207 | 1 | 8687 | 0.207 | 1 | 8687 | 0.414 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.184 | 1 | 8687 | 0.184 | 1 | 8687 | 0.368 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 1.001 | 1 | 8687 | 1.036 | 1 | 8687 | 2.037 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.909 | 1 | 8687 | 1.048 | 1 | 8687 | 1.957 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.138 | 1 | 8687 | 0.127 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.173 | 1 | 8687 | 0.254 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.092 | 1 | 8687 | 0.161 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 4.374 |  |  | 4.317 |  |  | 8.691 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected: Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

8687-8687 (units: sqm)
01/01/12-15/07/17
1
0
0
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL OGVS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.024 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.150 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.128 |  |  | 0.140 |  |  | 0.268 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip <br> Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.070 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.046 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.127 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.196 |  |  | 0.140 |  |  | 0.336 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL VEHICLE OCCUPANTS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

Land Use : 03-RESIDENTIAL
Category : C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

## 01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KN | KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Secondary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Number of dwellings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Range: | 294 to 472 (units: ) |  |
| Range Selected by User: | 204 to 613 (units: ) |  |
| Public Transport Provision: |  |  |
| Selection by: |  | Include all surveys |
| Date Range: 01/0 | 09 to 30/11/16 |  |

This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Selected survey days: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday | 1 days |
| Wednesday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre
1
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone 1
Residential Zone 1
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
C3 2 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
25,001 to 50,000
1 days
50,001 to 100,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 2 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.

## Car ownership within 5 miles:

0.6 to $1.0 \quad 2$ days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

## Travel Plan:

$\frac{\text { Trave }}{\text { No }}$
2 days

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

| PTAL Rating: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Very Good | 1 days |
| 6a Excellent | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 BT-03-C-02 BLOCKS OF FLATS ENGINEERS WAY

WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 472
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 30/11/16
2
2 KN-03-C-02 BLOCK OF FLATS
BECKFORD CLOSE
SOUTH KENSINGTON
Edge of Town Centre
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings:
Survey date: TUESDAY

## BRENT

Survey Type: MANUAL
KENSI NGTON AND CHELSEA

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:

```
294-472 (units:)
```

Survey date date range: 01/01/09-30/11/16
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
0
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS $®$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL OGVS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.002 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.002 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.002 |  |  | 0.002 |  |  | 0.004 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays: 0

Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  |  | ARRIVALS |  |  | EPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.012 | 2 | 383 | 0.031 | 2 | 383 | 0.043 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.117 | 2 | 383 | 0.142 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.033 | 2 | 383 | 0.038 | 2 | 383 | 0.071 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.062 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.054 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.020 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.038 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.073 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.059 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.064 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.031 | 2 | 383 | 0.023 | 2 | 383 | 0.054 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.107 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.059 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.096 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.074 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.065 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: | 0.475 |  |  | 0.546 |  |  | 1.021 |  |  |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [ No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRI ANS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { Days } \end{aligned}$ | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.034 | 2 | 383 | 0.065 | 2 | 383 | 0.099 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.034 | 2 | 383 | 0.141 | 2 | 383 | 0.175 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.043 | 2 | 383 | 0.078 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.051 | 2 | 383 | 0.078 | 2 | 383 | 0.129 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.106 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 | 2 | 383 | 0.163 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.077 | 2 | 383 | 0.055 | 2 | 383 | 0.132 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.060 | 2 | 383 | 0.094 | 2 | 383 | 0.154 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.082 | 2 | 383 | 0.154 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.087 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.159 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.114 | 2 | 383 | 0.070 | 2 | 383 | 0.184 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.085 | 2 | 383 | 0.074 | 2 | 383 | 0.159 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.061 | 2 | 383 | 0.027 | 2 | 383 | 0.088 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.076 | 2 | 383 | 0.023 | 2 | 383 | 0.099 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.087 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.949 |  |  | 0.911 |  |  | 1.860 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09-30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09-30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

Land Use $\quad: \quad 02$ - EMPLOYMENT
Category $\quad$ A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

## 01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CI | CITY OF LONDON | 1 days |
| WH | WANDSWORTH | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 920 to 1951 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 408 to 2000 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $03 / 06 / 15$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Wednesday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thursday | 1 days |
| Friday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 3 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Town Centre 2
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Commercial Zone 1
Development Zone 1
Built-Up Zone 1
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

$\frac{\text { Use Class: }}{\text { B1 }}$
3 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS $®$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:

| 10,001 to 15,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 50,001 to 100,000 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:

| 250,001 to 500,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 500,001 or More | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.5 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.6 to 1.0 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

| Travel Plan: | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes | 2 days |

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

```
4 Good
    1 days
5 Very Good
1 days
6a Excellent 1 days
```

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 BT-02-A-03
OFFICES

## BRENT

EMPIRE WAY
WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area:
920 sqm Survey date: WEDNESDAY 03/06/15
2 Cl -02-A-03 OFFICES
MONUMENT STREET
CITY OF LONDON

## MONUMENT

Town Centre
Commercial Zone
Total Gross floor area: 1951 sqm
Survey date: FRIDAY 29/11/13
3
WH-02-A-02 OFFICES
BATTERSEA PARK ROAD BATTERSEA

Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: 1215 sqm Survey date: THURSDAY $10 / 05 / 12$ Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLES
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.341 |  |  | 1.267 |  |  | 2.608 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
920-1951 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range: 01/01/12-03/06/15
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
3
Number of Saturdays:
0
Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE <br> MULTI -MODAL CYCLI STS Calculation factor: 100 sqm BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.267 |  |  | 0.268 |  |  | 0.535 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.391 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.659 |  |  | 1.537 |  |  | 3.196 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.342 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 | 3 | 1362 | 0.906 | 3 | 1362 | 1.420 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.906 | 3 | 1362 | 1.101 | 3 | 1362 | 2.007 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 | 3 | 1362 | 0.661 | 3 | 1362 | 1.273 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.905 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 | 3 | 1362 | 0.392 | 3 | 1362 | 1.028 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.734 | 3 | 1362 | 1.077 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 | 3 | 1362 | 0.661 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.416 | 3 | 1362 | 0.538 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.342 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 6.925 |  |  | 6.778 |  |  | 13.703 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02-EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.294 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.294 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.244 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.367 | 3 | 1362 | 0.367 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.883 |  |  | 1.833 |  |  | 3.716 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane
Bristol
Licence No: 337901

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.979 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.979 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.587 | 3 | 1362 | 0.587 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.694 |  |  | 3.643 |  |  | 7.337 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 06-HOTEL, FOOD & DRINK
```

Category : B-RESTAURANTS

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LB | LAMBETH | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS® sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 150 to 194 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 150 to 341 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision: Selection by:

Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $24 / 06 / 19$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:
Monday
2 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre 1
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone
1
No Sub Category
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
A3 2 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
50,001 to 100,000 1 days

100,001 or More
1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 2 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:
0.6 to 1.0
2 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

| Travel Plan: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes | 1 days |
| No | 1 days |

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

| 5 Very Good | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 b$ (High) Excellent | 1 days |

1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 BT-06-B-01
COFFEE SHOP \& RESTAURANT

## BRENT

EMPIRE WAY
WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone

| Total Gross floor area: | 150 sqm |
| :---: | :--- |
| Survey date: MONDAY | $18 / 05 / 15$ |

2 LB-06-B-01
PORTUGUESE RESTAURANT
STOCKWELL ROAD
STOCKWELL
Edge of Town Centre
No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area:
Survey date: MONDAY $24 / 06 / 19 \quad$ Survey Type: MANUAL
This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 11.849 |  |  | 11.046 |  |  | 22.895 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

150-194 (units: sqm
01/01/12 - 24/06/19
2
0
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.031 |  |  | 0.582 |  |  | 1.613 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.454 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.454 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 3.198 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 5.233 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 | 2 | 172 | 9.302 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 5.523 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 | 2 | 172 | 9.011 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 | 2 | 172 | 4.651 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.034 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 22.543 |  |  | 20.057 |  |  | 42.600 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 1.546 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.546 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 2.577 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.906 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.906 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 3.198 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 5.233 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 3.779 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 5.232 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 3.779 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 26.993 |  |  | 26.770 |  |  | 53.763 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAI L PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.290 |  |  | 3.712 |  |  | 7.002 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL Underground Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.290 |  |  | 3.712 |  |  | 7.002 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL Bus Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.326 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 9.909 |  |  | 10.398 |  |  | 20.307 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 07-LEISURE
Category : K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
```


## Selected regions and areas:

01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HG | HARINGEY | 1 days |
| IS | ISLINGTON | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 1225 to 1750 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 204 to 4057 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $28 / 06 / 16$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Tuesday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wednesday | 1 days |
| Thursday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 3 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre
2
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone 1

Built-Up Zone 2
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
3 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:

50,001 to 100,000
2 days
100,001 or More

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 3 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.5 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.6 to 1.0 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

## Travel Plan:

Yes 1 days

No
2 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

| 6 a Excellent | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 b (High) Excellent | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

## EMPIRE WAY

WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area:
2
HG-07-K-02
LORDSHIP LANE
WOOD GREEN
Edge of Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area:

3 IS-07-K-02 GOSWELL ROAD ANGEL

Edge of Town Centre Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: Survey date: TUESDAY

1750 sqm

NEDNESDAY $\begin{array}{lr}\text { Survey date: THURSDAY } & 18 / 09 / 14\end{array}$ THE GYM

1750 sqm 03/06/15
THE GYM e

## BRENT

都

Survey Type: MANUAL HARI NGEY

Survey Type: MANUAL

## ISLINGTON

Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 1.449 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 | 3 | 1472 | 1.495 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.453 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.951 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 | 3 | 1472 | 0.951 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.883 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.815 | 3 | 1472 | 0.294 | 3 | 1472 | 1.109 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.155 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 2.242 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.065 | 3 | 1472 | 1.223 | 3 | 1472 | 2.288 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.725 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 | 3 | 1472 | 1.835 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 | 3 | 1472 | 0.996 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 9.873 |  |  | 10.077 |  |  | 19.950 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

1225-1750 (units: sqm)
01/01/12-28/06/16
3
1
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.045 | 3 | 1472 | 0.158 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.226 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.091 | 3 | 1472 | 0.023 | 3 | 1472 | 0.114 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.045 | 3 | 1472 | 0.158 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.091 | 3 | 1472 | 0.318 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.386 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.363 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 2.379 |  |  | 2.380 |  |  | 4.759 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.294 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.295 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.997 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.997 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 1.427 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.744 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 | 3 | 1472 | 2.718 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 1.178 | 3 | 1472 | 1.948 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.838 | 3 | 1472 | 1.359 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 7.363 |  |  | 6.749 |  |  | 14.112 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL Bus Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.589 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 0.680 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.861 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.929 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 1.427 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 | 3 | 1472 | 1.472 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 | 3 | 1472 | 1.517 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.201 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.453 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 1.019 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.725 | 3 | 1472 | 0.680 | 3 | 1472 | 1.405 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.359 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 | 3 | 1472 | 2.061 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.857 | 3 | 1472 | 1.065 | 3 | 1472 | 2.922 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.336 | 3 | 1472 | 1.518 | 3 | 1472 | 2.854 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.906 | 3 | 1472 | 2.265 | 3 | 1472 | 3.171 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 1.495 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 12.458 |  |  | 12.300 |  |  | 24.758 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## Appendix L

Census journey to work review

## QS701EW - Method of travel to work

ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 9 December 2020]
population All usual residents aged 16 to 74
units Persons
area type 2011 wards
area name E05000045 : Childs Hill
rural urban Total
Method of Travel to Work 2011

| All categories: Method of travel to work | 14,850 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Work mainly at or from home | 836 |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 2,926 |
| Train | 606 |
| Bus, minibus or coach | 1,837 |
| Taxi | 36 |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped | 117 |
| Driving a car or van | 2,304 |
| Passenger in a car or van | 157 |
| Bicycle | 247 |
| On foot | 535 |
| Other method of travel to work | 98 |
| Not in employment | 5,151 |

In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.

Used the orange cells data

| Mode Share |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle | Car Pass' | Walk | Cycle | Bus | Rail |
| 41\% | 3\% | 9\% | 4\% | 32\% | 11\% |


| Mode Share (adjusted to better represent development) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle | Car Pass' | Walk | Cycle | Bus | Rail |
| $14 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

Mode Share


# Appendix M <br> Link flow diagrams 

















| From: | Griffiths, Carl |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 09 April 2021 09:37 |
| To: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| Subject: | RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, |
|  | Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)) |

Hi Devinda

Is Melvyn the TFL officer looking at this one? If so, please could you give him a heads up on the revised TA and liaise as necessary.

Thanks

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-plonning, right through to completion.

02083594500
building,controlebarnet.gov,uk


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

My anxiety
levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying

From: Griffiths, Carl
Sent: 08 April 2021 11:06
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hi Devinda

FYI please see attached which I will also upload to the website now

Thanks

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
差 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-ltd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## RE

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


02083594500

building.controlebornet.gov.uk


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for

can cost you everything

For more information go to:
www.barnet.gov.uk/covidcancost
B|A.RIN|ET

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: @iceniprojects.com>
Sent: 08 April 2021 10:55
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hi Carl,
Please find attached the revised TA prepared by Entran, along with an explanatory cover letter for your review.
Are you available tomorrow morning for a quick catch up on matters?
Many thanks,


# Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasqow / London | Manchester 

Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From:

## @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 01 April 2021 09:40
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Thanks Carl,
We will issue the TA later today.


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

[^0]FYI see attached. sorry for delay.

I am still in depths of inquiry but hoping we may conclude tomorrow

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey



Certificate Number 15180-QMS-081 1509001


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 30 March 2021 16:27
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hello Carl - please find attached comments from the LBB Transport team in response to the recent letter that was received from applicant / transport consultant. I note that we are still awaiting the revised Transport Assessment report.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 22 March 2021 16:46
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters

Hi Devinda

FYI see below and attached on $B \& Q$ Cricklewood.

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
差 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying "A siome

# CalD-19 <br> can cost you everything 

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: @iceniprojects.com>
Sent: 16 March 2021 08:16
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com);
Subject: Cricklewood - Transport Letters

Morning Carl,
As discussed briefly yesterday Entran have completed the revised TA and are just finalising the appendices. In the meantime, we wanted to share the accompanying letters for your review.

The first (L4) is a cover letter for the revised TA. This is necessary because the response to the LBB comments is a mixture of new work, further clarification and rebuttals. These are set out in the letter in order to keep the revised TA as 'clean' as possible. The second letter (L5) is a response to the Tepbrook letter, this isn't for public view, at this stage. We'll be issuing a combined response to Tepbrook this week.

Please could you advise on timescales for re-consultation once the TA is registered along with the updated parameter plan?

Many thanks,


Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog
Iceni Projects will be supporting the LandAid SleepOut on 11 March.
Click here to offer your support in ending youth homelessness. Thank you.
$\square$

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

Carter, Richard

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 09 April 2021 10:00 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, |
|  | Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)) |

Carl - I haven't seen this, not sure why not. But if it's not too late l'll review and get back to you.
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 09:44
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Just checking if you have seen this or not? Peter advised this was sent at the end of December

Thanks

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
差 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


> My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for


# can cost you 

 everythingConsider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 09:41
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

G'day Carl - no worries I will do (not sure he was the officer but will make sure it gets to the correct officer). Also, let me know if you have the transport response re Finchley Hospital, if not I will get it from the consultant directly? Thanks

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
$A$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 09:37
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Is Melvyn the TFL officer looking at this one? If so, please could you give him a heads up on the revised TA and liaise as necessary.

Thanks

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

[^1]We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Griffiths, Carl
Sent: 08 April 2021 11:06
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hi Devinda

FYI please see attached which I will also upload to the website now

Thanks

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.qov.uk
s. please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-ltd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey



Re

From:
@iceniprojects.com>
Sent: 08 April 2021 10:55
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hi Carl,
Please find attached the revised TA prepared by Entran, along with an explanatory cover letter for your review.
Are you available tomorrow morning for a quick catch up on matters?
Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

```
The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
```



```
Sent: 01 April 2021 09:40
To: Griffiths, Carl <Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))
Thanks Carl,
```

We will issue the TA later today.


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 30 March 2021 16:33
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

FYI see attached. sorry for delay.

I am still in depths of inquiry but hoping we may conclude tomorrow

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
麦 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet
Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.

- 02083594500


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying "A siome

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 30 March 2021 16:27
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hello Carl - please find attached comments from the LBB Transport team in response to the recent letter that was received from applicant / transport consultant. I note that we are still awaiting the revised Transport Assessment report.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
$\Rightarrow$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 22 March 2021 16:46
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters

Hi Devinda

FYI see below and attached on B\&Q Cricklewood.

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
 Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

## From @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 16 March 2021 08:16
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); $\square$ @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: Cricklewood - Transport Letters
Morning Carl,
As discussed briefly yesterday Entran have completed the revised TA and are just finalising the appendices. In the meantime, we wanted to share the accompanying letters for your review.

The first (L4) is a cover letter for the revised TA. This is necessary because the response to the LBB comments is a mixture of new work, further clarification and rebuttals. These are set out in the letter in order to keep the revised TA as 'clean' as possible. The second letter (L5) is a response to the Tepbrook letter, this isn't for public view, at this stage. We'll be issuing a combined response to Tepbrook this week.

Please could you advise on timescales for re-consultation once the TA is registered along with the updated parameter plan?

Many thanks,


Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

Iceni Projects will be supporting the LandAid SleepOut on 11 March.
Click here to offer your support in ending youth homelessness. Thank you.
$\square$

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

From:


Sent:
09 April 2021 10:29
To:
Griffiths, Carl
Cc:
John Mumby; $\qquad$
Subject: Cricklewood (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

Hi Carl,
Thanks for your time this morning. It was helpful to regroup on things. I know John has been trying to get in touch separately - what's the best number for him to speak to you on today?

Many thanks,


## iceni

Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

[^2]$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-ltd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survev


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

| From: | Griffiths, Carl |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 09 April 2021 10:57 |
| To: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| Subject: | RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

Thanks. Don't know why I thought it was Mervyn.

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
s. please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survev


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 10:52
To: Pak-Lim Wong [PakLim.Wong@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:PakLim.Wong@tfl.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Pak-Lim - please find attached revised TA report in relation to the above application for your review and comment (this should also be available for download from our Planning Portal). I believe this application is likely to be heard at Committee next month so your timely comments would be appreciated. Thanks.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Dresner Melvyn (ST) [Melvyn.Dresner@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:Melvyn.Dresner@tfl.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 10:35
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Pak-Lim Wong [PakLim.Wong@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:PakLim.Wong@tfl.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi Devinda,

Pak-Lim is the case officer.

Regards
Melvyn

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 April 2021 09:50
To: Dresner Melvyn (ST) [Melvyn.Dresner@tfl.gov.uk](mailto:Melvyn.Dresner@tfl.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

G'day Melvyn - Hope you're well. Just a quick question are you the officer dealing with the above application? We have received the latest / revised TA from the applicant and I wanted to give a heads up and forward the document to the correct TfL officer. Thanks.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

The contents of this e-mail and any attached files are confidential. If you have received this email in error, please notify us immediately at postmaster@tfl.gov.uk and remove it from your system. If received in error, please do not use, disseminate, forward, print or copy this email or its content. Transport for London excludes any warranty and any liability as to the quality or accuracy of the contents of this email and any attached files.

Transport for London is a statutory corporation whose principal office is at 5 Endeavour Square, London, E20 1JN. Further information about Transport for London's subsidiary companies can be found on the following link: http://www.tfl.gov.uk/corporate/about-tfl/

Although TfL have scanned this email (including attachments) for viruses, recipients are advised to carry out their own virus check before opening any attachments, as TfL accepts no liability for any loss, or damage which may be caused by viruses.

From:

Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

|  | @iceniprojects.com> |
| :--- | :--- |
| 15 April 2021 10:24 |  |
| Martin Jones |  |
| Griffiths, Carl; John Mumby; |  |
| RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response |  |

Hi Martin,
I hope you're well.
We wanted to provide a quick update on the B\&Q Cricklewood scheme and share the accompanying documents which respond to a number of the matters raised within the GLA stage 1 response. Additional documents for your review include:

- Updated Development Heights - Parameter Plan (10965-EPR-XX-XX-DR-A-TP-0106) presenting AOD height variations within each parcel;
- Fire safety strategy - demonstrating compliance with relevant Building Regulations;
- Urban Greening Factor calculations (prepared by exterior Architects) demonstrating a factor of 0.41;
- Updated Transport Assessment (prepared by Entran) responding to LBB and TFL comments. This has also been issued to LBB;
- Energy Memo response and completed early stage overheating tool form (prepared by Meinhardt).

Thank you for sharing the initial GLA comments regarding the financial viability assessment. As you will likely be aware, viability negotiations have been ongoing with LBB, but we should have a further update for you over the next week.

Do let me know if you have any questions.
Many thanks,


## iceni

Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

[^3]From: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Sent: 16 February 2021 13:47
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hello - further to my message below, please find attached our viability comments.

Kind regards
Martin

## Martin Jones

Principal Strategic Planner, Planning
GreaterLondonAuthority
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
07712545818
london.gov.uk
martin.jones@london.gov.uk
$\underline{\text { Register here to be notified of planning policy consultations or sign up for GLA Planning News }}$

Follow us on Twitter @LDN planning

From: Martin Jones
Sent: 03 February 2021 08:49
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi - hope you're well.

I just wanted to check on timescales for a response to the Stage 1 report - some of the issues raised can take a while to resolve (e.g. climate change matters).

Thanks
Martin

## Martin Jones

## Principal Strategic Planner, Planning

GreaterLondonAuthority
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
07712545818
london.gov.uk
martin.jones@london.gov.uk

Register here to be notified of planning policy consultations or sign up for GLA Planning News

Follow us on Twitter @LDN planning

From:
Sent: 05 November 2020 15:40
To: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Cc: @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com); Griffiths, Carl
[Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi Martin,
I hope you are well. I just wanted to let you know that I'm away early next week, as result please could I ask you to cc in my colleagues and John Mumby to the $9^{\text {th }}$ November stage 1 response.

Many thanks,


Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog


Read our latest Year Book. Available online here.

[^4]Sent: 29 October 2020 11:51
To: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Cc: @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); Griffiths, Carl
[Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi Martin,
Thanks for confirming and for the update on timings. Just to clarify has the meeting with the Mayor been pushed back, or is the $9^{\text {th }}$ November the anticipated date for the response?

Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

$\square$
Read our latest Year Book. Available online here.

[^5]From: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Sent: 29 October 2020 08:22

```
To:
    iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby <imumby@iceniprojects.com>; Griffiths, Carl
<Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: B&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
```

Hi

Yes we have what we need on viability, thanks. The Stage 1 has been delayed by a week to 9 Nov as TfL comments were delayed - apologies about that. Climate change/environmental comments are attached (we only include a summary in the Stage 1).

Thanks
Martin

## Martin Jones

Principal Strategic Planner, Planning
GreaterLondonAuthority
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
07712545818
london.gov.uk
martin.jones@london.gov.uk

Register here to be notified of planning policy consultations or sign up for GLA Planning News

Follow us on Twitter @LDN planning

## From <br> @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 28 October 2020 16:33
To: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Cc: Viability Fees [ViabilityFees@london.gov.uk](mailto:ViabilityFees@london.gov.uk); @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby
[jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com); Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi Martin,
I just wanted to follow up on this and ensure you have everything you need re. viability? Please can you confirm when we can expect the stage 1 response to be issued and if this will be fully informed by TFL comments?

Many thanks,


Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog


## Read our latest Year Book. Available online here.

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From:
Sent: 20 October 2020 17:17
To: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Cc: Viability Fees [ViabilityFees@london.gov.uk](mailto:ViabilityFees@london.gov.uk); @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby
[imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi Martin,
Thank you for providing an update. Would you be able to provide any feedback on the scheme in advance of your stage 1 report being issued?

In terms of viability matters, please do proceed with the review of the FVA. I've attached a completed copy of the GLA viability payment form.

If you have any further questions, do let me know.
Many thanks,



Find Us: Edinburgh Glasqow / London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

To subscribe to news updates from Iceni Projects, click here.
$\square$
Winner: Award for Planning Consultancy of the Year
Winner: Award for Best Use of Arts, Culture of Sport in Placemaking (Illuminated River)
Winner: Planning Permission of the Year (Leven Road Gasworks, St William)

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Sent: 15 October 2020 07:52
To:
@iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hi further to the message below, I have now found a full version of the DAS.

Also, as it stands, our viability team are likely to review the FVA, with the charge as indicated in our pre-application report. Could you send me a copy of the FVA (we only have the summary). Can you also confirm if it's on the Council's website, as I can't see it.

Thanks
Martin

From: Martin Jones
Sent: 13 October 2020 16:17
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Sorry , I meant to ask if you could send me a link to the DAS as a single document.
Many thanks
Martin

From: Martin Jones
Sent: 13 October 2020 16:15
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Cc: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com); @iceniprojects.com>; Griffiths, Carl
[Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
Hello - I hope to take it to the Mayor on 2 November.

Kind regards
Martin

## Martin Jones

Principal Strategic Planner, Planning
GreaterLondonAuthority
City Hall, The Queen's Walk, London SE1 2AA
07712545818
london.gov.uk

Register here to be notified of planning policy consultations or sign up for GLA Planning News

Follow us on Twitter @LDN planning

## From: @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 13 October 2020 09:38
To: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); @iceniprojects.com>; Griffiths, Carl
[Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response

Hi Martin,
I hope you are well.
I understand that you have been assigned the B\&Q Cricklewood application. I'm the planning agent working on behalf of Montreaux, and I just wanted to check in with you regarding timings for the GLA stage one response following the submission in late July 2020.

Do let me know if you have any questions on the scheme.
Many thanks,




Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog
To subscribe to news updates from Iceni Projects, click here.


Winner: Award for Planning Consultancy of the Year
Winner: Award for Best Use of Arts, Culture of Sport in Placemaking (Illuminated River)
Winner: Planning Permission of the Year (Leven Road Gasworks, St William)

[^6]
# NHS health information and advice about coronavirus can be found at nhs.uk/coronavirus <br> The Mayor and the GLA stand against racism. Black Lives Matter. 

## GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/

NHS health information and advice about coronavirus can be found at nhs.uk/coronavirus
The Mayor and the GLA stand against racism. Black Lives Matter.

## GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see
https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/

NHS health information and advice about coronavirus can be found at nhs.uk/coronavirus
The Mayor and the GLA stand against racism. Black Lives Matter.

## GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/

NHS health information and advice about coronavirus can be found at nhs.uk/coronavirus
The Mayor and the GLA stand against racism. Black Lives Matter.

## GREATER LONDON AUTHORITY NOTICE:

The information in this email may contain confidential or privileged materials. For more information see
https://www.london.gov.uk/about-us/email-notice/

## GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY

## Energy Memo: GLA Consultation

## Case details

Date of first review:
Case Name:
Case Number:
Case Officer:
London Borough:
Application Type
(Outline/Hybrid/Detailed):
Applicant:
Energy Consultant:
Document Title:
Document Date:

23/10/2020<br>B\&Q Cricklewood<br>2020/6538<br>Martin Jones<br>Barnet<br>Outline<br>Montreaux Limited<br>Meinhardt<br>Outline Energy Assessment<br>29/07/2020

## Development proposals - outline <br> Use <br> Floorspace/Number of units

Residential
Flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Classes A3/B1/D1 and D2)

## GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY

Comments sent to GLA case officer 25/11/2019

The updated GLA Energy Assessment Guidance provides details on the information that should be provided within the energy assessment to be submitted at stage 1. See link for the latest guidance published in October 2018: https://www.london.gov.uk/what-we-do/planning/planning-applications-and-decisions/pre-planning-application-meeting-service-0

The following targets are in effect for all Stage 1 schemes received by the Mayor as set out in the guidance:

Residential - Net zero carbon with at least an on-site $35 \%$ reduction in carbon emissions beyond Part L of 2013 Building Regulations.

Non-residential - $35 \%$ reduction in carbon emissions beyond Part L of 2013 Building Regulations. The zero carbon target will apply to non-domestic developments when the new London Plan is adopted (expected in late 2019).

The carbon emission figures should be reported against a Part L 2013 baseline. Carbon emissions for domestic and non-domestic elements of the development should be presented separately.

From January 2019, and until central Government updates Part L with the latest carbon emission factors, applicants are encouraged to use the SAP 10 emission factors for referable applications when estimating $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission performance against London Plan policies. A spreadsheet has been provided for this purpose and the applicant should submit this alongside their application. Applicants will still need to provide an assessment of $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ performance using SAP 2012 emission factors to enable a comparison to be made. Applicants proposing to only use SAP 2012 emission factors will need to provide a justification for this.

## Be Lean Demand Reduction

The applicant should commit to meeting Part L 2013 by efficiency measures alone as a minimum for both domestic and nondomestic elements separately. Applicants should note the new draft London Plan Energy Efficiency targets which set out the GLA's expectation for levels of improvement achievable for new developments:

Residential - 10\% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations from energy efficiency

Non-residential - 15\% improvement on 2013 Building Regulations from energy efficiency

Sample SAP full calculation worksheets (both DER and TER sheets) and BRUKL sheets including efficiency measures alone should be provided to support the savings claimed.

Information on the development's total energy demand (MWh/year) for each building use and the total Part L Fabric Energy Efficiency Standard (FEES) should be reported.

## Cooling and Overheating

The domestic overheating checklist, included in the Energy Assessment Guidance, should be completed at pre-application stage and used to identify potential overheating risk and passive responses early in the design process.

Evidence should be provided on how the demand for cooling and the overheating risk will be minimised through passive design in line with the Cooling Hierarchy. Dynamic overheating modelling in line with CIBSE Guidance is recommended (TM59 and TM49 for residential and TM52 and TM49 for non-residential).

The area weighted average ( $\mathrm{MJ} / \mathrm{m}^{2}$ ) and total ( $\mathrm{MJ} /$ year) cooling demand for the actual and notional building should be provided and the applicant should demonstrate that the actual building's cooling demand is lower than the notional.

## Be Clean Heating Infrastructure

The applicant should investigate opportunities for connection to nearby existing or planned district heating (DH) networks. Evidence of communication with the relevant parties (i.e. stakeholders, local authority energy officers) should be provided.

The site should be served by a single energy centre and the applicant should commit to providing a site wide heating network where all buildings/uses on site will be connected; relevant drawings/schematics for the energy centre and the site-wide network should be provided.

The applicant should provide information confirming that the development is future proofed for connection to wider district networks now or in the future.

It should be noted that gas-engine CHP is not supported for small/medium developments.

## Be Green Renewable Energy

The GLA expects all major development proposals to maximise on-site renewable energy generation. This is regardless of whether the $35 \%$ on-site target has already been met through earlier stages of the energy hierarchy.

Solar PV should be maximised. A plan showing the proposed location of the installation should be provided and the applicant should demonstrate that the roof's potential has been maximised for the installation.

- Centralised heat pumps are being proposed in the form of a ASHP. Further information on the heat pumps should be provided including:
o The heat pump's total capacity (kWth).
o An estimate of the heating and/or cooling energy (MWh/annum) the heat pumps would provide to the development and the percentage of contribution to the site's heat loads
o Details of how the Seasonal Coefficient of Performance (SCOP) and Seasonal Energy Efficiency ratio (SEER) has been calculated for the energy modelling. This should be based on a dynamic calculation of the system boundaries over the course of a year i.e. incorporating variations in source temperatures and the design sink temperatures (for space heat and hot water).
o Manufacturer datasheets showing performance under test conditions for the specific source and sink temperatures of the proposed development and assumptions for hours spent under changing source temperatures. Whether any additional technology is required for hot water top up and how this has been incorporated into the energy modelling assumptions.
o An estimate of the expected heating costs to occupants, demonstrating that the costs have been minimised through energy efficient design.
o The expected heat source temperature and the heat distribution system temperature with an explanation of how the difference will be minimised to ensure the system runs efficiently.
o A commitment to monitor the performance of the heat pump system post-construction to ensure it is achieving the expected performance approved during planning.


## Carbon Offsetting

Applicants are expected to maximise carbon emission reductions on-site. Where it is clearly demonstrated that no further carbon savings can be achieved but the site still falls short of the carbon reduction targets, applicants are required to make a cash-in-lieu contribution to the relevant boroughs' carbon offset fund using the boroughs' carbon offset price.

Energy strategies should provide a calculation of the shortfall in carbon emissions and evidence of discussions with the borough agreeing the offsetting approach.

## Monitoring

The energy strategy should include information on how the building's energy performance will be monitored post-construction to enable occupants to monitor and reduce their energy use.

GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY

|  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Comment | GLA Stage I | Applicant's Stage I response | GLA Post Stage I response |
| No. | Date: $23 / 10 / 20$ | Date: |  |
| General compliance $04 / 11 / 20$ |  |  |  |

The energy strategy is generally compliant with
the London Plan policies however, the applicant is
required to submit the additional information,
which has been requested below.
For the purposes of this assessment, the applicant
will be estimating the $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission performance against London Plan policies using the SAP 10 emissions factors. This is supported.
Be Lean
Based on the information provided, the domestic
element of the proposed development is
estimated to achieve a reduction of 185 tonnes
per annum $(10 \%)$ in regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions
compared to a 2013 Building Regulations
compliant development.
The applicant should be conditioned for reserved
matters applications to demonstrate a minimum
$10 \%$ domestic Be Lean reduction in regulated
CO2 emissions compared to a 2013 Building
Regulations compliant development.

Based on the information provided, the non-
domestic element of the proposed developmen
is estimated to achieve a reduction of 65 tonne
per annum ( $15 \%$ ) in regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emission
compared to a 2013 Building Regulations
4 compliant development
The applicant should be conditioned for reserved
matters applications to demonstrate a minimum
$15 \%$ non-domestic Be Lean reduction in regulated
CO2 emissions compared to a 2013 Building
Regulations compliant development.

The applicant should be conditioned for reserved matters applications to submit information to demonstrate they have considered and minimised the estimated energy costs to occupants and
5 outline how they are committed to protecting the consumer from high prices. This should cover the parameters set out in the guidance and include a confirmation of the quality assurance mechanisms
that will be considered as part of the strategy

## Overheating

The applicant has provided a commitment to undertake CIBSE TM59 overheating modelling for
the reserved matters applications. They should be conditioned to undertake as part of the reserved matters application a Dynamic Overheating
6 Analysis to assess the overheating risk. This should follow the CIBSE TM59 methodology for the London Design Summer Year 1 (DSY1) weather file: 2020s, High emission, $50 \%$ percentile scenario. The applicant should also investigate the risk of overheating using the DSY 2 \& 3 weather files

At the current stage the applicant should complete
and submit the Good Homes Alliance Early
Stage Overheating Risk Tool.
They have submitted the GLA checklist which is welcomed, but they should also submit the GHA 7 checklist.

They have also outlined measures in response to the cooling hierarchy. They propose to explore a suitable glazing ratio; excessive glazing should be avoided. They propose to investigate the use of external shading; this would be welcomed

The applicant has suggested that cooling may be appropriate for the commercial units, and communal residents spaces (where provided). They should be conditioned to demonstrate that any active cooling provision is lower than the notional in (MJ/m2). They should be conditioned undertake as part of the reserved matters application a Dynamic Overheating Analysis to assess the overheating risk for any naturally ventilated non-domestic spaces. This should
follow the CIBSE TM52 methodology for the dign Summer Year 1 (DSY1) weather file: 2020 s, High emission, $50 \%$ percentile scenario. The applicant should also investigate the risk of overheating using the DSY 2 \& 3 weather files.

As part fo the above, the applicant should
investigate the potential to catalyse a wider hea
network. They should discuss this with the
developers of other sites coming through in the area that may be able to connect to an area wid network.

The applicant should provide a commitment that the development is designed to allow future
connection to a district heating network.
11 The applicant should be conditioned to
demonstrate, as part of the reserved matters
applications, detail confirming the development is
designed to allow future connection to a district
heating network.
The applicant has confirmed that they propose
energy centre. It has been confirmed that all
apartments and non-domestic building uses will be connected to the heat network.

The applicant undertook a feasibility study of
13 renewable energy technology. and considers PV and ASHPs to be feasible.

The applicant is proposing to install 300 m 2 kWp of Photovoltaic (PV) panels with efficiency of
$16.5 \%$. They are required to maximise renewable energy generation and which includes maximising the area provided and the efficiency of panels provided. This should be addressed in the
reserved matters application.
14 The applicant should be conditioned to submit, as part of the reserved matters applications, a as part of the reserved matters applications, a
detailed roof layout demonstrating that the roof's potential for a PV installation has been potential for a PV installation has been
maximised. The on-site savings from renewable energy technologies should be maximised regardless of the London Plan targets having been met.

Heat pumps are being proposed in the form of a
(centralised hybrid ASHPs system with top-up
gas boilers and thermal storage. They have
suggested that a SCOP of 3.59 could be achieved
and that $60 \%$ of heat will be provided by the
ASHPs. They suggest the ASHPs could be
located mainly on the Block C roof but also on Blocks B1 and B2 as necessary. At the reserved matters stage, the applicant should be conditioned to provide full details of the ASHP proposals including:
a. An estimate of the heating and/or cooling
energy (MWh/annum) the heat pumps would
provide to the development and the percentage of
contribution to the site's heat loads.
P. Details of how the Seasonal Coefficient of
$15 \quad$ Performance (SCOP) and Seasonal Energy the energy modelling. This should be based on a dynamic calculation of the system boundaries over the course of a year i.e. incorporating variations in source temperatures and the design sink temperatures (for space heat and hot water). c. The expected heat source temperature and the
heat distribution system temperature with an
explanation of how the difference will be
minimised to ensure the system runs efficiently. The distribution loss factor should be calculated based on the above information and used for calculation purposes
d. Whether any additional technology is required for top up or during peak loads (e.g. hot water supply) and how this has been incorporated into the energy modelling assumptions.

## Carbon performance and offsetting

The carbon dioxide savings exceed the on-site
16 target set within the London Plan for domestic/non
domestic uses.
The applicant should confirm the carbon shortfal
in tonnes CO2 and the associated carbon offset
payment that will be made to the borough. This
17 should be determined at the reserved matters
stage based on the prevailing methodology at the
time. They should provide correspondence from
the borough confirming the agreed approach.

The applicant will be expected to review the 'Be seen' energy monitoring guidance
o/planning/implementing-london-plan/planning-guidance/be-seen-energy-monitoring-guidance-pre-consultation-draft) early in the design proces to ensure that they are fully aware of the relevant
20 requirements to comply with the 'be seen' policy.
A commitment should be provided that the
development will be designed to enable post
construction monitoring and that the information
set out in the 'be seen' guidance is submitted
he GLA's portal at the appropriate reporting
stages. This will be secured through suitable legal
wording.
Other points
The applicant should be conditioned to submit

21 the energy statements in the reserved matter borough and GLA, and to address the other items

## GREATERLONDONAUTHORITY

Domestic

| SAP 10 | Total residual <br> regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ <br> emissions | Regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions reductions |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | (tonnes per annum) | (tonnes per annum) | (per cent) |
|  | 1848 |  |  |
| Energy Efficiency | 1663 | 185 | $10 \%$ |
| CHP | 1016 | 647 | $35 \%$ |
| Renewable energy | 996 | 20 | $1 \%$ |
| Total |  | 852 | $46 \%$ |

## Non-domestic

| SAP 10 | Total residual <br> regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ <br> emissions | Regulated $\mathrm{CO}_{2}$ emissions reductions |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | (tonnes per annum) | (tonnes per annum) | (per cent) |
| Baseline i.e. 2013 <br> Building Regulations | 435 |  |  |
| Energy Efficiency | 370 | 65 | $15 \%$ |
| CHP | 296 | 74 | $17 \%$ |
| Renewable energy | 296 | 0 | $0 \%$ |
| Total |  | 139 | $32 \%$ |

## Carbon offsetting

|  | Shortfall <br> (tonnes per annum) | Shortfall <br> (£) |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Domestic | 996 |  |
| Non-domestic |  |  |
| Total | 996 | 1792800 |

## Appendix A Bus routes

## Buses from Cricklewood



N16 Night buses in blue
$\theta$ Connections with London Underground
$\geqslant$ Connections with London Overground
0
Red discs show the bus stop you need for your chosen bus service．The disc $\boldsymbol{Q}_{\text {appears on }}$ on the top of the bus stop in the

Route finder
Day buses including 24－hour services

| Bus route | Towards | Bus stops |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | Victoria | ல（1） |
| 32 | Edgware | －ல®®＠O® |
|  | Kilburn Park |  |
| 189 （4） | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | －ல®ツナ（ |
|  | Oxford Circus |  |
| 226 | Ealing Broadway | （1）${ }^{\text {® }}$（ |
|  | Golders Green | 『＠ฺ๑¢ |
| 245 | Alperton | （1）00®9 |
|  | Golders Green | （1）（9） |
| 260 | Golders Green | （1） |
|  | White City | （1）39 |
|  | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | （10） |
|  | Hammersmith | வல®ல（ |
| 316 | White City | ツ®（1） |
| 332 | Neasden | O＠®O®O（1） |
|  | Paddington |  |
| 460 | North Finchley | －（1） |
|  | Willesden | W3\％ |
| CII | Archway | ®（®）ఱ（ |
|  | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | や๑๑๑¢（1） |
| Night buses |  |  |
| Bus route | Towards | Bus stops |
| N16 | Edgware | －30®®®®® |
|  | Victoria | （1）（9）（1） |

# Appendix B <br> Traffic survey data <br> [Excel spreadsheet provided under separate cover] 



# Appendix C <br> Architects' Parameter Plans and <br> Schedule of Accommodation 



## Appendix D

Site access visibility splays



## Appendix E

## Artist's impressions of public realm provision



## B\&Q Cricklewood Lane



New, high-quality links to Cricklewood Lane as part of the Gricklewood Green enhancements

## B\&Q Cricklewood Lane

# Appendix F <br> Pedestrian desire lines 

## K E Y

""-""\#" Primary pedestrian desire lines " $+\|n+\cdots+\|$ Secondary pedestrian desire lines

Controlled crossing points

## Uncontrolled crossing points



Cricklewood Lane

## Appendix G

Refuse collection strategy and swept path analyses


## Cricklewood Lane

Refuse collection strategy review - July 2020


## Appendix H

## Framework Travel Plan <br> [Separate document]



## Appendix I

Healthy Streets Assessment

| Metrics <br> (Click on (i) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') |  | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  |  | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | 1Total volume of two way motorised <br> traffic | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 2 | 2 | Existing = 835 at PM Peak, Proposed = 940 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the motorised traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less } \\ & \text { than } 2 \% \text { of motorised traffic, } 7 \mathrm{am} \text { to } \\ & 7 \mathrm{pm} . \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m . | 0 | 0 | Possibly slight reduction as a result of the B\&Q closure but not enough to increase score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Trafic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are eweer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $($ l. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | See Metric 1. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large venicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehides is less than } \\ & \text { 5\%/(c.to to }+308 \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is 5 to $10 \%$ (c. +3 to +5 DB ). | The eroportion of large velicices is greater than (c. $\mathrm{c}+50 \mathrm{DB}$ and over). | - | 1 | 1 | Possible reduction in large vehicle traffic could increase score to 2 but keeping 1 to be conservative | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | NO2 concentration (from London <br> Atmoshheric Emisision Inventory) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. |  |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No proposeded change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ducing private car use (1) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic vehicles. | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | $\square^{-}$ | 1 | 2 | Closure of B\&Q car park introduces some level of motor vehicle restriction | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Complor (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. or Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropeed kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | Proposed scheme does not include changes to the Southern side of the road where the side roads are | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Mid-link crosings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by lcrosingsthat are sitale some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away <br> from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Technologyto optimise efficiency y movement (pedestritins. coclists, buses and general motor trafic) (i) | All appropriate detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic techno signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technolog applied to traficis Signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 3 | 3 | ${ }^{\text {No proposed change. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for crcling (i) | Where cycles are separated from othe traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more. | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 1.5m to 2.2m (one-way) or 2.5 m to 3.5 m (two-way). (Otherwise: with of the eerside general trafic lane (inhere there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycl alane pusadidaent general traffic lane is between 4 m and 4.5 m . | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | act of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 1 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole cucling surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | Lighting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (isison of cycle parking (i) | Cyandards parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | Cycle parking to be included with improvements to Cricklewood Grn? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | Street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |



Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your not be possible, if so ustify your
$\qquad$

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \text { Layout } \\ \text { lay } \end{array}\right.$ | $\int_{\text {Proposed }}^{\text {Playout }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toon noisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

If 0 ' ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:
If 0 'scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
n overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
is not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be pel The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. $A$ proposed scheme should also aim to deliver a score increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a treet is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ incr
will delivera a $10 \%$ uplift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets Check are the best avilable
quantifiaibe and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Heathy Streets indicators are e inked to only
a few metricse.g. shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 31 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to
the whole environment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Metrics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. II it not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug

## hy you cannot get a perfect score

a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise Tomoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent mising the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check aims to hightight bese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing <br> layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | People feel safe | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | People feel relaxed | Clean Air |
|  | $1 \begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Total volume of two way motorised } \\ \text { traffic } \end{array} \end{array}$ | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 0 | 0 | Existing = 1523 <br> Proposed = 1653 (with growth and other committed dev) No proposals for hike lanes? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than $2 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater han 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to either: <br> - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m | 0 | 0 | Existing 9\%. <br> Some B\&Q large vehicles will be removed from this road but unlikely to bring total proportion below 5\%. Prehaps this score would improve if a bike lane is proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No changes to 30 mph speed restrictions are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | 4\begin{tabular}{\|l|l}
\hline
\end{tabular}Traffic noise based on peak hour <br> motorised traffic volumes$\quad$ (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are fewer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{C} 58 \mathrm{DB} \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $5{ }^{\text {Noise from large evehicles }}$ (i) | The proportion of lage ve ehictes is less than | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of flarge evinices is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \text { (10\% } \\ & \text { (c. }+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 10 \% \\ & \text { (c. }+5 \text { DB and over). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\substack{\text { NO2 concentration (from London } \\ \text { Atmoshheric Emission Inventory) }}$ <br> (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) |  | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> Side roads are on- way yut for motor <br> sehicies and have featurus to encourge | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | A-link crossings, to meet desirel lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. }}$ <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cro }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cros }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} 11 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrianss, cyclists, buses } \\ \text { and general motor traffic) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | All appropiate detection and optimistion <br> ternnology has been applied tot traffic <br> sinals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 2 | 2 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |




Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'O' scores the design whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 48 | 48 |
| Easy to cross | 53 | 53 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 33 |
| Places to stop and rest | 60 | 60 |
| Not too noisy | 40 | 40 |
| People choose to walk, cydle and use public transport | 48 | 48 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 56 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 22 |
| People feel relaxed | 49 | 49 |
| Clean Air | 33 | 33 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 49 | 49 |
| Number of '0' scores | 2 | 2 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
共

## What the numbers mea

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a street is. It it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available
quantifiable and evidence baseed standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent ese decisions so that taketaldders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | Not too noisy | People choose to walk, cycle and use PT | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewerthan 500 vehicles per hour <br> at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 3 | 3 | Existing $=149$ at PM Peak Proposed = 87 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and (i) people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 2\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm. | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . |  | 0 | 1 | 13.3\% existing, <br> Although unclear of exact number of large vehicles enterring/ exiting the site it is unlikely to be above $5 \%$. A score of 1 has been chosen as a conservative estimate. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 3 | Speed of motorised traftic (i) | 85 th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 3 | 21 mph existing Although not clear as yet it is likely that Depot Approach will have a new 20 mph speed restriction. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traffic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | There are fewert than 55 venicles per hour (c. 5880 B8). | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour (c. $58-70$ DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour $(\mathrm{c} \geqslant 70 \mathrm{DB})$ | - | 2 | 3 | see metric 1 Although proposed peak traffic is | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 5 | Noise from large venicles (i) | The proporition of large vehicles is less than 5\% (c. t to to 30 B$)$. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large velicices is greater } \\ & \text { than } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{c}+5 \text { DB and overf). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | see metric 2 | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 6 | NO2 concentration (from London Atmospheric Emission Inventor) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | See Diag. Unlikely to change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ng private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to local residents, deliveries and public service | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 3 | 3 | Currently no through road and none planned. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> $\stackrel{\text { or }}{\text { or }}$ <br> Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage Mivers to then cantiously | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for encourage drivers to turn cautiously <br> encourage drivers to turn cautiously | side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 0 | 2 | Currently no dropped kerbs. Proposed scheme has one side road between blocks $C$ and $D$. The crossing will have dropped kerbs and a raised table to encourage cautious vehicle | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Middilink crossings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but <br> the time | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 1 | 1 | Currently no desire lines or crossings. The proposed scheme doesn't encourage | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> 아 <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{11}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ \text { signals. } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No measures are in place to support } \\ & \text { controlled crossing. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Crossings at junction with A5 }} ^{\text {is controlled. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | Width of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 1 | 2 | New footways near entrance to site. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people crcing (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | Unclear at present whether proposed scheme includes a bike path on Depot Approach. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 0 | 1 | No clear mitigations either existing or proposed. The volume of large vehicle is reduced in the proposed scheme however | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for rccing (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 0 | 2 | To be confirmed after taking dims from DWG file. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 |  | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated <br> from parking or loading facilities | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or bading | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 2 | 2 | 1oading restrictions during day | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> are defects but resurfacing of the whole cvcling surface is proposed | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for cycling. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 2 | More activity on proposed scheme. Overlocken by blocks $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ C and D Open space (garden) adjacent to road will act as surveilance | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{21}$ | Lighing (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 1 | 3 | Proposed scheme will conform to standards? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (i) | Ctandards is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing cyle parking. cocle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 1 | 3 | No existing trees <br> From indicitive scheme there will be good tree planting coverage the the length of the road | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  |  | If assessing existing: There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges, hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. If assessing proposal: Existing standalone greenery is to be retained or enhanced. | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing planting. <br> From indicitive scheme there will be regular planting the full length of the road. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  | There is sless than 50 m between resting points | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between 50m and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | No existing resting places. Not clear as yet but likely to be resting places on the edges of the | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | There is less than 50 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 1 | No specific shelters existing or proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\left.{ }_{7}\right]^{\text {Fioturs influen ing time bus passenger }} \quad$ (i) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ |  | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessiblily (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop |  | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? (Y/N)If not, do not complete metrics $31-33$ |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The bus stop is within sight of another senice - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ street.to-station step.free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is not step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is availale closes to station <br> acess noints that meets existing <br> demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Elistong } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places to stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Not too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel safe | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Clean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of '0' scores | 4 | 0 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
If'0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
tis not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. A proposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is.II it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Heathy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel.

The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best avaiable quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians strom all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To tetransarent ang the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check a ims to hightight Hese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealthy' - some design s will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Easy to } \\ & \text { cross } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{array}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | Things to see and do | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel } \\ \text { relaxed } \end{gathered}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|_{1} ^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewert than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . $5 \%$ of motorised traftic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m .號 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than $5 \%$ of motorised traffic 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traficic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised trafific volumes | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { There are fewert than } 55 \text { venicices per hour } \\ \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB) } \end{array}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 588.70 DB . | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour (c. 770 OBB). | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large vehicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less than } \\ & 5 \% \text { (c. }+0 \text { to }+3 D B \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of al arge vehicles is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \begin{array}{l} 1008 \\ (c .+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The ropoprion of large evehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 1008 \text { (tan } \\ & \text { (c. } 5 \text { D } \mathrm{Band} \text { over). } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | No2 concentration (fom London Atmospheric Emission Inventory) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 with local traffic veater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ |  | 3 | Existing levels are 40, local traffic volume reduction measures are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic <br> vehicles. | There are some time or movement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are no access restrictions for } \\ & \text { motorised traffic. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{-}$ |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 | ${ }_{\text {Comfor of crossing side road for }}^{\text {people walking }}$ (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> moads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side road have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. |  | 3 | No side roads | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Midllink crosings, to met desirie lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desiere lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - |  | 3 | No need for controlled crossing conflicting traffic volume is low | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrins frcist, } \\ \text { and general motor traficic) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ & \text { signals. } \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. |  |  |  | 1 | No trafici signals. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - |  | 1 | controlled crossings | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walkings space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. walking in busy locations. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { There is less than } 1.5 \mathrm{~m} \text { clear width } \\ & \text { for walking. }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 3 | Walkways appear narrow in some locations but walking on the grass is encouraged | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Part or all of a footway wider than } 3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { with fewer than } 200 \text { pedestrians per hour } \\ & \text { is designated as shared use. } \end{aligned}$ | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or Part or all of a footway less than $3 m$ wide is designated as shared use. | - | 1 | Assuming at this stage all walkways can be cycled on? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing motor vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. | Some measures are in place to reduce turning movements by motor vehicles a priority junctions. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle mow fewe are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place | There are no restrictions on turning movements by motor vehicles at side roads and other uncontrolled accesses. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated and more are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place |  | 3 | The only way cyclists might meet venicle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effetive width for cycling (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where therer is nocyclel lane) or width of the cycl lane plus adiacent generar traffic lane is petween 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 1 | If the footway is shared, it is quite narrow. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | pact of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity. <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading | There is frequent or continuous kerbsid activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 3 | No kerbside activity | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Qualit of ycling surface (i) | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Qualit of walking surface (i) | There is an even and smooth surface for walking <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are major defects in the surface for walking. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Survellance of public spaces (i) | There is constant surveillance - because mixed use buildings overlook the street or space, or because there are many people using the space or walking through. |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 3 | High volume of other users Mixed use surrounding Residential onlookers | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | İghting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same ctandard | Street lighting meets the British Standard 54899:2003 and the European Standard ceNTT 13201 but lighting of off cearriageway spaces for walking or cycling does not. | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201 | - | 3 | New dev so assumed that the street lighting complies to standard | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | vision of crcle earking (i) | Cycle parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cycle parking does not meet existing } \\ & \text { demand. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | Some cycle parking is shown on concent images but most parking | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 23 | street trees (i) | If assessing existing <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { All }}$ <br> All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 3 | Concept images show high level of landscaping. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  | If assessing existing There is substantial planting in good condition designed to create or improve social space and/or act as a connection between other green spaces (eg pocket park, rain garden, community garden area). <br> If assessing proposal: Existing greenery is to be retained or enhanced and new greenery is proposed. | If assessing existing: <br> There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> Existing standalone greenery is to be <br> retained or enhanced | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 3 | As above | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 25 (Welking distance betwen resting points (i) | There is less than 50 m between resting points. | There is between 50 m and 150 m between resting points. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | Concept images show high level <br> of resting spots | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { There is less than } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { between sheltered } \\ \text { areas. } \end{array}$ | There is between 50 m and 150 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | As above. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | There are positive influences on bus iourney time, eg bus lane exemptions for buses from movement bans for general traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ | There are negative influences on bus <br> journey time e, eg unclear markings, <br> narrow lane widht parkingloadiing <br> issues, short cage length, mixing with | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | , | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessibility (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop. | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible but either there is limited clear space around the bus stop for boarding and dilihting or, for borough roads, there is no clearwav in place. | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ If not, do not complete metrics 31-33 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 29 [ums stop connectivity with other public (i) | The bus stop is within sight of another service - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ Street-t-s-station step-free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is no step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is available close to station access points that meets existing demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'I' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { layout } \end{array}$ | $\int_{\text {layout }}^{\text {Proposed }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of ife | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| Easy to cross | \#\#\#\#\# | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Not too noisy | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| People feel safe | \#\#\#\#\# | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \#\#\#\#\# | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \#\#\#\#\# | 75 |
| Clean Air | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of '0' scores | 0 | 0 |

If ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O}$ ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
$\qquad$

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores sive general picture of how a desing, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy $\operatorname{streets}$ Indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics antribute to multiple Indicators scores.
His not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' 'scors to be elininated. $A$ eroposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score will delivera $10 \%$ uplift in active travel.
The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.f. pedestricns.g from all walks of life, because all the emetrics contribute to
the whole envirinment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean

 Ten 2050 which means that close consideration must tee paid to ensure everry opportunity to redesign our streets seeks to eliminate these known hazards.Metrics scored 'o' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent and ese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealth' - some designs will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

## Appendix J <br> ATZ assessment

## Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood [20/3564/OUT]

TECHNICAL NOTE 4

## Healthy Streets and Active Travel Zone assessments

## 1. Introduction

1.1. This technical note (TN4) has been prepared by Entran Ltd in response to consultation responses from LBB Highways and receipt of the GLA Stage 1 report in respect of a planning application for a mixed-use development on land at Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood.
1.2. The planning application was supported by a Transport Assessment (TA) which referred throughout to the Healthy Streets objectives and included an assessment of routes to and from the Site on foot and by bike. However, LBB have asked for a more comprehensive Healthy Streets assessment and a formal ATZ assessment. The purpose of this note is to provide that information as requested.
2. Public realm improvements
2.1. The planning application is Outline with site layout and landscaping being reserved matters. However, the redevelopment of this Site will deliver extensive improvements to the public realm both within the scheme itself and to Cricklewood Green and the Cricklewood Lane frontage.
2.2. These improvements will deliver new purpose-built pedestrian and cycle links into the Site from Cricklewood Lane, and between Cricklewood Lane and Depot Approach. The development will also provide new areas of public open space and public squares. This will not only provide high quality amenity space for the new residents, but will also provide new public spaces for the benefit of the local community.

2.3. Cricklewood Green does not form part of the planning application, but the movement strategy includes new landscaped routes through Cricklewood green which are expected to be secured by means of a legal agreement pursuant to Section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990.

2.4. Beyond the site boundaries, the redevelopment of the Site will reduce traffic on the surrounding highway network and will remove an existing junction onto Cricklewood Lane, both of which will improve local highway conditions for pedestrians and cyclists. The development will also make appropriate financial contributions to enhance the pedestrian route to Cricklewood Station beneath the rail bridge, and to provide a new controlled crossing across Cricklewood Lane. This is expected to be in the form of a Puffin crossing; the previse location will be determined as part of any reserved matters application for the site and once the layout has been determined.

## 3. Healthy Streets

3.1. The 'Healthy Streets Check for Designers' has been used to undertake the audit. It is noted that the Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is healthy or not, but indicates the strengths and weaknesses of a street; it is not possible to achieve an overall score of $100 \%$, as to score well against some metrics, compromises are needed in other metrics. The Healthy Streets Audit is available in Appendix TN-A for reference.
3.2. Figure 3.1 shows that the proposed arrangement of Cricklewood Lane is an improvement compared to the existing environment with the closure of an existing vehicle access, enhanced public realm, landscaping and activated frontage improving the 'quality of place to stay' clean air and levels.

Figure 3.1 - Cricklewood Lane, Healthy Streets Healthy Streets Check scores


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores
(\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \begin{array}{l} \text { layout } \end{array} \end{array}\right.$ | Proposed layout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toonoisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

3．3．Depot Approach as shown in Figure 3.2 would also be improved by virtue of improved supervision， reduced vehicle speeds and enhanced pedestrian environment．

Figure 3.2 －Depot Approach，Healthy Streets

## Healthy Streets Check scores



Healthy Streets Indicators＇scores
（\％）

|  | Existing layout | Proposed layout |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all wallks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to crass | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places ro stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Mas too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People droose to wirn cyle whime pithlistrensport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel sate | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Olean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of＇ 0 ＇scores | 4 | 0 |

3．4．Figure 10.3 demonstrates that the new route through the Proposed Development has been designed to reflect the Healthy Streets aspirations，with high scores in all categories．

Figure 3.3 －Internal Routes，Healthy Streets Healthy Streets Check scores


Healthy Streets Indicators＇scores
（\％）

|  | Existing layout | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 74 |
| tasy to cross | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \＃\＃\＃韦\＃ | 100 |
| Not toon nisy | 戠枟粎 | 100 |
| Peaple chouse to walk，cyde anduse public trampont | ftitita | 74 |
| People feel safe | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 75 |
| Clean Air | \＃\＃\＃\＃\＃ | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of＇0＇scores | 0 | 0 |


3.5. The health streets assessment demonstrates that the existing roads in the vicinity of the site will be improved in all 10 Healthy Streets categories, and that new public realm will be delivered that complies with all Healthy Streets objectives. This demonstrates that the development of this site will have a positive, beneficial effect on the surrounding highways and public realm.
3.6. With regards to Vision Zero, the assessment was two-stage. Section 3 of the TA includes an objective appraisal of collision data and a review of the significance of those collisions on the Proposed Development. However, a series of public consultation events in Cricklewood ensured all highways and transportation issues could be discussed in full with interested members of the public and other stakeholders. Through that detailed process the development team gained very important local knowledge and were also able to establish the safety issues that were most important to the local community. On the basis of this two-tier approach, the Proposed Development includes measures to improve safety and the perception of safety at the site access and proposed public realm improvements on Cricklewood Lane. In addition, the Proposed Development will deliver and enhanced pedestrian route to Cricklewood Station and a new controlled crossing on Cricklewood Lane. This is entirely consistent with the Vision Zero principles.

## 4. Active Travel Zone (ATZ) Assessment

4.1. An accessibility audit was included as part of the TA; however, this has now been expanded to a full ATZ assessment.
4.2. An active travel zone assessment (ATZ) is an assessment of key journeys and their routes using a mapping system designed by TfL. During this assessment, the TfL guidance was followed starting with 'Map 1'. This map is to demonstrate a 20 -minute cycle catchment from the site, this was achieved using the London WebCat software. This base map illustrates all underground, overground, national rail and DLR stations. The ATZ assessment then illustrates the listed amenities surrounding the site, starting with those closest to the site and then radiating outwards. The amenities shown on this 'Map 1'are public transport stops, primary and secondary school, shopping centres, supermarkets, leisure centres, places of worship and medical centres.

4.3. The adopted methodology was to indicate the closest of each of these facilities, as well as sufficient additional amenities to inform Map 2 (local neighbourhood). A significant proportion of amenities plotted using this method are shown to be less than 10 minutes from the site, with further facilities also plotted beyond 0 minutes. This assessment also demonstrates that a large area of interest falls within a 20-minute cycle catchment.
4.4. Following the TfL guidance, a second map has been produced at a neighbourhood scale. This is presented as 'map 2'. Within this second map all the previously demonstrated amenities have been presented while also demonstrating routes to key destinations. There are five key routes from the site which have been sub-divided into links and assessed against the Healthy Streets objectives.
4.5. Map 2 is shown in Figure 4.2 below, and a commentary is included as Appendix TN-B.

Figure 4.2 - ATZ Map 2

4.6. In accordance with TfL guidance, the characteristics of a healthy neighbourhood have been mapped out, showing public transport interchanges and facilities, local green spaces, quite routes and safer junctions. These are shown on Map 3.

Figure 4.3 - ATZ Map 3.

4.7. Following completion of the desktop work, a detailed study was carried out on-site. This involved walking and cycling the key routes and identifying significant features that either enhance or detract from the journeys on foot or by bike. In each case, a detailed photographic record was kept to illustrate important elements of each route.
4.8. The results of the detailed site study are recorded in the Route Commentary in Appendix TN-C.

## 5. Gravity Model

5.1. An audit to obtain pedestrian desire lines was demonstrate in the TA, however after receiving comments from LBB this has been expanded into an in-depth assessment of pedestrian movements following the finding from the ATZ assessment.
5.2. The adopted methodology assesses the trip attracters within a close proximity to the site and assigns pedestrian and cycle movements to the appropriate key routes. Based on the location of these trip attracters the number of pedestrians and cyclists are distributed onto the identified routes demonstrated earlier on the ATZ's Map 2. Full details of the gravity model are included as Appendix TN-D. The predicted pedestrian trips are included in Section 11 of the TA. For the purpose of this exercise, pedestrian trips include all those walking to bus stops or rail stations.
5.3. This exercise demonstrates that the pedestrian route along depot approach will carry 44 pedestrians during the busiest peak hour. That equates to an average of one pedestrian in each direction every three minutes. This is the gross pedestrian movements, not the net change when compared to the existing retail park. This modest level of pedestrian movement does not necessitate improvements to this route.
5.4. The route beneath the rail bridge would carry 126 pedestrians during the busiest hour. This equates to one pedestrian in each direction per minute. Again, this is the gross pedestrian movements, not the net change when compared to the existing retail park. This route will receive a financial contribution from the development to improve the pedestrian route. Furthermore, the development will safeguard a parcel of land to the south of the rail line so as not to preclude the provision of a southern access into the station at some point in the future.
5.5. The proposed development will improve the pedestrian crossing point on Cricklewood Lane, located near the primary pedestrian access. That crossing will carry 173 pedestrians per hour during the busiest AM peak. The existing uncontrolled crossings (pedestrian refuges) will be supported by an additional controlled crossing (Puffin), the precise location of which will be determined as part of any detailed or reserved matters application for the Site, once the layout Site has been determined.

## 6. Proposed Transport Improvements

6.1. The Healthy Streets assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will result in an overall improvement to the public realm local to the site, and that the internal street has been designed in accordance with the Healthy Streets principles.
6.2. The ATZ assessment has shown that an improved form of pedestrian crossing across Cricklewood Lane would benefit the development and the local community and that routes to the Station should be improved. The proposed development will address both these issues, as well as improving facilities for cyclists.
6.3. The Proposed Development provides the opportunity for a new Car Club space to be provided onsite. If a space were to be provided on-site it would be in a location accessible to the wider public so that the new Car Club vehicle would be available to the new residents as well as the wider local community.
6.4. A Framework Travel Plan was submitted in support of the planning application which includes ambitious sustainable mode share targets and extensive measures in the form of infrastructure, information and incentives. The TA confirms that the final TP will be secured by appropriate condition.
6.5. In addition to the robust targets and measures contained in the Travel Plan, the Proposed Development will deliver a suite of transport improvements designed to promote sustainable travel behaviour. The original list of improvements were set out in full in the TP and Section 13 of the TA, but these have now been expanded following the ATZ assessment as summarised below:

- New pedestrian/cycle route between Depot Approach and Cricklewood Lane;
- Removal of an existing busy vehicle access from Cricklewood Lane;
- Extensive new public realm designed on Healthy Streets principles, including a new public square, open space and play areas;
- Extensive improvements to existing public realm, including Cricklewood Green enhancements to be secured by S106 agreement;
- New Car Club space to provide for new residents and the wider local community;
- Land safeguarded so as not to preclude future southern access into Cricklewood Station;
- Contribution towards improvements to the pedestrian route beneath the rail bridge to be secured by S106 agreement;
- Contribution to upgrade on uncontrolled crossing on Cricklewood Lane to a Puffin to be secured by S106 agreement.
6.6. The Proposed Development has been designed from the outset to encourage sustainable travel behaviour and to reduce the need to travel, especially by car. This primary objective is balanced with the practical requirements of a development in this location; in particular, the proximity of existing retail stores with large car parks, and the need to avoid displaced parking.


## Appendix TN-A

Healthy Streets Assessment

| Metrics <br> (Click on (i) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') |  | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  |  | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | 1Total volume of two way motorised <br> traffic | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 2 | 2 | Existing = 835 at PM Peak, Proposed = 940 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the motorised traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less } \\ & \text { than } 2 \% \text { of motorised traffic, } 7 \mathrm{am} \text { to } \\ & 7 \mathrm{pm} . \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m . | 0 | 0 | Possibly slight reduction as a result of the B\&Q closure but not enough to increase score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Trafic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are eweer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $($ l. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | See Metric 1. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large venicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehides is less than } \\ & \text { 5\%/(c.to to }+308 \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | The proportion of large vehicles is 5 to $10 \%$ (c. +3 to +5 DB ). | The eroportion of large velicices is greater than (c. $\mathrm{c}+50 \mathrm{DB}$ and over). | - | 1 | 1 | Possible reduction in large vehicle traffic could increase score to 2 but keeping 1 to be conservative | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | NO2 concentration (from London <br> Atmoshheric Emisision Inventory) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. |  |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No proposeded change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ducing private car use (1) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic vehicles. | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | $\square^{-}$ | 1 | 2 | Closure of B\&Q car park introduces some level of motor vehicle restriction | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Complor (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. or Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropeed kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | Proposed scheme does not include changes to the Southern side of the road where the side roads are | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Mid-link crosings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by lcrosingsthat are sitale some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away <br> from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting raffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Technologyto optimise efficiency y movement (pedestritins. coclists, buses and general motor trafic) (i) | All appropriate detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic techno signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technolog applied to traficis Signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 3 | 3 | ${ }^{\text {No proposed change. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for crcling (i) | Where cycles are separated from othe traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more. | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 1.5m to 2.2m (one-way) or 2.5 m to 3.5 m (two-way). (Otherwise: with of the eerside general trafic lane (inhere there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycl alane pusadidaent general traffic lane is between 4 m and 4.5 m . | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | act of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 1 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole cucling surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 2 | No proposed change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | Lighting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (isison of cycle parking (i) | Cyandards parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | Cycle parking to be included with improvements to Cricklewood Grn? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | Street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 2 | 2 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |



Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your not be possible, if so ustify your
$\qquad$

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \text { Existing } \\ \text { Layout } \\ \text { lay } \end{array}\right.$ | $\int_{\text {Proposed }}^{\text {Playout }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 46 | 54 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 67 |
| Shade and shelter | 50 | 50 |
| Places to stop and rest | 53 | 73 |
| Not toon noisy | 40 | 53 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 46 | 54 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 64 |
| Things to see and do | 28 | 44 |
| People feel relaxed | 47 | 55 |
| Clean Air | 42 | 58 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 48 | 57 |
| Number of '0' scores | 1 | 1 |

If 0 ' ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:
If 0 'scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
n overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
is not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be pel The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. $A$ proposed scheme should also aim to deliver a score increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a treet is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ incr
will delivera a $10 \%$ uplift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets Check are the best avilable
quantifiaibe and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Heathy Streets indicators are e inked to only
a few metricse.g. shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 31 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to
the whole environment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Metrics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. II it not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug

## hy you cannot get a perfect score

a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise Tomoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent mising the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check aims to hightight bese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | (Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing <br> layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | People feel safe | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | People feel relaxed | Clean Air |
|  | $1 \begin{array}{l\|l\|} \hline 1 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Total volume of two way motorised } \\ \text { traffic } \end{array} \end{array}$ | There are fewer than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 0 | 0 | Existing = 1523 <br> Proposed = 1653 (with growth and other committed dev) No proposals for hike lanes? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than $2 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater han 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to either: <br> - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m | 0 | 0 | Existing 9\%. <br> Some B\&Q large vehicles will be removed from this road but unlikely to bring total proportion below 5\%. Prehaps this score would improve if a bike lane is proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 2 | No changes to 30 mph speed restrictions are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | 4\begin{tabular}{\|l|l}
\hline
\end{tabular}Traffic noise based on peak hour <br> motorised traffic volumes$\quad$ (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are fewer than } 55 \text { vehicices per hour } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{C} 58 \mathrm{DB} \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 58.70 DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per | - | 1 | 1 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $5{ }^{\text {Noise from large evehicles }}$ (i) | The proportion of lage ve ehictes is less than | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of flarge evinices is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \text { (10\% } \\ & \text { (c. }+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 10 \% \\ & \text { (c. }+5 \text { DB and over). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | Change in site traffic will not reduce this enough to improve score. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\substack{\text { NO2 concentration (from London } \\ \text { Atmoshheric Emission Inventory) }}$ <br> (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) |  | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
|  |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> Side roads are on- way yut for motor <br> sehicies and have featurus to encourge | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | A-link crossings, to meet desirel lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings | - | 1 | 1 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { A zebra or parallel crossing is provided. }}$ <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cro }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { Cros }}$ <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 2 | No change. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{array}{l\|l\|} 11 & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrianss, cyclists, buses } \\ \text { and general motor traffic) } \end{array} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | All appropiate detection and optimistion <br> ternnology has been applied tot traffic <br> sinals. | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation <br> technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - | 2 | 2 | No change | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |




Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'O' scores the design whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 48 | 48 |
| Easy to cross | 53 | 53 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 33 |
| Places to stop and rest | 60 | 60 |
| Not too noisy | 40 | 40 |
| People choose to walk, cydle and use public transport | 48 | 48 |
| People feel safe | 56 | 56 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 22 |
| People feel relaxed | 49 | 49 |
| Clean Air | 33 | 33 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 49 | 49 |
| Number of '0' scores | 2 | 2 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
共

## What the numbers mea

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a street is. It it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel. The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available
quantifiable and evidence baseed standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians from all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent ese decisions so that taketaldders are informed as to what compromises have been made.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | $\begin{gathered} \text { Existing } \\ \text { layout } \end{gathered}$ | Proposed |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{gathered} \text { Easy to } \\ \text { cross } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{gathered}$ | Places to stop and rest | Not too noisy | People choose to walk, cycle and use PT | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Things to } \\ \text { see and } \\ \text { do } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { People } \\ & \text { feel } \\ & \text { relaxed } \end{aligned}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewerthan 500 vehicles per hour <br> at peak. | There are 500 to 1000 vehicles per hour at peak. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. | 3 | 3 | Existing $=149$ at PM Peak Proposed = 87 (with added growth and other committed dev) | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and (i) people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 2\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm. | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> or <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane at least 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined width of the cycle lane and the next general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m . |  | 0 | 1 | 13.3\% existing, <br> Although unclear of exact number of large vehicles enterring/ exiting the site it is unlikely to be above $5 \%$. A score of 1 has been chosen as a conservative estimate. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 3 | Speed of motorised traftic (i) | 85 th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. | 2 | 3 | 21 mph existing Although not clear as yet it is likely that Depot Approach will have a new 20 mph speed restriction. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traffic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised traffic volumes | There are fewert than 55 venicles per hour (c. 5880 B8). | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour (c. $58-70$ DB). | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour $(\mathrm{c} \geqslant 70 \mathrm{DB})$ | - | 2 | 3 | see metric 1 Although proposed peak traffic is | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 5 | Noise from large venicles (i) | The proporition of large vehicles is less than 5\% (c. t to to 30 B$)$. |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large velicices is greater } \\ & \text { than } \\ & \text { (c. } \mathrm{c}+5 \text { DB and overf). } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | see metric 2 | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 6 | NO2 concentration (from London Atmospheric Emission Inventor) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 concentration is greater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ | 1 | 1 | See Diag. Unlikely to change. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | ng private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to local residents, deliveries and public service | There are some time or movement | There are no access restrictions for motorised traffic. | - | 3 | 3 | Currently no through road and none planned. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 |  | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> $\stackrel{\text { or }}{\text { or }}$ <br> Side roads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage Mivers to then cantiously | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for encourage drivers to turn cautiously <br> encourage drivers to turn cautiously | side roads have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. | 0 | 2 | Currently no dropped kerbs. Proposed scheme has one side road between blocks $C$ and $D$. The crossing will have dropped kerbs and a raised table to encourage cautious vehicle | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Middilink crossings, to meet desire lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but <br> the time | Main desire lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - | 1 | 1 | Currently no desire lines or crossings. The proposed scheme doesn't encourage | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour. <br> 아 <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - | 2 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{11}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ \text { signals. } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. | No detection and optimisation technology applied to traffic signals. |  | 1 | 1 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No measures are in place to support } \\ & \text { controlled crossing. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | 2 | $\left.\right\|_{\text {Crossings at junction with A5 }} ^{\text {is controlled. }}$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | Width of clear continuous walking space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. | There is less than 1.5 m clear width for walking. | 1 | 2 | New footways near entrance to site. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people crcing (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling | Part or all of a footway wider than $3 m$ with fewer than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use. | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or <br> Part or all of a footway less than 3 m wide is designated as shared use | - | 3 | 3 | Unclear at present whether proposed scheme includes a bike path on Depot Approach. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing moto vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic, or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. |  |  | At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated, more than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle movements are made by larger vehicles and there are no mitigation measures in place. | 0 | 1 | No clear mitigations either existing or proposed. The volume of large vehicle is reduced in the proposed scheme however | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effective width for rccing (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cyclelane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent generar traffic lane is between 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 0 | 2 | To be confirmed after taking dims from DWG file. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 |  | There is no kerbside activity <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated <br> from parking or loading facilities | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | There is frequent or continuous kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or bading | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 2 | 2 | 1oading restrictions during day | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Quality of cycling surface | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> Or <br> are defects but resurfacing of the whole cvcling surface is proposed | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for cycling. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Quality of walking surface | There is an even and smooth surface for walking. <br> Or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the <br> whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the <br> surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are major defects in the } \\ & \text { surface for walking. } \end{aligned}$ | 2 | 3 | New surface? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Surveillance of public spaces | $\begin{aligned} & \text { lere is constant survelliance - because } \\ & \text { mixed use biildings verlok the etreet or } \\ & \text { space, or because there are many people } \\ & \text { using the space or walking through. } \end{aligned}$ |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 1 | 2 | More activity on proposed scheme. Overlocken by blocks $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ C and D Open space (garden) adjacent to road will act as surveilance | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{21}$ | Lighing (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same |  | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. | - | 1 | 3 | Proposed scheme will conform to standards? | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | (i) | Ctandards is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but is not accessible by all. | Cycle parking does not meet existing demand. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing cyle parking. cocle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| ${ }^{23}$ | street trees (i) | If assessing existing: <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> or All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: <br> There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 1 | 3 | No existing trees <br> From indicitive scheme there will be good tree planting coverage the the length of the road | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  |  | If assessing existing: There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges, hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. If assessing proposal: Existing standalone greenery is to be retained or enhanced. | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 1 | 3 | No existing planting. <br> From indicitive scheme there will be regular planting the full length of the road. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 |  | There is sless than 50 m between resting points | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between 50m and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 3 | No existing resting places. Not clear as yet but likely to be resting places on the edges of the | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | There is less than 50 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { between sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 1 | 1 | No specific shelters existing or proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | $\left.{ }_{7}\right]^{\text {Fioturs influen ing time bus passenger }} \quad$ (i) |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ |  | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessiblily (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop |  | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? (Y/N)If not, do not complete metrics $31-33$ |  |  |  |  |  | N | N | <<<Please enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | The bus stop is within sight of another senice - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ street.to-station step.free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is not step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is availale closes to station <br> acess noints that meets existing <br> demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the compro
street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more '0' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your


Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Existing } \\ & \begin{array}{l} \text { Elistong } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { Proposed } \\ & \text { layout } \end{aligned}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of life | 38 | 62 |
| Easy to cross | 63 | 73 |
| Shade and shelter | 33 | 67 |
| Places to stop and rest | 33 | 87 |
| Not too noisy | 53 | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | 38 | 62 |
| People feel safe | 44 | 71 |
| Things to see and do | 22 | 56 |
| People feel relaxed | 38 | 64 |
| Clean Air | 50 | 83 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 40 | 67 |
| Number of '0' scores | 4 | 0 |

If '0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
If'0' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here:

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores give general picture of how a design, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics ontribute to multiple Indicators scores.
tis not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' scores to be eliminated. A proposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is.II it not the case that a street with a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Heathy Streets Check score it. It is also not the case that a $10 \%$ inct
will deliver a $10 \%$ upift in active travel.

The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best avaiable quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.g. pedestrians strom all walks of life, because all the metrics contribute to The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given project, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean


Mertics scored ' 0 ' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores butit it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To tetransarent ang the difficult decisions designers must weigh up the Check a ims to hightight Hese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealthy' - some design s will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

|  | Metrics | Scoring system |  |  |  | Enter score here |  | Notes | How each metric contributes to the Healthy Streets Indicators' scores |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Click on (1) for more guidance on scoring or open the 'Scoring guidance tab ') | 3 | 2 | 1 | 0 | Existing layout | Proposed layout |  | Pedestria ns from all walks of life | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Easy to } \\ & \text { cross } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Shade } \\ \text { and } \\ \text { shelter } \end{array}$ | Places to stop and rest | $\begin{gathered} \text { Not too } \\ \text { noisy } \end{gathered}$ | People <br> choose to <br> walk, cycle <br> and use PT | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel safe } \end{gathered}$ | Things to see and do | $\begin{gathered} \text { People } \\ \text { feel } \\ \text { relaxed } \end{gathered}$ | Clean Air |
|  | $\left.\right\|_{1} ^{\text {Totatal volume of two way motorised }}$ trafic | There are fewert than 500 vehicles per hour at peak. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are } 500 \text { to } 1000 \text { vehicles per hour } \\ & \text { at peak. } \end{aligned}$ | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are separated from motorised traffic. | There are more than 1000 vehicles per hour at peak, where people cycling are mixed with motorised traffic. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 2 | Interaction between large vehicles and people cycling | There will be no large vehicles using the street, or cycle traffic is separated from motorised traffic | The proportion of large vehicles is less than 7 pm . | The proportion of large vehicles is $2 \%$ to $5 \%$ of motorised traffic, 7 am to 7 pm . $5 \%$ of motorised traftic, 7 am to 7 pm . <br> The proportion of large vehicles is greater than 5\% of motorised traffic, 7am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: in a nearside general traffic lane or bus ane at least 4.5 m wide, or in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is at least 4.5 m .號 4.5 m . | The proportion of large vehicles is greater than $5 \%$ of motorised traffic 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling 7 am to 7 pm , and people are cycling either: - in a nearside general traffic lane or bus lane less than 4.5 m wide, or - in a cycle lane where the combined general traffic lane is less than 4.5 m |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Speed of motorised trafic (i) | 85th percentile speed is less than 20 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further <br> 아 <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is over 25 mph but a complete redesign of the street environment should reduce this to below 20 mph . | 85 th percentile speed is 20 to 25 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further. | 85 th percentile speed is 25 to 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85 th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , but there are some proposals to reduce speed further | 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph . <br> or <br> Existing 85th percentile speed is greater than 30 mph , and there are no proposals to reduce this speed. |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Traficic noise based on peak hour (i) motorised trafific volumes | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|} \hline \text { There are fewert than } 55 \text { venicices per hour } \\ \text { (c. } 558 \text { DB) } \end{array}$ | There are 55 to 450 vehicles per hour $(c$. 588.70 DB . | There are more than 450 vehicles per hour (c. 770 OBB). | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Noise from large vehicles (i) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of large vehicles is less than } \\ & 5 \% \text { (c. }+0 \text { to }+3 D B \text { ). } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The proportion of al arge vehicles is } 5 \text { to } \\ & \begin{array}{l} 1008 \\ (c .+3 \text { to }+5 \text { DB). } \end{array} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The ropoprion of large evehicles is greater } \\ & \text { than } 1008 \text { (tan } \\ & \text { (c. } 5 \text { D } \mathrm{Band} \text { over). } \end{aligned}$ | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | No2 concentration (fom London Atmospheric Emission Inventory) (i) | If assessing existing: The NO2 <br> concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is less than $32 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ or the existing concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with local traffic volume reduction measures proposed. | If assessing existing: The NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The existing NO2 concentration is 32 to $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m} 3$ with no proposal to reduce local traffic volume or the existing NO2 with local traffic veater than $40 \mu \mathrm{~g} / \mathrm{m}$ with local traffic volume reduction |  | $\square$ |  | 3 | Existing levels are 40, local traffic volume reduction measures are proposed. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ |
|  | Reducing private car use (i) | There is no through-movement for motorised traffic, with access limited to <br> local residents, deliveries and public servic <br> vehicles. | There are some time or movement | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There are no access restrictions for } \\ & \text { motorised traffic. } \end{aligned}$ | ${ }^{-}$ |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 8 | ${ }_{\text {Comfor of crossing side road for }}^{\text {people walking }}$ (i) | Side roads are closed to motor traffic. <br> or <br> moads are one-way out for motor vehicles and have features to encourage | Side roads are two-way or one-way in for motor vehicles, and have features to encourage drivers to turn cautiously. | Side road have dropped kerbs only. | Side roads have no dropped kerbs. |  | 3 | No side roads | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | Midllink crosings, to met desirie lines (i) | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings suitable for all users at all times. | Main desire lines across links are met by crossings that are suitable some of the time but that do not meet demand all of the time. | Main desiere lines across links are not met by pedestrian crossings. | - |  | 3 |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 10 | Opportunity to cross the street away (i) from junctions | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume less than 200 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> A zebra or parallel crossing is provided <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised so that people crossing the main carriageway have priority, while traffic on the main carriageway has on-demand green. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume between 200 and 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is less than 15 m or greater than 15 m in a 20 mph speed limit. <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and staggered than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | Crossing is uncontrolled, with conflicting traffic volume greater than 1000 vehicles per hour <br> or <br> Crossing is signalised and straight-across where the distance to cross is greater than 15 m in a $30 \mathrm{mph}+$ speed limit. | - |  | 3 | No need for controlled crossing conflicting traffic volume is low | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \begin{array}{l} \text { Technology to optimise efficiency of } \\ \text { movement (pedestrins frcist, } \\ \text { and general motor traficic) } \end{array} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { All appropriate detection and optimisation } \\ & \text { technology has been applied to traffic } \\ & \text { signals. } \end{aligned}$ | Some detection and optimisation technology has been applied to traffic signals. |  |  |  | 1 | No trafici signals. | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - |
|  |  | Many measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | Some measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | No measures are in place to support controlled crossing. | - |  | 1 | controlled crossings | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |


| 13 | With of clear continuous walkings space (i) | There is 2.5 m or more clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> There is 2 m or more in moderately busy locations. <br> or | There is 2 m to 2.5 m clear width for walking in busy locations. <br> or <br> There is 1.5 m to 2 m width in moderately busy locations. | There is 1.5 m to 2 m clear width for walking in busy locations. walking in busy locations. | $\left\lvert\, \begin{aligned} & \text { There is less than } 1.5 \mathrm{~m} \text { clear width } \\ & \text { for walking. }\end{aligned}\right.$ | 3 | Walkways appear narrow in some locations but walking on the grass is encouraged | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Sharing of footway with people cycling (i) |  shared use for walking and cycling. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Part or all of a footway wider than } 3 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { with fewer than } 200 \text { pedestrians per hour } \\ & \text { is designated as shared use. } \end{aligned}$ | Part or all of a footway used by more than 200 pedestrians per hour is designated as shared use <br> or Part or all of a footway less than $3 m$ wide is designated as shared use. | - | 1 | Assuming at this stage all walkways can be cycled on? | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 15 | Collision risk between people cycling (i) and turing motor vehicles | Side roads are closed to motorised traffic or turning movements by motor vehicles are minimised <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, all conflicting movements between cycle traffic and turning motor traffic are separated. | Some measures are in place to reduce turning movements by motor vehicles a priority junctions. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle than $5 \%$ of turning vehicle mow fewe are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place | There are no restrictions on turning movements by motor vehicles at side roads and other uncontrolled accesses. <br> and <br> At signal-controlled junctions, cycle movements are not separated and more are made by larger vehicles but mitigation measures are in place |  | 3 | The only way cyclists might meet venicle | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 16 | Effetive width for cycling (i) | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is 2.2 m or more (one-way) or 3.5 m or more (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is 4.5 m or more |  | Where cycles are separated from other traffic, the width of the lane or track is less than 1.5 m (one-way) or less than 2.5 m (two-way). <br> Otherwise: <br> Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where there is no cycle lane) or width of the cycle lane plus adjacent general traffic lane is less than 3.2 m . | Width of the nearside general traffic lane (where therer is nocyclel lane) or width of the cycl lane plus adiacent generar traffic lane is petween 3.2 m and 3.9 m. | 1 | If the footway is shared, it is quite narrow. | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 17 | pact of parking and loading on cycling | There is no kerbside activity. <br> or <br> People cycling are physically separated | There is occasional kerbside activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading | There is frequent or continuous kerbsid activity, and people cycling can keep at least 1.0 m clearance to vehicles parked or loading. | People cycling cannot maintain at least 1.0 m clearance from vehicles parked or loading. | 3 | No kerbside activity | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 18 | Qualit of ycling surface (i) | The surface for cycling is even and smooth, with sufficient skid resistance. <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the | There are a few minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are many minor defects in the surface for cycling. | There are major defects in the surface for cycling. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 19 | Qualit of walking surface (i) | There is an even and smooth surface for walking <br> or <br> There are defects but resurfacing of the whole walking surface is proposed. | There are a few minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are many minor defects in the surface for walking. | There are major defects in the surface for walking. | 3 | New path | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 20 | Survellance of public spaces (i) | There is constant surveillance - because mixed use buildings overlook the street or space, or because there are many people using the space or walking through. |  | There is poor surveillance - because few buildings overlook the street or space, there is little activity. | - | 3 | High volume of other users Mixed use surrounding Residential onlookers | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 21 | İghting (i) | Street lighting meets the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201. <br> and <br> Lighting of off-carriageway facilities for walking or cycling meets the same ctandard | Street lighting meets the British Standard 54899:2003 and the European Standard ceNTT 13201 but lighting of off cearriageway spaces for walking or cycling does not. | Street lighting does not meet the British Standard 5489:2003 and the European Standard CEN/TR 13201 | - | 3 | New dev so assumed that the street lighting complies to standard | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 22 | vision of crcle earking (i) | Cycle parking exceeds existing demand and is accessible by all. | Cycle parking meets existing demand but | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cycle parking does not meet existing } \\ & \text { demand. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 2 | Some cycle parking is shown on concent images but most parking | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 23 | street trees (i) | If assessing existing <br> There are multiple trees, with canopies spaced less than 15 m apart on average. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> The street is already tree-lined with less than 15 m between tree canopies and there are no proposed changes. <br> $\frac{\text { or }}{\text { All }}$ <br> All existing trees are to be retained, with |  | If assessing existing: There are no trees, or only one tree <br> If assessing proposal <br> There are no trees. <br> or <br> The number of trees has been reduced | - | 3 | Concept images show high level of landscaping. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |


| 24 |  | If assessing existing There is substantial planting in good condition designed to create or improve social space and/or act as a connection between other green spaces (eg pocket park, rain garden, community garden area). <br> If assessing proposal: Existing greenery is to be retained or enhanced and new greenery is proposed. | If assessing existing: <br> There is some planting, eg shrubs, verges hedges, ornamental flower beds, or adaptation for some animal species. <br> If assessing proposal: <br> Existing standalone greenery is to be <br> retained or enhanced | If assessing existing: There is no planting. If assessing proposal: No green infrastructure is proposed, or the size of existing greenery is to be reduced. | - | 3 | As above | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 25 | 25 (Welking distance betwen resting points (i) | There is less than 50 m between resting points. | There is between 50 m and 150 m between resting points. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { resting points. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | Concept images show high level <br> of resting spots | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \text { There is less than } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { between sheltered } \\ \text { areas. } \end{array}$ | There is between 50 m and 150 m between sheltered areas. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { between } \\ & \text { sheltered areas. } \end{aligned}$ | - | 3 | As above. | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any bus services running on this street? (Y/N) <br> If not, do not complete metrics 29-30 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | There are positive influences on bus iourney time, eg bus lane exemptions for buses from movement bans for general traffic. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Buses are mixed with traffic but not } \\ & \text { significantly delayed. } \end{aligned}$ | There are negative influences on bus <br> journey time e, eg unclear markings, <br> narrow lane widht parkingloadiing <br> issues, short cage length, mixing with | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | , | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 28 | Bus sop accessibility (i) | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible, there is clear space for boarding and alighting and there is a clearway in place at the bus stop. | Bus stop is wheelchair accessible but either there is limited clear space around the bus stop for boarding and dilihting or, for borough roads, there is no clearwav in place. | Bus stop is not wheelchair accessible, ie the kerb height is less than 100 mm | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | - |
| Are there any rail/underground/bus station accessible from this street? $(\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N})$ If not, do not complete metrics 31-33 |  |  |  |  |  | N | <<<Pllease enter Y or N for both existing and proposed. |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 29 | 29 [ums stop connectivity with other public (i) | The bus stop is within sight of another service - less than 50 m away. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is between } 50 \mathrm{~m} \text { and } 150 \mathrm{~m} \\ & \text { away from another service. } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { The bus stop is more than } 150 \mathrm{~m} \text { away } \\ & \text { from } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
| 30 | ${ }_{30}$ Street-t-s-station step-free access (i) | All entry points to the station are step-free. | The main entry point to the station is no step-free but step-free alternatives are provided. | $\begin{aligned} & \text { There is no step-free access to the } \\ & \text { station. } \end{aligned}$ | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | - |
|  | ${ }^{\text {S }}$ Support for interchange between cycling (i) | Secure cycle parking is provided close to station access points, and exceeding existing demand. | Cycle parking is available close to station access points that meets existing demand. | There is insulfifient cycle parkinin to meet demand of cyle parking is poorly located for station aceess points. | - |  |  | $\checkmark$ | - | - | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - | - | $\checkmark$ | - |

Healthy Streets Check scores
(i)

The Healthy Streets Check score does not show whether a street is
healthy or not but indicates the healthy or not but indicates the
strengths and weaknesses of a scheme/street.
It is not possible to achieve an
overall score of $100 \%$. To score well against some metrics, compromise will be needed with other metrics. This reflects the street.
Should the assessment reveal one or more ' 'I' scores the design
should be reviewed to consider whether the score can be improved. In some cases this will
not be possible, if so justify your

Healthy Streets Indicators' scores (\%)

|  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \\ \text { layout } \end{array}$ | $\int_{\text {layout }}^{\text {Proposed }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Pedestrians from all walks of ife | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| Easy to cross | \#\#\#\#\# | 80 |
| Shade and shelter | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Places to stop and rest | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Not too noisy | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| People choose to walk, cycle and use public transport | \#\#\#\#\# | 74 |
| People feel safe | \#\#\#\#\# | 82 |
| Things to see and do | \#\#\#\#\# | 67 |
| People feel relaxed | \#\#\#\#\# | 75 |
| Clean Air | \#\#\#\#\# | 100 |
| Overall Healthy Streets Check score | 0 | 78 |
| Number of '0' scores | 0 | 0 |

If ${ }^{\prime} \mathrm{O}$ ' scores are unavoidable, please explain why here
$\qquad$

## How to interpret the result

The Check will produce a percentage score against each of the 10 Healthy Streets Indicators. These percentage scores sive general picture of how a desing, in the round, is delivering against the 10 Healthy $\operatorname{streets}$ Indicators. Designers should
overall percentage score is also presented. This is not an average of the scores for each Indicator as each metrics antribute to multiple Indicators scores.
His not possible to score a perfect $100 \%$ in any one design because compromises and trade-offs inevitably need to be . The objective therefore is to get as high a score as possible, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as
possible and for 0 ' 'scors to be elininated. $A$ eroposed scheme should also aim to deliver ascore increase from baseline for all Healthy Streets Indicators' scores.

## What the numbers mean

The Healthy Streets Check is not a scientific assessment of how healthy a Street is. It is not the case that a street with $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score confers $10 \%$ greater health benefit to people who use
it. It s s also not the case that a $10 \%$ increase in Healthy Streets Check score will delivera $10 \%$ uplift in active travel.
The metrics included in the Healthy Streets check are the best available quantifiable and evidence based standards that are within the gift of the traffic engineer or urban designer to influence through the design of the
street. As a result some of the Healthy streets Indicators are linked to only street. As a result some of the Healthy Streets Indicators are linked to only
a few metrics es.g.shade \& shelter while others are linked to all 13 metrics e.f. pedestricns.g from all walks of life, because all the emetrics contribute to
the whole envirinment in the round and therefore affect the Indicator. The numbers must therefore not be given any undue weight in the interpretation of the results. The objective is to get as high a score as possible for a given proiect, for this to be as evenly distributed across the 10 Indicators as possible and for ' 0 'scores to be eliminated.

## What '0' scores mean

 Ten 2050 which means that close consideration must tee paid to ensure everry opportunity to redesign our streets seeks to eliminate these known hazards.Metrics scored 'o' will be flagged in the final results if they have not been addressed. It is not always possible to improve ' 0 ' scores but it is important that these are identified throug
Why you cannot get a perfect score
a complex street environment a balanced approach must be taken; freeing up space for cycling or extending crossing times for pedestrians may produce delays for buses. Likewise emoving a pinch point for cyclists or buses may mean removing an island refuge for pedestrians or from the reverse perspective installing an island refuge may introducea a pinch point
or buses and cyclists To betransarent and ese decisions so that stakeholders are informed as to what compromises have been made.
any metrics have scored ' 0 ' these will be flagged up in the summary graph above and if they cannot be reconciled
ustification for the decision to leave them in the design should be written in the text box below the scoring table.
There is no threshold score for a Healthy Street. Streets are not either 'healthy' or 'unhealth' - some designs will perform There is not hreshold score for Heathy Street. Streets are not erther heathy or unheathy - some desins wil perform
better than others against the 10 Healthy Streets indicators which may reflect physical, financial or political constraint on
the proect.

## Appendix TN-B

Map 2 route commentary

| Route | Destination (s) | Walking route description (from site) | Cycling route description (from site) | Safety concerns and photographs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | - Kilburn Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Gesher School <br> - Mulberry House School <br> - Mapesbury Medical Group <br> - Bus stops BN, CE, CW <br> - Shops and services along Cricklewood Broadway (A5) <br> - Kilburn town centre | Leave site via Cricklewood Green, following Cricklewood Lane West A407 for 120 m to the junction with Cricklewood Broadway (A5). Turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway for local shops and services with controlled pedestrian crossings at regular intervals. Continuing 1.4 km pedestrians can reach Kilburn Underground Station. | Cyclist would follow same route as pedestrians beginning on the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green before joining the highway and turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway. | - Crossing at the junction with Cricklewood Lane and Cricklewood Broadway (Photograph 1). 5 KSI since 2015. <br> - In general pedestrian walkways ok along Cricklewood Ln and Cricklewood Broadway but unsafe for cyclists; no segregated or unsegregated cycle lane, with large proportion of large vehicles and fast traffic ( 30 mph ) Photograph 2. <br> - Cyclists will struggle joining Cricklewood Lane after using the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green Photograph 3 |
| Route2 | - Hampstead School <br> - Hampstead Underground Station (Northern) <br> - Bus stop CO <br> - Hampstead town centre | Pedestrians leave site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood lane for 200m, walking beneath the Cricklewood underpass. Pedestrians will then use the controlled crossing at the junction with Lichfield Road before walking another 500 m to the Hampstead school or another 1.8 km to Hampstead Underground station. | Cyclists would leave the site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood Lane before turning right at the junction with Lichfield Road. A short 500 m cycle will take cyclist to the Hampstead School. Hampstead Underground Station (the site's nearest Northern Line station) is within reasonable cycling distance; past the school and along lightly trafficked Frognall Lane onto Hampstead High Street to the Station. | - One KSI incident has been recorded since 2015 at the junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. Photograph 4 <br> - Cricklewood underpass is reasonably lit. Photograph 5. <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on heavily trafficked Hampstead High Street. 2 KSI have been identified here. No obvious access to the station. |
| Route 3 | - St Agnes Catholic Primary School <br> - Claremont Primary School <br> - Whitefield School <br> - Greenfield medical centre <br> - Claremont and Childs Hill Churches <br> - Cricklewood Station <br> - Temple Fortune and Hendon Central town centres | Begins same as route 2 but turning left at the junction with Lichfield Road. Pedestrians continue North to the schools, medical centres, and places of worship. Whitefield School is approximately 1.8 km along Claremont Road past the Golder's Green Estate. | Same as pedestrian route, no dedicated cycle lanes. | - Wide junction in photograph 6 could present safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly as they both house large vehicles. <br> - No significant safety concerns for cyclists given this rout is lightly trafficked residential road once turning off Cricklewood Lane. |
| Route 4 | - Anso and Ramin primary Schools <br> - Chichele Road and Wilesden Green surgeries <br> - Central Brent Mosque and St Gabriel's places of worship. <br> - Wilesden Green Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Kensal Green Underground Station (Bakerloo) <br> - Brodensbury Station. <br> - Harlesden and Wilesden Green town centres. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway at the controlled crossing 20 m South of the junction with Cricklewood Lane. Pedestrians then head South West along Chichele Road to the GP surgeries, primary schools and Wilesden Green Underground Station 800 m further on. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway. Cyclist then use Chichele Road, travelling South West along residential roads to Wilesden Underground Station ( 800 m ). Kensal Green is still within reasonable cycling distance and is the closest access to the Bakerloo line. Cyclists continue past Wilesden Green station, crossing Wilesden Lane onto Sidmouth Road/ All Souls Ave. Cyclists must then use Harrow road for 600 m before turning left onto Kensal Green. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing Photograph 7 <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on this route but mostly uses lightly trafficked residential roads, with the exception of Harrow Road, and Wilesden Lane which are both moderately trafficked. |
| Route 5 | - Mora Primary School <br> - Menorah HS <br> - The Crest Academy <br> - Burnley Practice GP <br> - St Agnes Catholic Church <br> - Bus stops BD and BP <br> - Neasden and Colindale town centres | Route 5 has been identified as the least popular pedestrian cycle route from the site; given that most local amenities, services, and public transport nodes are South of the site. To reach the Mora Primary School, pedestrians begin the same as routes 4 and 1 from Cricklewood Green and onto Cricklewood Lane. They would then walk 250 m North along Cricklewood Road, using the crossing 20 m South of Mora Road, and then walk the short distance down Mora Road to the school. | Cyclist begin the same as routes 1 and 4 , turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway and continuing North. To reach Mora Primary School, cyclist turn off Cricklewood Broadway onto Mora Road. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing. |


| Route | Destination (s) | Walking route description (from site) | Cycling route description (from site) | Safety concerns and photographs |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route 1 | - Kilburn Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Gesher School <br> - Mulberry House School <br> - Mapesbury Medical Group <br> - Bus stops BN, CE, CW <br> - Shops and services along Cricklewood Broadway (A5) <br> - Kilburn town centre | Leave site via Cricklewood Green, following Cricklewood Lane West A407 for 120 m to the junction with Cricklewood Broadway (A5). Turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway for local shops and services with controlled pedestrian crossings at regular intervals. Continuing 1.4 km pedestrians can reach Kilburn Underground Station. | Cyclist would follow same route as pedestrians beginning on the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green before joining the highway and turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway. | - Crossing at the junction with Cricklewood Lane and Cricklewood Broadway (Photograph 1). 5 KSI since 2015. <br> - In general pedestrian walkways ok along Cricklewood Ln and Cricklewood Broadway but unsafe for cyclists; no segregated or unsegregated cycle lane, with large proportion of large vehicles and fast traffic ( 30 mph ) Photograph 2. <br> - Cyclists will struggle joining Cricklewood Lane after using the shared path in front of Cricklewood Green Photograph 3 |
| Route2 | - Hampstead School <br> - Hampstead Underground Station (Northern) <br> - Bus stop CO <br> - Hampstead town centre | Pedestrians leave site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood lane for 200m, walking beneath the Cricklewood underpass. Pedestrians will then use the controlled crossing at the junction with Lichfield Road before walking another 500 m to the Hampstead school or another 1.8 km to Hampstead Underground station. | Cyclists would leave the site via Cricklewood Green, turning left onto Cricklewood Lane before turning right at the junction with Lichfield Road. A short 500 m cycle will take cyclist to the Hampstead School. Hampstead Underground Station (the site's nearest Northern Line station) is within reasonable cycling distance; past the school and along lightly trafficked Frognall Lane onto Hampstead High Street to the Station. | - One KSI incident has been recorded since 2015 at the junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. Photograph 4 <br> - Cricklewood underpass is reasonably lit. Photograph 5. <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on heavily trafficked Hampstead High Street. 2 KSI have been identified here. No obvious access to the station. |
| Route 3 | - St Agnes Catholic Primary School <br> - Claremont Primary School <br> - Whitefield School <br> - Greenfield medical centre <br> - Claremont and Childs Hill Churches <br> - Cricklewood Station <br> - Temple Fortune and Hendon Central town centres | Begins same as route 2 but turning left at the junction with Lichfield Road. Pedestrians continue North to the schools, medical centres, and places of worship. Whitefield School is approximately 1.8 km along Claremont Road past the Golder's Green Estate. | Same as pedestrian route, no dedicated cycle lanes. | - Wide junction in photograph 6 could present safety concerns for pedestrians, particularly as they both house large vehicles. <br> - No significant safety concerns for cyclists given this rout is lightly trafficked residential road once turning off Cricklewood Lane. |
| Route 4 | - Anso and Ramin primary Schools <br> - Chichele Road and Wilesden Green surgeries <br> - Central Brent Mosque and St Gabriel's places of worship. <br> - Wilesden Green Underground Station (Jubilee) <br> - Kensal Green Underground Station (Bakerloo) <br> - Brodensbury Station. <br> - Harlesden and Wilesden Green town centres. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway at the controlled crossing 20 m South of the junction with Cricklewood Lane. Pedestrians then head South West along Chichele Road to the GP surgeries, primary schools and Wilesden Green Underground Station 800 m further on. | Route 4 begins the same as route one before crossing Cricklewood Broadway. Cyclist then use Chichele Road, travelling South West along residential roads to Wilesden Underground Station ( 800 m ). Kensal Green is still within reasonable cycling distance and is the closest access to the Bakerloo line. Cyclists continue past Wilesden Green station, crossing Wilesden Lane onto Sidmouth Road/ All Souls Ave. Cyclists must then use Harrow road for 600 m before turning left onto Kensal Green. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing Photograph 7 <br> - No dedicated cycle lanes on this route but mostly uses lightly trafficked residential roads, with the exception of Harrow Road, and Wilesden Lane which are both moderately trafficked. |
| Route 5 | - Mora Primary School <br> - Menorah HS <br> - The Crest Academy <br> - Burnley Practice GP <br> - St Agnes Catholic Church <br> - Bus stops BD and BP <br> - Neasden and Colindale town centres | Route 5 has been identified as the least popular pedestrian cycle route from the site; given that most local amenities, services, and public transport nodes are South of the site. To reach the Mora Primary School, pedestrians begin the same as routes 4 and 1 from Cricklewood Green and onto Cricklewood Lane. They would then walk 250 m North along Cricklewood Road, using the crossing 20 m South of Mora Road, and then walk the short distance down Mora Road to the school. | Cyclist begin the same as routes 1 and 4 , turning left onto Cricklewood Broadway and continuing North. To reach Mora Primary School, cyclist turn off Cricklewood Broadway onto Mora Road. | - Other than the safety concerns described for route 1 , pedestrian safety is ok on this route. <br> - Crossing Cricklewood Broadway presents safety concerns for cyclists and it is likely that most will dismount and use the pedestrian crossing. |


| Photograph | Issue of safety | Suggestions for improvement |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 - uncontrolled pedestrian crossing at the junction between Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane | - Busy junction with no dedicated cycle lane or early start arrangement for cyclists <br> - KSI cluster of vehicle / pedestrian incidents. | - Early start arrangement for cyclists. <br> - Cycle box at lights. <br> - Improvements to pedestrian crossing. |
| 2 - Cricklewood Broadway no cycle facilities | - Limited crossing points for pedestrians. <br> - Heavily trafficked road with no provisions for cyclists <br> - 30 mph speed restriction | - 20 mph speed restrictions on the stretch through Cricklewood neighbourhood centre. <br> - Investigate feasibility of segregated cycle lane. |
|  | - Cyclist joining carriage way from Cricklewood Lane shared path must cross the Eastbound lane to join vehicle traffic. | - Investigate continuation of path |
| 4-One KSI incident at junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road | - One KSI incident at junction between Cricklewood Lane and Lichfield Road. | - Investigate improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities. |
|  | - Poorly lit underpass alongside heavily trafficked fast moving ( 30 mph ) road. | - Improve lighting provisions. <br> - Investigate barriers between pedestrians and vehicle traffic for the stretch of underpass. |
| 6 - wide junction on Claremont road | - Wide junction raises safety concerns for pedestrians using Claremont road. | - Investigate ways of pedestrians crossing to other side of Claremont Road in advance of this junction. |
| 7 - Cricklewood Broadway / Chichele Road junction. | - Large, intimidating, and busy junction with no provisions for cyclists. <br> - Near KSI cluster. | - Lower speeds to 20 mph . <br> - Early start arrangements for cyclists at all four arms of junction. <br> - Cycle box at traffic lights. |

## Area: A1

## Location: Cricklewood Broadway

## Routes Affected: 1



Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 1 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Broadway and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Cricklewood Broadway is a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many places to stop and rest in Area 1; both formal and informal.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is well overlooked so people will feel relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 1 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 1 scores moderately on this indicator.

Area: A2
Location: Cricklewood Broadway North of
Cricklewood Lane junction
Routes Affected: 5


Healthy Streets indicators.
Easy to cross/ people feel safe
Area 2 does scores moderately on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity.
Things to see and do
Area 2 like are 1 is still Cricklewood Broadway; a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are few places to stop and rest in Area 2; more benches/ informal seating could improve this.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is less well
overlooked than Area 1 so people will feel less relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 2 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 2 scores less well on this indicator.

## Area: A3

## Location: Crickleway Lane

Routes Affected: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 3 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one uncontrolled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Lane and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Area 3; Cricklewood Lane forms part of the Cricklewood neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Cricklewood Green provides a good location for markets, informal performances and other "things to see and do" Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many formal and informal places to stop and rest in Area 3. More places to rest on the Southern side of the road could improve this further.
People feel relaxed
Area 3 is moderately trafficked meaning people may not feel relaxed. Cricklewood Green on the North side of the road is a place where people could relax so improves Area 3's score for this indicator.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 3 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 3 scores less well on this indicator. Planting on Cricklewood Green improves the score slightly.

Area: A4
Location: Junction Cricklewood Lane/ Lichfield
Road
Routes Affected: 2, 3


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/people feel safe

Area 4 scores well on the easy to cross indicator. Controlled crossings on all four arms of the junction means safe crossings for pedestrians; important as this junction is used for most journeys to school from the site. The poorly lit underpass scores less well, and lighting should be improved to make people feel safer.
Things to see and do
Area 4 is mostly residential so there is not much to "see or do". More planting could improve this. Places to stop and rest
As area 4 is mostly residential there are few places to stop and rest.
People feel relaxed
Area 4 is mostly lightly trafficked, and lower vehicle speeds mean people feel more relaxed.
Not too noisy
The area shown is "not too noisy" on the most part as the traffic speeds and volumes are lower. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this further.

## Clean air

Area 4 scores ok for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs from nearby Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 4 scores less well on this indicator. The underpass does provide some shade and shelter.


Photograph 3 - Cyclits will struggle to join
highway from shared path in front of

## Cricklewood green.





Photograph 6 - wide access at Claremont Road



Photograph 9 - No obvious safe way for cyclist to cross onto Chichele Road

## Appendix TN-C

Photographic record

## Area: A1

## Location: Cricklewood Broadway

## Routes Affected: 1



Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 1 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Broadway and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Cricklewood Broadway is a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many places to stop and rest in Area 1; both formal and informal.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is well overlooked so people will feel relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 1 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 1 scores moderately on this indicator.

Area: A2
Location: Cricklewood Broadway North of
Cricklewood Lane junction
Routes Affected: 5


Healthy Streets indicators.
Easy to cross/ people feel safe
Area 2 does scores moderately on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one controlled crossing in the immediate vicinity.
Things to see and do
Area 2 like are 1 is still Cricklewood Broadway; a neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are few places to stop and rest in Area 2; more benches/ informal seating could improve this.
People feel relaxed
People may not feel "relaxed" due to the heavy traffic on Cricklewood Broadway, planting could improve this by providing a barrier between pedestrians and vehicle. The area is less well
overlooked than Area 1 so people will feel less relaxed in this regard.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 2 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 2 scores less well on this indicator.

## Area: A3

## Location: Crickleway Lane

Routes Affected: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/ people feel safe

Area 3 does not score well on the "easy to cross indicator". There is one uncontrolled crossing in the immediate vicinity. Given that there are shops and services on both side of Cricklewood Lane and a number of KSI clusters being identified here more pedestrian crossing facilities should be investigated. There are no provisions for cyclists to cross.
Things to see and do
Area 3; Cricklewood Lane forms part of the Cricklewood neighbourhood centre so there are "things to see and do". Cricklewood Green provides a good location for markets, informal performances and other "things to see and do" Perhaps more planting, seating areas, and shelter could improve this further.
Places to stop and rest
There are many formal and informal places to stop and rest in Area 3. More places to rest on the Southern side of the road could improve this further.
People feel relaxed
Area 3 is moderately trafficked meaning people may not feel relaxed. Cricklewood Green on the North side of the road is a place where people could relax so improves Area 3's score for this indicator.
Not too noisy
The area shown isn't "not too noisy" as the heavy traffic means people will have to raise their voices. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this.
Clean air
Area 3 scores badly for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 3 scores less well on this indicator. Planting on Cricklewood Green improves the score slightly.

Area: A4
Location: Junction Cricklewood Lane/ Lichfield
Road
Routes Affected: 2, 3


Healthy Streets indicators.

## Easy to cross/people feel safe

Area 4 scores well on the easy to cross indicator. Controlled crossings on all four arms of the junction means safe crossings for pedestrians; important as this junction is used for most journeys to school from the site. The poorly lit underpass scores less well, and lighting should be improved to make people feel safer.
Things to see and do
Area 4 is mostly residential so there is not much to "see or do". More planting could improve this. Places to stop and rest
As area 4 is mostly residential there are few places to stop and rest.
People feel relaxed
Area 4 is mostly lightly trafficked, and lower vehicle speeds mean people feel more relaxed.
Not too noisy
The area shown is "not too noisy" on the most part as the traffic speeds and volumes are lower. Improvements to road surface and planting could help this further.

## Clean air

Area 4 scores ok for "clean air" as high traffic volumes and high numbers of HGVs from nearby Cricklewood Broadway and Cricklewood Lane worsen air quality. There are no restrictions on vehicle types or volumes; this could improve air quality.
Shade and shelter
Less frequent shop entrances, bus shelters and limited planting mean Area 4 scores less well on this indicator. The underpass does provide some shade and shelter.

## Appendix TN-D <br> Gravity model

| 10\% | Destination category | Amenity | Postcode | Distance / Km | Route from site | Proportion within destination | Proportion of total journeys | Notes |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Primary Schools | St Agnes' Catholic | NW2 1RG | 0.3 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% | 50\% primary Schools, 50\% secondary schools, evenly distributed |
|  |  | Childs Hill | NW2 1SL | 0.6 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Claremont | NW2 1AB | 1.0 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Anson Primary | NW26AD | 1.0 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | All Saints' CE NW2 | NW22TH | 1.1 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Rimon Jewish Primary | NW11 8AE | 1.4 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Wessex Gardens | NW11 9RR | 1.6 | 3 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Gesher School | NW23BS | 0.8 | 1 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Ramin School | NW24EX | 1.0 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Mora Primary | Mora road | 0.8 | 5A | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  |  | Gladstone Park Primary | NW101LB | 1.4 | 4 | 4.5\% | 0.45\% |  |
|  | Secondary Schools | Whitefield School | NW21TR | 1.8 | 3 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | Menorah HS for girls | NW27BZ | 1.8 | 5A | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | Hampstead School | NW23RT | 0.8 | 2 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | The Crest Academy | NW27SN | 2.4 | 5A | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
|  |  | St Augustine's CE HS | NW65SN | 2.9 | 1 | 10\% | 1.00\% |  |
| 18\% | Health Centre | Cricklewood Health Centre | NW2 1DZ | 0.2 | 1 | 8\% | 1.35\% | All NHS health centres within a 1 km walking radius have been selected, with journeys distributed evenly. It is assumed that $60 \%$ of jouneys in this category are to health centres, $15 \%$ to places of worship (to include informal group meeting as well as services), and $25 \%$ to banks and post offices |
|  |  | Burnley Practice Branch | NW26TU | 0.3 | 5A | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Chichele Rd | NW23AN | 0.3 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Wilesden Green Surgery | NW23UY | 0.5 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Greenfield Medical Cnetre | NW21HS | 0.6 | 3 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Mapesbury Medical Group | NW23PS | 0.8 | 1 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Walm Lane | NW24RT | 1.0 | 4 | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  |  | Oxgate Gardens | NW26EA | 1.1 | 5A | 8\% | 1.35\% |  |
|  | Place of Worship | St Agnes Catholic Church | NW21HR | 0.3 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Claremont Free Church | NW21PY | 0.5 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% | The nearest place of worship for the most popular local faiths have been slected with the 1 km radius extended to 1.4 km to include the nearest Synagogue. |
|  |  | St. Gabriels C of E | NW24RX | 0.8 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Central Mosque of Brent | NW24PU | 1.1 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Childs Hill Baptist Church | NW22JY | 1.1 | 3 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Shree Swaminarayan Temple | NW25RG | 1.4 | 4 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  |  | Shomrei Hadath Synagogue | NW61DD | 1.4 | 2 | 2\% | 0.39\% |  |
|  | Other | Post office | NW23HR | 0.2 | 5 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Barclays | NW23HF | 0.2 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Nationwide | NW23HF | 0.2 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
|  |  | Santander | NW23HF | 0.3 | 1 | 6\% | 1.13\% |  |
| 28\% | Retail | Tesco Express | NW23DR | 0.2 | 5 | 10\% | 2.80\% | The vast majority of retail destinations are found on Cricklewoodwood Broadway. The retail destinations North of the site that would perhaps use depot Approach tend do be larger retail |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway High Street |  | 0.0 | 1 | 90\% | 25.20\% |  |
| 31\% | Leisure | The Manor Health \& Leisure Club | NW26PG | 0.5 | 5A | 10\% | 3.10\% | including DIY shops where travel by foot is less popular, with the exception of the Tesco Express included here. Assumption made: $90 \%$ to |
|  |  | Virgin active | NW2 2DS | 0.3 | 3 | 10\% | 3.10\% | Cricklewood Broadway, 10\% to Tescos Express. |
|  |  | Fitness Planet Gym | NW2 6NX | 0.2 | 5A | 10\% | 3.10\% |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Play Area | NW2 3DX | 0.1 | 5A | 15\% | 4.65\% | Leisure to include the nearest open spaces and |
|  |  | Gladstone Park Open Space and |  |  |  |  |  | playgrounds as well as gyms and eat/ drink establishments. Assumption: Gym 30\% (evenly |
|  |  |  | NW2 6NT |  |  |  |  | distributed between 3 nearest), Open Space $30 \%$, |
|  |  |  |  | 1.8 | 5A | 15\% | 4.65\% | Eat/Drink 40\% |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway High Street |  | 0.0 | 1 | 40\% | 12.40\% | The vast majority of eat and drink establishments |
| 13\% | Place of work ATZ 'town centres' (London Plan 2015) | Cricklewood - district (to become metropolitan) |  | 0.0 | 1 | 40\% | 5.200\% | destinations are found on Cricklewoodwood Broadway. |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Place of work destinations are 'town centres' |
|  |  | Temple Fortune - district |  | 1.3 | 3 | 15\% | 1.950\% | taken from the London Plan (2015) with all |
|  |  | Wilesden Green - district |  | 1.3 | 4 | 15\% | 1.950\% | within a 2 km walking radius included here. Crciklewood 40\%, Even distribution between |
|  |  | West Hampstead - district |  | 1.9 | 2 | 15\% | 1.950\% | others. |
|  |  | Golder's Green - district |  | 2.1 | 3 | 15\% | 1.950\% |  |


|  |  | Station / Stop |  |  |  | Number of trips |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mode |  |  | AM Peak |  | Daily |  | Higher proportional split asigned to the nearer station. Other UG |
| 26\% | Rail | Wilensden Green (jubilee) | UG | 1.1 | 4 | 40\% | 53 | 45 | 421 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood (Thameslink) | overground | 0.2 | 3 | 60\% | 80 | 67 | 631 |  |
|  | Bus | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 16, 32,245,266,31 | 3.2 | 5 | 25\% | 32 | 30 | 32 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown (BN) | 32,322 | 0.2 | 1 | 15\% | 19 | 18 | 19 |  |
| 13\% |  | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 189,226,245,260 | 0.2 | 1 | 20\% | 25 | 24 | 25 |  |
|  |  | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 189,226,260, 460 | 0.2 | 1 | 20\% | 25 | 24 | 25 | The distribution of journeys to bus stations |
|  |  | Cricklewood Ln stop BP | 266 | 0.2 | 5 | 10\% | 13 | 12 | 13 | is |
|  |  | Cricklewood Ln stop CO | C11 | 0.2 | 2 | 10\% | 13 | 12 | 13 |  |


|  |  |  |  |  | Total trips |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Route | No. of destinations. | Proportion of total journeys |  |  | AM Peak |  |  | PM Peak |  |  | Daily |  |  |
|  |  | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total | Walking | Cycling | Total |
| 1 | 13 | 48.8\% | 1.5\% | 50\% | 173 | 0 | 173 | 173 | 0 | 173 | 112 | 1 | 113 |
| 2 | 4 | 3.2\% | 0.1\% | 3\% | 19 | 0 | 20 | 19 | 0 | 19 | 97 | 0 | 97 |
| 3 | 15 | 12.8\% | 0.4\% | 13\% | 107 | 0 | 107 | 95 | 0 | 95 | 967 | 0 | 967 |
| 4 | 11 | 8.3\% | 0.3\% | 9\% | 71 | 0 | 71 | 63 | 0 | 63 | 637 | 0 | 637 |
| 5 | 13 | 3.8\% | 0.1\% | 4\% | 52 | 0 | 52 | 50 | 0 | 50 | 144 | 0 | 144 |
| 5A | 9 | 20.0\% | 0.6\% | 21\% | 43 | 0 | 43 | 44 | 0 | 44 | 524 | 1 | 524 |

## Bus stops

| Bus Route | Direction | Nearest Stop | Stop Name | Route no. from site |
| :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 16 | Victoria | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 32 | Edgeware | BN | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Kilburn Park | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 189 | Brent Cross | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Oxford Circus | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 226 | Ealing Broadway | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Golder's Green | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 245 | Aplerton | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 260 | Golders Green | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 266 | Brent Cross | BP | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Hammersmith | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BP | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 316 | White City | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| 332 | Neasdon | BN | Cricklewood Broadway The Crown | 5 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Paddington | BD | Cricklewood Ln stop BD | 1 Cricklewood Green |
| 460 | North Finchley | CE | Cricklewood Broadwat CE | 5 Cricklewood Green |
| C11 | Willesden | CW | Cricklewood Broadwat CW | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  | Archway | CO | Cricklewood Ln stop CO | 1 Cricklewood Green |
|  |  |  | 2 Cricklewood Green |  |



| Bus route | Towards | Bus stops |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 16 | Victoria | (1®(1)(1) |
| 32 | Edgware | -®@(®®®1) |
|  | Kilburn Park | (๑®(ฺ)(1) |
| 189 (1)w | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | -(1)ฺ¢ |
|  | Oxford Clicus | -(1)(®®ฺ\| |
| 226 | Ealing Broadway | (1) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
|  | Golders Green | ๑やฺฺ( |
| 245 | Alperton | (®®(๑) |
|  | Golders Green | (1)(¢)(9) |
| 260 | Golders Green | (๑๑) |
|  | White City | (1)(3) |
| 266 | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | (10)®® |
|  | Hammersmith | (1)(¢)(3) |
| 316 | White City | ©®(®)(1) |
| 332 | Neasden | -லவ®®(6) |
|  | Paddington | -®®®®®(1) |
| 460 | North Finchley | -(ִ) |
|  | Willesden | (1)( |
| CII | Archway | ๑๑ฺ๑๑๑ |
|  | Brent Cross Shopping Centre | ๑@๑๑๑๑ |

## Journeys by purpose

Travel in London Report 12 (TfL)
Figure 4.4 Trips per person per day

| Usual workplace | 0.39 | $18 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{9 \%}$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Other work | 0.16 | $7 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{4 \%}$ |
| Education | 0.19 | $9 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 0 \%}$ |
| Shopping | 0.51 | $24 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{2 8 \%}$ |
| Leisure | 0.57 | $27 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{3 1 \%}$ |
| Other | 0.32 | $15 \%$ |  | $\mathbf{1 8 \%}$ |

2.14

TA - Table 11.11 B1 office trip rates


* adjusted figure represents walking and cycling by journey purpose (i.e. bus and rail journeys to work removed)



## Appendix K

TRICS® data

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 01-RETAIL
Category : K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL VEHICLES
```


## Selected regions and areas:

## 03 SOUTH WEST

GS GLOUCESTERSHIRE
1 days
This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 8687 to 8687 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 2575 to 16150 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: 01/01/12 to 15/07/17
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:
Thursday 1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
No Sub Category
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
A1
1 days

This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

Population within 500m Range:
All Surveys Included

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
10,001 to 15,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
25,001 to 50,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:
1.1 to $1.5 \quad 1$ days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

Petrol filling station:
Included in the survey count 0 days
Excluded from count or no filling station 1 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that include petrol filling station activity, and the number of surveys that do not.

Travel Plan:
No 1 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

## PTAL Rating:

No PTAL Present 1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 GS-01-K-02 RETAI L PARK EASTERN AVENUE GLOUCESTER BARNWOOD Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area: Survey date: THURSDAY 28/11/13

## GLOUCESTERSHI RE

Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.150 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 | 1 | 8687 | 0.185 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.472 | 1 | 8687 | 0.345 | 1 | 8687 | 0.817 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.495 | 1 | 8687 | 0.414 | 1 | 8687 | 0.909 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.345 | 1 | 8687 | 0.368 | 1 | 8687 | 0.713 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 | 1 | 8687 | 0.530 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.207 | 1 | 8687 | 0.207 | 1 | 8687 | 0.414 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.184 | 1 | 8687 | 0.184 | 1 | 8687 | 0.368 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 1.001 | 1 | 8687 | 1.036 | 1 | 8687 | 2.037 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.909 | 1 | 8687 | 1.048 | 1 | 8687 | 1.957 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.138 | 1 | 8687 | 0.127 | 1 | 8687 | 0.265 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.173 | 1 | 8687 | 0.254 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.092 | 1 | 8687 | 0.161 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 4.374 |  |  | 4.317 |  |  | 8.691 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected: Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

8687-8687 (units: sqm)
01/01/12-15/07/17
1
0
0
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL OGVS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.024 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.150 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.128 |  |  | 0.140 |  |  | 0.268 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip <br> Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.069 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.058 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.070 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.046 | 1 | 8687 | 0.081 | 1 | 8687 | 0.127 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.023 | 1 | 8687 | 0.012 | 1 | 8687 | 0.035 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 | 1 | 8687 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.196 |  |  | 0.140 |  |  | 0.336 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL VEHICLE OCCUPANTS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 01 - RETAIL/K - RETAIL PARK - EXCLUDING FOOD MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS <br> Calculation factor: 100 sqm <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

Land Use : 03-RESIDENTIAL
Category : C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

## 01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| KN | KENSINGTON AND CHELSEA | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Secondary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Number of dwellings |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Actual Range: | 294 to 472 (units: ) |  |
| Range Selected by User: | 204 to 613 (units: ) |  |
| Public Transport Provision: |  |  |
| Selection by: |  | Include all surveys |
| Date Range: 01/0 | 09 to 30/11/16 |  |

This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Selected survey days: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Tuesday | 1 days |
| Wednesday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre
1
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone 1
Residential Zone 1
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
C3 2 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
25,001 to 50,000
1 days
50,001 to 100,000
1 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 2 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.

## Car ownership within 5 miles:

0.6 to $1.0 \quad 2$ days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

## Travel Plan:

$\frac{\text { Trave }}{\text { No }}$
2 days

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

| PTAL Rating: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| 5 Very Good | 1 days |
| 6a Excellent | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

1 BT-03-C-02 BLOCKS OF FLATS ENGINEERS WAY

WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Number of dwellings: 472
Survey date: WEDNESDAY 30/11/16
2
2 KN-03-C-02 BLOCK OF FLATS
BECKFORD CLOSE
SOUTH KENSINGTON
Edge of Town Centre
Residential Zone
Total Number of dwellings:
Survey date: TUESDAY

## BRENT

Survey Type: MANUAL
KENSI NGTON AND CHELSEA

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:

```
294-472 (units:)
```

Survey date date range: 01/01/09-30/11/16
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
0
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS $®$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL OGVS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.002 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.001 | 2 | 383 | 0.002 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 | 2 | 383 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.002 |  |  | 0.002 |  |  | 0.004 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period



This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays: 0

Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  |  | ARRIVALS |  |  | EPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.012 | 2 | 383 | 0.031 | 2 | 383 | 0.043 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.117 | 2 | 383 | 0.142 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.033 | 2 | 383 | 0.038 | 2 | 383 | 0.071 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.062 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.025 | 2 | 383 | 0.054 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.020 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.038 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.073 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.059 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.029 | 2 | 383 | 0.064 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.031 | 2 | 383 | 0.023 | 2 | 383 | 0.054 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.107 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.059 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.096 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.037 | 2 | 383 | 0.074 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.065 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: | 0.475 |  |  | 0.546 |  |  | 1.021 |  |  |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [ No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED <br> MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRI ANS <br> Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS <br> BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No. } \\ & \text { Days } \end{aligned}$ | Ave. DWELLS | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.034 | 2 | 383 | 0.065 | 2 | 383 | 0.099 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.034 | 2 | 383 | 0.141 | 2 | 383 | 0.175 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.035 | 2 | 383 | 0.043 | 2 | 383 | 0.078 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.051 | 2 | 383 | 0.078 | 2 | 383 | 0.129 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.106 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 | 2 | 383 | 0.163 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.077 | 2 | 383 | 0.055 | 2 | 383 | 0.132 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.060 | 2 | 383 | 0.094 | 2 | 383 | 0.154 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.082 | 2 | 383 | 0.154 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.087 | 2 | 383 | 0.072 | 2 | 383 | 0.159 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.114 | 2 | 383 | 0.070 | 2 | 383 | 0.184 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.085 | 2 | 383 | 0.074 | 2 | 383 | 0.159 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.061 | 2 | 383 | 0.027 | 2 | 383 | 0.088 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.076 | 2 | 383 | 0.023 | 2 | 383 | 0.099 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 383 | 0.057 | 2 | 383 | 0.030 | 2 | 383 | 0.087 |
| 21:00-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.949 |  |  | 0.911 |  |  | 1.860 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09-30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09 - 30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:0

Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 03 - RESIDENTIAL/C - FLATS PRIVATELY OWNED

MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 1 DWELLS
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
294-472 (units:) 01/01/09-30/11/16

Number of Saturdays: 2

Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

Land Use $\quad: \quad 02$ - EMPLOYMENT
Category $\quad$ A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

## 01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| CI | CITY OF LONDON | 1 days |
| WH | WANDSWORTH | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 920 to 1951 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 408 to 2000 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $03 / 06 / 15$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Wednesday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Thursday | 1 days |
| Friday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 3 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Town Centre 2
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Commercial Zone 1
Development Zone 1
Built-Up Zone 1
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

$\frac{\text { Use Class: }}{\text { B1 }}$
3 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS $®$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:

| 10,001 to 15,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 50,001 to 100,000 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:

| 250,001 to 500,000 | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 500,001 or More | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.5 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.6 to 1.0 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

| Travel Plan: | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes | 2 days |

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

```
4 Good
    1 days
5 Very Good
1 days
6a Excellent 1 days
```

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 BT-02-A-03
OFFICES

## BRENT

EMPIRE WAY
WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area:
920 sqm Survey date: WEDNESDAY 03/06/15
2 Cl -02-A-03 OFFICES
MONUMENT STREET
CITY OF LONDON

## MONUMENT

Town Centre
Commercial Zone
Total Gross floor area: 1951 sqm
Survey date: FRIDAY 29/11/13
3
WH-02-A-02 OFFICES
BATTERSEA PARK ROAD BATTERSEA

Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: 1215 sqm Survey date: THURSDAY $10 / 05 / 12$ Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLES
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.341 |  |  | 1.267 |  |  | 2.608 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
920-1951 (units: sqm)
Survey date date range: 01/01/12-03/06/15
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
3
Number of Saturdays:
0
Number of Sundays:
0
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
0
Surveys manually removed from selection:
This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE <br> MULTI -MODAL CYCLI STS Calculation factor: 100 sqm BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 0.267 |  |  | 0.268 |  |  | 0.535 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.048 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.391 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.659 |  |  | 1.537 |  |  | 3.196 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.342 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 | 3 | 1362 | 0.906 | 3 | 1362 | 1.420 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.906 | 3 | 1362 | 1.101 | 3 | 1362 | 2.007 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 | 3 | 1362 | 0.661 | 3 | 1362 | 1.273 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.905 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 | 3 | 1362 | 0.392 | 3 | 1362 | 1.028 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.514 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.734 | 3 | 1362 | 1.077 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 | 3 | 1362 | 0.661 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.416 | 3 | 1362 | 0.538 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.342 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.465 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.146 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 6.925 |  |  | 6.778 |  |  | 13.703 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02-EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL BUS/ TRAM PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.294 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.294 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.244 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.367 | 3 | 1362 | 0.367 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.883 |  |  | 1.833 |  |  | 3.716 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane
Bristol
Licence No: 337901

## TRIP RATE for Land Use 02 - EMPLOYMENT/A - OFFICE

MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-00:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 00:30-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-01:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:30-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-02:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:30-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-03:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:30-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-04:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:30-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-05:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:30-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-06:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:30-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-07:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.147 |
| 07:30-08:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.220 |
| 08:00-08:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.636 |
| 08:30-09:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.979 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.979 |
| 09:00-09:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.563 |
| 09:30-10:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.245 |
| 10:00-10:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.196 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 |
| 10:30-11:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 11:00-11:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.195 |
| 11:30-12:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:00-12:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 12:30-13:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 |
| 13:00-13:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 | 3 | 1362 | 0.098 |
| 13:30-14:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.024 | 3 | 1362 | 0.073 | 3 | 1362 | 0.097 |
| 14:00-14:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 |
| 14:30-15:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.293 |
| 15:00-15:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 | 3 | 1362 | 0.122 |
| 15:30-16:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 | 3 | 1362 | 0.343 |
| 16:00-16:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 | 3 | 1362 | 0.685 |
| 16:30-17:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.049 | 3 | 1362 | 0.269 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 17:00-17:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.587 | 3 | 1362 | 0.587 |
| 17:30-18:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 | 3 | 1362 | 0.612 |
| 18:00-18:30 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 | 3 | 1362 | 0.318 |
| 18:30-19:00 | 3 | 1362 | 0.000 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 | 3 | 1362 | 0.171 |
| 19:00-19:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 19:30-20:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:00-20:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 20:30-21:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:00-21:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21:30-22:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:00-22:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 22:30-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-23:30 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:30-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.694 |  |  | 3.643 |  |  | 7.337 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 06-HOTEL, FOOD & DRINK
```

Category : B-RESTAURANTS

MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES

## Selected regions and areas:

01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LB | LAMBETH | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS® sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 150 to 194 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 150 to 341 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision: Selection by:

Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $24 / 06 / 19$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:
Monday
2 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.
Selected survey types:

| Manual count | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre 1
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known.

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone
1
No Sub Category
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
A3 2 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:
50,001 to 100,000 1 days

100,001 or More
1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 2 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:
0.6 to 1.0
2 days

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

| Travel Plan: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Yes | 1 days |
| No | 1 days |

This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

| 5 Very Good | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| $6 b$ (High) Excellent | 1 days |

1 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters
1 BT-06-B-01
COFFEE SHOP \& RESTAURANT

## BRENT

EMPIRE WAY
WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone

| Total Gross floor area: | 150 sqm |
| :---: | :--- |
| Survey date: MONDAY | $18 / 05 / 15$ |

2 LB-06-B-01
PORTUGUESE RESTAURANT
STOCKWELL ROAD
STOCKWELL
Edge of Town Centre
No Sub Category
Total Gross floor area:
Survey date: MONDAY $24 / 06 / 19 \quad$ Survey Type: MANUAL
This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 11.849 |  |  | 11.046 |  |  | 22.895 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

150-194 (units: sqm
01/01/12 - 24/06/19
2
0
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS® user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 1.031 |  |  | 0.582 |  |  | 1.613 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL VEHI CLE OCCUPANTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.454 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.454 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 3.198 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 5.233 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 | 2 | 172 | 9.302 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 5.523 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 | 2 | 172 | 9.011 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 | 2 | 172 | 4.651 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.034 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 22.543 |  |  | 20.057 |  |  | 42.600 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 1.546 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.546 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 2.577 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.906 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 | 2 | 172 | 2.906 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 3.198 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 5.233 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 3.488 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 3.779 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 5.232 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.616 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 | 2 | 172 | 4.360 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 4.942 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 | 2 | 172 | 3.779 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 26.993 |  |  | 26.770 |  |  | 53.763 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAI L PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.290 |  |  | 3.712 |  |  | 7.002 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL Underground Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.582 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 3.290 |  |  | 3.712 |  |  | 7.002 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 06 - HOTEL, FOOD \& DRINK/B - RESTAURANTS
MULTI-MODAL Bus Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 07:00-08:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 | 1 | 194 | 0.000 | 1 | 194 | 1.031 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 0.515 | 1 | 194 | 1.030 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.162 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.453 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.744 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 | 2 | 172 | 2.907 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.326 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 | 2 | 172 | 1.163 | 2 | 172 | 2.035 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.291 | 2 | 172 | 0.581 | 2 | 172 | 0.872 |
| 22:00-23:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| 23:00-24:00 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 | 2 | 172 | 0.000 |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 9.909 |  |  | 10.398 |  |  | 20.307 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## TRIP RATE CALCULATI ON SELECTI ON PARAMETERS:

```
Land Use : 07-LEISURE
Category : K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL VEHICLES
```


## Selected regions and areas:

01 GREATER LONDON

| BT | BRENT | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HG | HARINGEY | 1 days |
| IS | ISLINGTON | 1 days |

This section displays the number of survey days per TRICS $\circledR^{\circledR}$ sub-region in the selected set

## Primary Filtering selection:

This data displays the chosen trip rate parameter and its selected range. Only sites that fall within the parameter range are included in the trip rate calculation.

| Parameter: | Gross floor area |
| :--- | :--- |
| Actual Range: | 1225 to 1750 (units: sqm) |
| Range Selected by User: | 204 to 4057 (units: sqm) |
| Parking Spaces Range: | All Surveys Included |

Public Transport Provision:
Selection by: Include all surveys
Date Range: $\quad 01 / 01 / 12$ to $28 / 06 / 16$
This data displays the range of survey dates selected. Only surveys that were conducted within this date range are included in the trip rate calculation.

Selected survey days:

| Tuesday | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Wednesday | 1 days |
| Thursday | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys by day of the week.

| Selected survey types: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Manual count | 3 days |
| Directional ATC Count | 0 days |

This data displays the number of manual classified surveys and the number of unclassified ATC surveys, the total adding up to the overall number of surveys in the selected set. Manual surveys are undertaken using staff, whilst ATC surveys are undertaking using machines.

Selected Locations:
Edge of Town Centre
2
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre) 1
This data displays the number of surveys per main location category within the selected set. The main location categories consist of Free Standing, Edge of Town, Suburban Area, Neighbourhood Centre, Edge of Town Centre, Town Centre and Not Known

Selected Location Sub Categories:
Development Zone 1

Built-Up Zone 2
This data displays the number of surveys per location sub-category within the selected set. The location sub-categories consist of Commercial Zone, Industrial Zone, Development Zone, Residential Zone, Retail Zone, Built-Up Zone, Village, Out of Town, High Street and No Sub Category.

## Secondary Filtering selection:

Use Class:
3 days
This data displays the number of surveys per Use Class classification within the selected set. The Use Classes Order 2005 has been used for this purpose, which can be found within the Library module of TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$.

## Secondary Filtering selection (Cont.):

Population within 1 mile:

50,001 to 100,000
2 days
100,001 or More

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 1-mile radii of population.
Population within 5 miles:
500,001 or More 3 days
This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated 5 -mile radii of population.
Car ownership within 5 miles:

| 0.5 or Less | 1 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 0.6 to 1.0 | 2 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys within stated ranges of average cars owned per residential dwelling, within a radius of 5 -miles of selected survey sites.

## Travel Plan:

Yes 1 days

No
2 days
This data displays the number of surveys within the selected set that were undertaken at sites with Travel Plans in place, and the number of surveys that were undertaken at sites without Travel Plans.

PTAL Rating:

| 6 a Excellent | 2 days |
| :--- | :--- |
| 6 b (High) Excellent | 1 days |

This data displays the number of selected surveys with PTAL Ratings.

| TRICS 7.7.1 | 070420 B19.39 | Database right of TRICS Consortium Limited, 2020. All rights reserved | Wednesday10/ 06/ 20 <br> Page <br> $\mathbf{3}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Entran Ltd | Chapel Pill Lane | Bristol | Licence No: 337901 |

LIST OF SITES relevant to selection parameters

## EMPIRE WAY

WEMBLEY
Suburban Area (PPS6 Out of Centre)
Development Zone
Total Gross floor area:
2
HG-07-K-02
LORDSHIP LANE
WOOD GREEN
Edge of Town Centre
Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area:

3 IS-07-K-02 GOSWELL ROAD ANGEL

Edge of Town Centre Built-Up Zone
Total Gross floor area: Survey date: TUESDAY

1750 sqm

NEDNESDAY $\begin{array}{lr}\text { Survey date: THURSDAY } & 18 / 09 / 14\end{array}$ THE GYM

1750 sqm 03/06/15
THE GYM e

## BRENT

都

Survey Type: MANUAL HARI NGEY

Survey Type: MANUAL

## ISLINGTON

Survey Type: MANUAL

This section provides a list of all survey sites and days in the selected set. For each individual survey site, it displays a unique site reference code and site address, the selected trip rate calculation parameter and its value, the day of the week and date of each survey, and whether the survey was a manual classified count or an ATC count.

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 1.449 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 | 3 | 1472 | 1.495 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.453 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.951 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 | 3 | 1472 | 0.951 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.883 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.928 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.815 | 3 | 1472 | 0.294 | 3 | 1472 | 1.109 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.155 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 2.242 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.065 | 3 | 1472 | 1.223 | 3 | 1472 | 2.288 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.725 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 | 3 | 1472 | 1.835 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 | 3 | 1472 | 0.996 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 9.873 |  |  | 10.077 |  |  | 19.950 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

The survey data, graphs and all associated supporting information, contained within the TRICS Database are published by TRICS Consortium Limited ("the Company") and the Company claims copyright and database rights in this published work. The Company authorises those who possess a current TRICS licence to access the TRICS Database and copy the data contained within the TRICS Database for the licence holders' use only. Any resulting copy must retain all copyrights and other proprietary notices, and any disclaimer contained thereon.

The Company accepts no responsibility for loss which may arise from reliance on data contained in the TRICS Database. [No warranty of any kind, express or implied, is made as to the data contained in the TRICS Database.]

## Parameter summary

Trip rate parameter range selected:
Survey date date range:
Number of weekdays (Monday-Friday):
Number of Saturdays:
Number of Sundays:
Surveys automatically removed from selection:
Surveys manually removed from selection:

1225-1750 (units: sqm)
01/01/12-28/06/16
3
1
0
0

This section displays a quick summary of some of the data filtering selections made by the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ user. The trip rate calculation parameter range of all selected surveys is displayed first, followed by the range of minimum and maximum survey dates selected by the user. Then, the total number of selected weekdays and weekend days in the selected set of surveys are show. Finally, the number of survey days that have been manually removed from the selected set outside of the standard filtering procedure are displayed.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL CYCLISTS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.045 | 3 | 1472 | 0.158 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.226 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.091 | 3 | 1472 | 0.023 | 3 | 1472 | 0.114 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.068 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.045 | 3 | 1472 | 0.158 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.091 | 3 | 1472 | 0.318 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.386 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.363 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 2.379 |  |  | 2.380 |  |  | 4.759 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL PEDESTRIANS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period


This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901
TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL TOTAL RAIL PASSENGERS
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

| Time Range | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.113 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.294 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.385 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.136 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.295 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 0.249 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.340 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.227 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.431 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.362 | 3 | 1472 | 0.204 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.997 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.997 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 1.427 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.744 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 | 3 | 1472 | 2.718 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 1.178 | 3 | 1472 | 1.948 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.838 | 3 | 1472 | 1.359 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.181 | 3 | 1472 | 0.521 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 7.363 |  |  | 6.749 |  |  | 14.112 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

Entran Ltd Chapel Pill Lane Bristol
Licence No: 337901

TRIP RATE for Land Use 07 - LEISURE/K - FITNESS CLUB (PRIVATE)
MULTI-MODAL Bus Passengers
Calculation factor: 100 sqm
BOLD print indicates peak (busiest) period

|  | ARRIVALS |  |  | DEPARTURES |  |  | TOTALS |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Time Range | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate | No. Days | Ave. GFA | Trip Rate |
| 00:00-01:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 01:00-02:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 02:00-03:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 03:00-04:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 04:00-05:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 05:00-06:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 06:00-07:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.430 | 3 | 1472 | 0.159 | 3 | 1472 | 0.589 |
| 07:00-08:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.272 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 0.680 |
| 08:00-09:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 0.317 | 3 | 1472 | 0.861 |
| 09:00-10:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.929 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 1.427 |
| 10:00-11:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 1.110 |
| 11:00-12:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 | 3 | 1472 | 1.472 |
| 12:00-13:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.770 | 3 | 1472 | 0.747 | 3 | 1472 | 1.517 |
| 13:00-14:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.657 | 3 | 1472 | 0.544 | 3 | 1472 | 1.201 |
| 14:00-15:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.453 | 3 | 1472 | 0.566 | 3 | 1472 | 1.019 |
| 15:00-16:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.498 | 3 | 1472 | 0.476 | 3 | 1472 | 0.974 |
| 16:00-17:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.725 | 3 | 1472 | 0.680 | 3 | 1472 | 1.405 |
| 17:00-18:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.359 | 3 | 1472 | 0.702 | 3 | 1472 | 2.061 |
| 18:00-19:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.857 | 3 | 1472 | 1.065 | 3 | 1472 | 2.922 |
| 19:00-20:00 | 3 | 1472 | 1.336 | 3 | 1472 | 1.518 | 3 | 1472 | 2.854 |
| 20:00-21:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.906 | 3 | 1472 | 2.265 | 3 | 1472 | 3.171 |
| 21:00-22:00 | 3 | 1472 | 0.408 | 3 | 1472 | 1.087 | 3 | 1472 | 1.495 |
| 22:00-23:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 23:00-24:00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Total Rates: |  |  | 12.458 |  |  | 12.300 |  |  | 24.758 |

This section displays the trip rate results based on the selected set of surveys and the selected count type (shown just above the table). It is split by three main columns, representing arrivals trips, departures trips, and total trips (arrivals plus departures). Within each of these main columns are three sub-columns. These display the number of survey days where count data is included (per time period), the average value of the selected trip rate calculation parameter (per time period), and the trip rate result (per time period). Total trip rates (the sum of the column) are also displayed at the foot of the table.

To obtain a trip rate, the average (mean) trip rate parameter value (TRP) is first calculated for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. The average (mean) number of arrivals, departures or totals (whichever applies) is also calculated (COUNT) for all selected survey days that have count data available for the stated time period. Then, the average count is divided by the average trip rate parameter value, and multiplied by the stated calculation factor (shown just above the table and abbreviated here as FACT). So, the method is: COUNT/TRP*FACT. Trip rates are then rounded to 3 decimal places.

## Appendix L

Census journey to work review

## QS701EW - Method of travel to work

ONS Crown Copyright Reserved [from Nomis on 9 December 2020]
population All usual residents aged 16 to 74
units Persons
area type 2011 wards
area name E05000045 : Childs Hill
rural urban Total
Method of Travel to Work 2011

| All categories: Method of travel to work | 14,850 |
| :--- | ---: |
| Work mainly at or from home | 836 |
| Underground, metro, light rail, tram | 2,926 |
| Train | 606 |
| Bus, minibus or coach | 1,837 |
| Taxi | 36 |
| Motorcycle, scooter or moped | 117 |
| Driving a car or van | 2,304 |
| Passenger in a car or van | 157 |
| Bicycle | 247 |
| On foot | 535 |
| Other method of travel to work | 98 |
| Not in employment | 5,151 |

In order to protect against disclosure of personal information, records have been swapped between different geographic areas. Some counts will be affected, particularly small counts at the lowest geographies.

Used the orange cells data

| Mode Share |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle | Car Pass' | Walk | Cycle | Bus | Rail |
| 41\% | 3\% | 9\% | 4\% | 32\% | 11\% |


| Mode Share (adjusted to better represent development) |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Vehicle | Car Pass' | Walk | Cycle | Bus | Rail |
| $14 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $14 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $47 \%$ | $15 \%$ |

Mode Share


# Appendix M <br> Link flow diagrams 

















From:

Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:
Attachments:


15 April 2021 11:20
Griffiths, Carl
John Mumby;
RE: Cricklewood - Tepbrook Response
Town Legal - Response Letter.pdf; 2020-11-26_Response_Tepbrook_IS05_15075.pdf; 20210312 Cricklewood_L5_RF .pdf

Hi Carl,
I know we shared the transport response to the Tepbrook objection with you a couple of weeks ago, but we wanted to ensure that you also had the attached responses from GIA and Town Legal. The enclosed technical letters set out the applicants response to the key matters raised. These letters are for your internal review at this stage. But please do advise if the responses need to be uploaded to the statutory register.

Many thanks,



Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on: Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: @iceniprojects.com>
Sent: 22 March 2021 16:42
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters

Hi Carl,
Did you have any comments on the letters issued last week?
Critically, the revised TA draws the same conclusion as the original submission, that the Proposed Development will result in a net reduction in vehicle trips on the local highway network, both during the highway peaks and across the day as a whole. We should be in a position to issue the revised TA shortly. We let me know you views in terms of consultation?

Many thanks,

Planner,Planning



Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From:
@iceniprojects.com>
Sent: 16 March 2021 12:15
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters

Hi Carl,
Further to my email this morning l've updated TA cover letter (attached) for your review. I'll follow up with TA hopefully later today. Please could we catch up quickly on the re-consultation point at some point today?

Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog
Iceni Projects will be supporting the LandAid SleepOut on 11 March. Click here to offer your support in ending youth homelessness. Thank you.

```
x
```


## From:

Sent: 16 March 2021 08:16
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); @iceniprojects.com>
Subject: Cricklewood - Transport Letters
Morning Carl,
As discussed briefly yesterday Entran have completed the revised TA and are just finalising the appendices. In the meantime, we wanted to share the accompanying letters for your review.

The first (L4) is a cover letter for the revised TA. This is necessary because the response to the LBB comments is a mixture of new work, further clarification and rebuttals. These are set out in the letter in order to keep the revised TA as 'clean' as possible. The second letter (L5) is a response to the Tepbrook letter, this isn't for public view, at this stage. We'll be issuing a combined response to Tepbrook this week.

Please could you advise on timescales for re-consultation once the TA is registered along with the updated parameter plan?

Many thanks,



Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog
Iceni Projects will be supporting the LandAid SleepOut on 11 March.
Click here to offer your support in ending youth homelessness. Thank you.


[^7]| From: | John Georgoulias [john.georgoulias@thameswater.co.uk](mailto:john.georgoulias@thameswater.co.uk) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 20 April 2021 17:09 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT \& 20/3906/FUL - DTS 64504 \& 66114 |

Dear Carl,

Apologies,

For application 20/3906/FUL we have requested a foul water and surface water condition, not just surface water as I've outlined below.

Kind regards

John

## John Georgoulias

Developer Services - Thames Valley Regional Development Planning Lead
Mobile 07747645428 Landline 02035779959
john.georgoulias@thameswater.co.uk
Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, WD3 9SQ
Find us online at developers.thameswater.co.uk


New site? Need network capacity information? Developers can make a pre-planning enquiry at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning

## From: John Georgoulias

Sent: 20 April 2021 16:59
To: carl.griffiths@barnet.gov.uk
Subject: 20/3564/OUT \& 20/3906/FUL - DTS 64504 \& 66114

Dear Carl,

I would like to draw your attention to our responses to planning application 20/3564/OUT \& 20/3906/FUL which I believe is still pending a decision. Thames Water have requested conditions as we have concerns about the existing foul water \& clean water capacity to serve the development for 20/3564/OUT \& the existing surface water capacity for 20/3906/FUL.

Are you able to confirm when a decision is likely to be made for both these applications and given our response, are you minded to attach our requested conditions ahead of those concerns being addressed by the developer with Thames Water? We are keen to work with the developer so would be happy to liaise with the directly if you are able to provide details of the best point of contact.

I'd be happy to discuss this with you further.

## Kind regards

John

## John Georgoulias

Developer Services - Thames Valley Regional Development Planning Lead Mobile 07747645428 Landline 02035779959
iohn.georgoulias@thameswater.co.uk

Maple Lodge Sewage Treatment Works, Denham Way, Rickmansworth, WD3 9SQ
Find us online at developers.thameswater.co.uk


## New site? Need network capacity information? Developers can make a pre-planning enquiry at thameswater.co.uk/preplanning

Visit us online www.thameswater.co.uk, follow us on twitter www.twitter.com/thameswater or find us on www.facebook.com/thameswater. We're happy to help you 24/7.

Thames Water Limited (company number 2366623) and Thames Water Utilities Limited (company number 2366661) are companies registered in England and Wales, both are registered at Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading, Berkshire RG1 8DB. This email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the person it was sent to. Any views or opinions in this email are those of the author and don't necessarily represent those of Thames Water Limited or its subsidiaries. If you aren't the intended recipient of this email, please don't copy, use, forward or disclose its contents to any other person - please destroy and delete the message and any attachments from your system.

Click here to report this email as spam to Guildford Borough Council's email security provider.

Guildford Borough Council has arrangements for handling sensitive emails. For more information on how you may be affected please go to www.quildford.qov.uk/SecureEmail. If you have received this message in error, please (a) notify the sender immediately, (b) destroy this email and any attachments, and (c) do not use, copy, and/or disclose this email or any attachments to any person.

Guildford Borough Council regularly updates virus software to ensure as far as possible that its networks are free of viruses. However, you will need to check this message and any attachments for viruses as Guildford Borough Council can take no responsibility for any computer virus that might be transferred by this email.

The contents of this email may not reflect Guildford Borough Council policy. We store and monitor all emails and attachments sent and received by Guildford Borough Council employees in our Cryoserver system for up to 2 years to prevent misuse of the Council's networks.

This message has been scanned for malware by Forcepoint. www.forcepoint.com

Visit us online www.thameswater.co.uk, follow us on twitter www.twitter.com/thameswater or find us on www.facebook.com/thameswater. We're happy to help you 24/7.

Thames Water Limited (company number 2366623) and Thames Water Utilities Limited (company number 2366661) are companies registered in England and Wales, both are registered at Clearwater Court, Vastern Road, Reading,

Berkshire RG1 8DB. This email is confidential and is intended only for the use of the person it was sent to. Any views or opinions in this email are those of the author and don't necessarily represent those of Thames Water Limited or its subsidiaries. If you aren't the intended recipient of this email, please don't copy, use, forward or disclose its contents to any other person - please destroy and delete the message and any attachments from your system.

Carter, Richard

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 21 April 2021 16:46 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |
|  |  |
| Importance: | High |

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks
John

## 70 St Mary Axe

London

## Carl Griffiths

London Borough of Barnet
2 Bristol Avenue
Colindale
London
NW9 4EW
$15^{\text {th }}$ April 2021

## Dear Carl

## BROADWAY RETAIL PARK, CRICKLEWOOD LANE - FURTHER RESPONSE TO BNP PARIBAS REAL ESTATE FINANCIAL VIABILITY ASSESSMENT REVIEW

Thank you for providing us with an updated version (draft report v1) of the independent viability review report (dated 29 March 2021) prepared by BNP Paribas Real Estate (BNPPRE) on behalf of the London Borough of Barnet (LBB). We would like to take this opportunity to thank BNPPRE for their further consideration of the proposals.

Following a review of the updated report, we have prepared this letter to provide some additional information regarding the remaining differences of opinion and inform you that the Applicant has agreed to make a change to the affordable housing offer on a without prejudice basis.

Although both parties agree with the majority of the assumptions adopted within the Financial Viability Assessment (FVA), there are a number of differences of opinion which we examine further below.

## ILLUSTRATIVE SCHEME FLOOR AREA ASSUMPTIONS

As set out within the FVA, we have appraised the illustrative masterplan which demonstrates one way in which the parameter plans and design guidelines could be interpreted to deliver a high quality development. The lllustrative masterplan has been worked up in detail and represents the most accurate projection of how the development will come forward at the current time.

Throughout their report, BNPPRE have referred to additional value being created by the significantly increased net floor area shown in the maximum parameters area schedule. This is not realistic for a number of reasons explained in detail within separate correspondence.

LBB requested that Montagu Evans undertake some sensitivity testing on a hypothetical max parameter scheme which was provided within an email dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021. The sensitivity testing showed that a viability appraisal using the maximum parameter floor areas would reduce the residual land value of the site by approximately $£ 45,505,468$ to negative - $£ 32,059,734$ showing a viability deficit of $-£ 52,500,984$ when compared to a $£ 20,441,250$ Benchmark Land Value.

As discussed during our meeting on $15^{\text {th }}$ March 2021, we expect this sensitivity testing to have resolved the queries on this topic and would request that BNPPRE remove any reference to potential additional value from the maximum parameters within their final report.

## RESPONSE TO BNPPRE'S REVIEW OF THE FVA ASSUMPTIONS \& INPUTS

Following a review of the updated BNPPRE report, we have summarised below the remaining differences of opinion and addressed each difference where necessary.

| VIABILITY INPUT | MONTAGU EVANS (APPLICANT) | BNPPRE (LBB) | COMMENTS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Benchmark Land Value |  |  |  |
| Total Benchmark Land Value | £20,441,250 | £20,417,675 | Applicant willing to proceed on this basis* |
| Gross Development Value Inputs |  |  |  |
| BTR property operating costs | 25\% | 22.5\% | Not agreed - please see below. |
| Car parking values (per space) | Nil | £20,000 | Not agreed - please see below. |
| Development Cost Inputs |  |  |  |
| Construction cost (incl. contingency) | £288,272,609 | £288,272,609 | Agreed - please see below. |
| Marketing \& sales - affordable | 0.5\% of GDV | £100,000 | Not agreed - please see below. |
| Debt finance rate | 7\% | 6.5\% | Applicant willing to proceed on this basis* |
| Developer's return - private | 20\% GDV | 17.5\% GDV | Not agreed - please see below. |
| Developer's return - commercial | 17.5\% GDV | 15\% GDV | Not agreed - please see below. |

*Although we do not agree with the BNPPRE assumption, the Applicant is willing to proceed on a without prejudice basis in order to reach agreement expeditiously.

We would respond further regarding a number of the assumptions adopted below.

## BUILD TO RENT PROPERTY OPERATING COSTS (GROSS TO NET \%)

The Applicant's FVA adopted a 25\% allowance for management, repair and void costs. This was based on advice received from the Montagu Evans Capital Markets team that specialise in the acquisition, disposal and funding of residential investment projects including BTR.

BNP initially undertook their assessment based on a $20 \%$ assumption and have since increased this to $22.5 \%$ as a compromised position. BNPPRE have stated that we have only provided anecdotal evidence which is not true.

Montagu Evans provided the following two pieces of evidence:

## Grainger plc 2020 Annual Report \& Accounts

Grainger plc are the UK's largest listed residential landlord and a market leader in the UK build to rent and private rented sector currently managing over 8,500 homes. Their latest Annual Report discloses that they achieved $25.9 \%$ property operating costs. This is a factual position taken as an average across 8,500 properties so you would expect economies of scale to have been achieved.

This is very strong reliable evidence based on facts so is certainly not anecdotal.

Jones Lang LaSalle (JLL) research document entitled, 'Evaluating Build to Rent Performance, Analysis of Stabilised BTR Data' (September 2018)

Although this is a little historic now, JLL undertook research, analysing 7 BTR schemes. Again, this is a research document and so not anecdotal.

The evidence demonstrates that $25 \%$ is optimistic and the Applicant is therefore unwilling to adjust the assumption.

It should be noted that BNPPRE have not provided any evidence to support their position.

## CAR PARKING VALUES

BNPPRE have included a receipt of $£ 20,000$ for the potential 110 car parking spaces. These car parking spaces will be wheelchair spaces and it is therefore unreasonable to assume that a receipt will be received for them.

BNP have sought confirmation from the Council that this position is acceptable and have tested the viability with and without receipts.

## CONSTRUCTION COST ESTIMATE

The Applicant provided a construction cost estimate prepared by Ward Williams Associates (WWA) which was reviewed by CDM Project Services (CDM) on behalf of LBB.

All parties have continued discussions regarding the appropriate level of construction costs and have now reached agreement at $£ 288,272,609$ (including a $5 \%$ contingency). We attach a letter from WWA at Appendix 1, documenting the agreement reached.

## MARKETING \& SALES AGENCY FEES - AFFORDABLE

The Applicant's viability appraisal adopted an assumed $1 \%$ of GDV as a sales agent fee for the affordable housing. Most developers do not have the in-house expertise to tender, negotiate and agree terms with Registered Providers and will require a specialist agent to carry out this function for them.

The industry standard agency fee for undertaking this work is $1 \%$ of the package price. Based upon the viability appraisal submitted, this estimated fee totalled $£ 1,054,219$ based on the sale of 327 affordable housing units valued at $£ 105,421,885$. BNPPRE have reduced this agency fee to a fixed $£ 100,000$ or $0.095 \%$. We do not think that this level of fee is realistic for a qualified and specialist affordable housing agent to undertake the work. A fee of $1 \%$ has been the industry standard for some time and Montagu Evans have agreed the majority of all viability submissions across London at this level. It should also be noted that the affordable housing is contained within a number of blocks over different phases so it is very unlikely that it will be sold in a single transaction.
the Applicant is willing to reduce the agency fee assumption to $0.5 \%$ based on current market conditions but is unable to agree a reduction to the fixed $£ 100,000$ fee being proposed by BNPPRE.

## DEBT FINANCE RATE

The Applicant's appraisal adopts a debt finance rate of $7 \%$ and BNPPRE have reduced this rate to $6.5 \%$. We have agreed that 7\% is appropriate on developments across London with Councils' advisors and the GLA prior to the Covid-19 pandemic. Clearly, securing development funding has become more difficult and more expensive since the pandemic with some lenders temporarily withdrawing from the market.

Based on the Applicant's package of concessions and compromises set out above, there are various assumptions that we feel are extremely optimistic and there is a danger that if we flex every single input without giving consideration to the overall balance then the appraisal will start to look unrealistic.

However, the Applicant is willing to proceed on the basis of $6.5 \%$ on a without prejudice basis in order to reach agreement expeditiously.

## DEVELOPER'S RETURN

The Applicant is unwilling to reduce the profit levels for the reasons set out in previous correspondence. The Applicant is taking a significant risk by over delivering affordable housing (in viability terms) up front. This level of risk and the reliance on significant value growth to improve viability should not be underestimated. It is crucial that profit levels are adopted at fundable levels to ensure that this much needed affordable housing can be delivered in the borough.

## UPDATED AFFORDABLE HOUSING PROVISION

We are of the opinion that the Applicant's initial proposed affordable housing offer is the maximum viable level and has been robustly supported within the Financial Viability Assessment and subsequent correspondence.

However, there remains a number of differences of opinion and the Applicant wishes to progress matters expeditiously and move forwards towards the successful delivery of this important development.

The Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. This is estimated to reduce the total Gross Development value by $£ 11,541,280$, having a significant impact on the viability of the scheme.

We summarise the updated affordable housing provision below:

| TENURE | NO. OF HABITABLE ROOMS | \% OVERALL | \% AFFORDABLE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Private | 1,752 | $65.0 \%$ | NA |
| Intermediate | 662 | $24.5 \%$ | $70 \%$ |
| London Affordable Rent | 282 | $10.5 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| TOTAL | 2,696 | $100 \%$ | $100 \%$ |

The proposed amendment is being made on a without prejudice basis, subject to the following:

- BNPPRE amending their final viability review report to reflect that the maximum parameter queries have been resolved.
- A late stage review mechanism not being required in the S106 agreement in accordance with the Fast Track route in accordance with the London Plan (2021).
- The viability deficit summarised below being incorporated into the early stage review formula through the use of a "Breakeven GDV" figure.

Based on the package of concessions and compromises, we have prepared an updated viability appraisal reflecting the change to London Affordable Rent and attach a summary as Appendix 2.

We summarise the Applicant's updated viability position below.

| BENCHMARK LAND VALUE | RESIDUAL LAND VALUE | VIABILITY DEFICIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $£ 20,417,675$ | $£ 11,462,081$ | $-£ 8,955,594$ |

We hope that the above is clear and concludes the viability discussions. If you have any further queries then please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours sincerely,


Email: @montagu-evans.co.uk

## APPENDIX 1 <br> SUMAMRY OF AGREED COSNTRUCTION COST

ESTIMATE

B\&Q Broadway Retail Park,
Cricklewood Lane, London NW2
Montreaux Cricklewood
Developments Limited
Financial Viability Costing Agreement

### 1.0 Executive Summary

1.1 CDM Project Services provided their Cost Plan Review report dated November 2020 as part of the BNP Paribas Review of 'Financial Viability Assessment' dated November 2020. CDM Project Services assessed the Ward Williams Associates (WWA) Feasibility Cost Plan Nr 1, dated $13^{\text {th }}$ March 2020 which assessed the scheme costs to be lower than the WWA Feasibility Cost Plan by $(£ 10,943,894)$ or (3.7\%).
1.2 WWA produced a rebuttal report defending most of the cost reductions in February 2021.
1.3 CDM Project Services responded to the rebuttal and still challenged the following items: -
a. Overheads and Profit Allowance
b. Scaffolding \& External Walls Rates
c. External Works Area
d. Archaeology
e. UXO Allowance
1.4 The above cost items and clarifications are detailed in the next section.
1.5 The negotiations reduced the saving to ( $£ \mathbf{7} 067$ 391) or (2.39\%) on our original submission and concluded with an agreed construction cost of $\underline{£ 288,272,609}$.

### 2.0 Variance Qualifications

### 2.1 Overheads and Profit Allowance

CDM Project Services defended their position on the reduced OHP percentage of 5\% from our $6 \%$ by producing an RICS paper stating the range of OHP being reported. The RICS paper was based upon the national average and not specific to London which we have found to be at the higher end of the scale. To reach an agreement, the $5 \%$ rate was adopted.

### 2.2 Scaffolding \& External Wall Rates

CDM Project Services provided examples of other schemes WWA have been involved with as evidence of the façade rates being used on other schemes. The schemes presented were not comparable schemes as one didn't use scaffolding as it was a panelised facade system and the other was a development by a national House Builder with very low Preliminaries due to the way they manage and build developments. It was agreed that scaffolding was an acceptable item but the rate was too high. An agreed deduction of (£2961 256) was made to the WWA cost plan.

### 2.3 Acoustic Treatment Rate

The rate used for Phase 3 should be the same as Phase 1 and 2. We agree with the cost saving of $(£ 122500)$.

### 2.4 External Works Area

Within our overall site measurement, we had allowed works outside the redline drawing. It was agreed to remove this which reduced our costs by ( $£ 265670)$.

### 2.5 Archaeology

The preconstruction reports conclude that there wasn't any need for further archaeological works. Although a risk, it would be a low risk so agreed to remove the $(£ 50000)$.

### 2.6 UXO Allowance

The site is unlikely to have any UXB issues given the information provided in the preconstruction reports. It was agreed to reduce the allowance by $(£ 10,000)$ to cover any obstruction risk.

### 3.0 Conclusion

3.1 WWA and CDM Project Services concluded that the savings for the scaffolding, acoustics, external works, Archaeology \& UXB obstructions reduced the net construction cost down by $(£ 3,409,426)$. This is a movement of $£ 2,736,793$ from CDM Project Services original position.
3.2 The further reduction of the OHP concluded the gross development construction cost of £288,272,609.
3.5 The above construction cost equates to a (2.39\%) reduction in the original WWA Feasibility Cost Plan which is within an acceptable range and has been agreed with CDM Project Services.
$\qquad$
EXETER:
2 Providence Court
Pynes Hill
Exeter, Devon
EX25JL

T: 01392409690

A10 Elmbridge Court Chettenham Road tast Gloucester
GL3 1]Z

T: 01452301012

87 Worship Street
London
EC2A 2BE

T:020 74860501

## APPENDIX 2 <br> UPDATED FINANCIAL VIABILITY APPRAISAL LONDON AFFORDABLE RENT

Cricklewood Lane Financial Viability Appraisal
Apr 2021 Update - London Affordable Rent

Development Appraisal Montagu Evans LLP

15 April 2021

## Cricklewood Lane

## Financial Viability Appraisal

## Apr 2021 Update - London Affordable Rent

Appraisal Summary for Merged Phases 123456789

## Currency in $£$

## REVENUE

Sales Valuation
Block B - London Affordable Ren
Block B - Shared Ownership
Block C - Shared Ownership
Block C - Private Residential
Block D - Private Residential
Totals
Units
86
84
157
172
$\frac{224}{723}$

| $\mathbf{f t}^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Sales Rate $\mathbf{f t}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| 72,133 | 185.00 |
| 57,903 | 500.00 |
| 103,169 | 500.00 |
| 122,048 | 704.00 |
| $\frac{143,532}{498,785}$ | 704.00 |


| Unit Price | Gross Sales |
| ---: | ---: |
| 155,170 | $13,344,605$ |
| 344,661 | $28,951,500$ |
| 328,564 | $51,584,500$ |
| 499,545 | $85,921,792$ |
| 451,101 | $\mathbf{1 0 1 , 0 4 6 , 5 2 8}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{2 8 0 , 8 4 8 , 9 2 5}$ |

## Rental Area Summary

> Block A - Build to Rent
> Block A - Commercial
> Block B - Commercial
> Block D - Commercial
> Totals

Investment Valuation

| Block A - Build to Rent Current Rent | 6,241,860 | YP @ | 3.7500\% | 26.6667 | 166,449,600 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Block A - Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rent | 98,078 | YP @ | 6.0000\% | 16.6667 |  |
| (6mths Rent Free) |  | PV 6mths @ | 6.0000\% | 0.9713 | 1,587,688 |
| Block B - Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rent | 135,158 | YP @ | 6.0000\% | 16.6667 |  |
| (6mths Rent Free) |  | PV 6mths @ | 6.0000\% | 0.9713 | 2,187,943 |
| Block D - Commercial |  |  |  |  |  |
| Market Rent | 17,685 | YP @ | 6.0000\% | 16.6667 |  |
| (6mths Rent Free) |  | PV 6mths @ | 6.0000\% | 0.9713 | 286,287 |
| Total Investment Valuation |  |  |  |  | 170,511,517 |
| GROSS DEVELOPMENT VALUE |  |  |  | 451,360,442 |  |
| Purchaser's Costs |  |  | $(10,856,539)$ |  |  |
| Effective Purchaser's Costs Rate |  | 6.80\% |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | $(10,856,539)$ |  |
| NET DEVELOPMENT VALUE |  |  |  | 440,503,904 |  |
| NET REALISATION |  |  |  | 440,503,904 |  |
| OUTLAY |  |  |  |  |  |
| ACQUISITION COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Residualised Price |  |  | 11,462,081 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 11,462,081 |  |
| Stamp Duty |  |  | 563,104 |  |  |
| Effective Stamp Duty Rate |  | 4.91\% |  |  |  |
| Agent Fee |  | 1.00\% | 114,621 |  |  |
| Legal Fee |  | 0.50\% | 57,310 |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | 735,035 |  |
| CONSTRUCTION COSTS |  |  |  |  |  |
| Construction | $\mathbf{f t}^{2}$ | Build Rate ft ${ }^{\mathbf{2}}$ | Cost |  |  |
| Block A - Build to Rent | 359,076 | 255.19 | 91,634,152 |  |  |
| Block A - Commercial | 4,359 | 255.20 | 1,112,417 |  |  |
| Block B - Commercial | 6,007 | 255.20 | 1,532,986 |  |  |
| Block D - Commercial | 786 | 255.20 | 200,587 |  |  |
| Block B - London Affordable Rent | 103,239 | 255.20 | 26,346,560 |  |  |
| Block B - Shared Ownership | 82,872 | 255.20 | 21,149,056 |  |  |

## Cricklewood Lane

## Financial Viability Appraisal

Apr 2021 Update - London Affordable Rent

| Block C - Shared Ownership | $\mathbf{1 4 3 , 7 9 0}$ | 255.20 | $36,695,092$ |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Block C - Private Residential | 170,102 | 255.20 | $43,409,965$ |
| Block D - Private Residential | $\mathbf{2 0 5 , 5 8 2}$ | 255.20 | $\mathbf{5 2 , 4 6 4 , 5 2 6}$ |
| Totals | $\mathbf{1 , 0 7 5 , 8 1 3} \mathbf{f t}^{\mathbf{2}}$ |  | $\mathbf{2 7 4 , 5 4 5 , \mathbf { 3 4 2 }}$ |
| Contingency |  | $5.00 \%$ | $\mathbf{1 3 , 7 2 7 , 2 6 7}$ |
| CIL |  |  | $\mathbf{1 7 , 6 6 7 , 3 1 5}$ |


| PROFESSIONAL FEES |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Professional Fees | $10.00 \%$ | $28,827,261$ |
|  |  |  |
| MARKETING \& LETTING | $10.00 \%$ | 25,092 |
| Letting Agent Fee | $5.00 \%$ | 12,546 |
| Letting Legal Fee |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| DISPOSAL FEES | $0.25 \%$ | 389,629 |
| Sales Agent Fee | $1.00 \%$ | 38,033 |
| Sales Agent Fee | $0.50 \%$ | 469,403 |
| Sales Agent Fee | $3.00 \%$ | $5,609,050$ |
| Sales Agent Fee | $0.10 \%$ | 155,852 |
| Sales Legal Fee | $0.50 \%$ | 19,016 |
| Sales Legal Fee | $0.25 \%$ | 702,122 |
| Sales Legal Fee |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| MISCELLANEOUS FEES | $15.00 \%$ | $24,967,440$ |
| Developer's Return - BTR | $17.50 \%$ | 277,845 |
| Developer's Return - Commercial | $6.00 \%$ | $2,537,766$ |
| Developer's Return - Affordable | $17.50 \%$ | 382,890 |
| Developer's Return - Commercial | $6.00 \%$ | $3,095,070$ |
| Developer's Return - Affordable | $20.00 \%$ | $17,184,358$ |
| Developer's Return - Private | $20.00 \%$ | $20,209,306$ |
| Developer's Return - Private Sale | $17.50 \%$ | 50,100 |
| Developer's Return - Commercial |  |  |

305,939,924
$28,827,261$
37,638

Sales Agent Fee
0.25\%
0.50\% 469,403
3.00\% 5,609,050
0.10\% 155,852
0.50\%
0.50\%

702,122
7,383,105

68,704,776
$17,414,083$
Debit Rate $6.5000 \%$, Credit Rate $0.0000 \%$ (Nominal)
Total Finance Cost
TOTAL COSTS
440,503,904
PROFIT

| Performance Measures |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Profit on Cost\% | $0.00 \%$ |
| Profit on GDV\% | $0.00 \%$ |
| Profit on NDV\% | $0.00 \%$ |
| Development Yield\% (on Rent) | $1.47 \%$ |
| Equivalent Yield\% (Nominal) | $3.81 \%$ |
| Equivalent Yield\% (True) | $3.90 \%$ |
| IRR\% (without Interest) | $7.28 \%$ |
|  |  |
| Profit Erosion (finance rate 6.500) | N/A |

Carter, Richard

| From: | Griffiths, Carl |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 21 April 2021 16:49 |
| To: | Dillon, Andrew |
| Subject: | FW: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |
|  |  |
| Importance: | High |

FYI

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
差 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.
©
02083594500
building,controlebarnet.gov,uk

My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying " siome

Can cost you everything

For more information go to:
www.barnet.gov.ukJcovidcancost

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks
John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning



Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasqow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

[^8]Carter, Richard

| From: | Griffiths, Carl |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 21 April 2021 16:50 |
| To: | John Mumby |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |

Hi John

Thanks for this, I can confirm receipt.

Kind Regards

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
素 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


```
building.control@barnet.gov.uk
```

BARINETI


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying " siome

Can cost you everything

For more information go to:
www.barnet.gov.ukJcovidcancost

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks
John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning



Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasqow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

[^9]From:
Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:

Griffiths, Carl
08 June 2021 11:20
Members Enquiries
Re-MembersEnquiries;
RE: 20/3564/OUT - B And Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES - Your Ref: 101002188287

## Dear

I can confirm receipt of the objection from Mike Freer MP and can confirm that it will be taken into consideration in the determination of the application.

## Kind Regards

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects

Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
[2] please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?
------Original Message-----
From: Members Enquiries [members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 01 June 2021 09:17
To: @parliament.uk>
Cc: Re-MembersEnquiries [Re-MembersEnquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Re-MembersEnquiries@Barnet.gov.uk); Mustafa, Seral [Seral.Mustafa@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Seral.Mustafa@barnet.gov.uk) Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B And Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES - Your Ref:
101002188287

## Dear

Thank you for your email regarding 20/3564/OUT.
Your enquiry has been passed to the Planning department and the Link Officer for this service area is
 This has been logged under reference number 101002188287; which you will need to quote in any future correspondence. We will respond to your enquiry by 8th June at the latest.
Should you require any further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact us on
Kind Regards,

## Members Enquiries

Customer Support Group
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: | Web: www.barnet.gov.uk How would you rate the service provided in this e-mail?
Please click here to give us your feedback.
How do you rate the service provided in this email?
[https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=](https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=) [https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=](https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=)
[https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=](https://websurveys.govmetric.com/theme/gm/1565?Q_RATINGID=) Good Average Poor

> From: @parliament.uk\>
> Sent: 27 May 2021 17:04
> To: Griffiths, Carl \<Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk\>
> Cc: Members Enquiries \<members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk\>
> Subject: From the Office of Mike Freer MP

> Dear Mr Griffiths,

Re: 20/3564/OUT - B And Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

I am writing with regards to the above planning application. I would be grateful if Mike\&\#8217;s comments could be included as part of the ongoing consultation:

As MP for Finchley \& Golders Green, I have received many objections from residents regarding the proposals to redevelop the old $B \& a m p ; Q$ site. I am writing to provide my personal objections based on the scope and scale of the proposed development that would push our local services to breaking point. The size of the proposed development is entirely out of keeping with the local area in design and scale, given that this area is predominantly low-density suburban housing. The visual impact will be detrimental to the local area. Adding 1100 residential units in buildings ranging from 3 to 25 storeys would add significantly to the congestion that already exists on Cricklewood Lane and surrounding road network. There is also insufficient parking which would place further pressure on parking capacity in the nearby residential roads. On that basis, I strongly encourage the Planning Committee to reject this proposal.

I would be grateful if you could confirm receipt of this email.

Best wishes,


UK Parliament Disclaimer: this e-mail is confidential to the intended recipient. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender and delete it from your system. Any unauthorised use, disclosure, or copying is not permitted. This e-mail has been checked for viruses, but no liability is accepted for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail. This e-mail address is not secure, is not encrypted and should not be used for sensitive data.

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 21 April 2021 16:52 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |

Thank you Carl

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director, Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com

## icen:

Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow / London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged
material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Wednesday, April 21, 2021 4:50 PM
To: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi John

Thanks for this, I can confirm receipt.
Kind Regards
Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.qov.uk
去 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-ltd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey
 Why LABC Barnet? Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.
) building.controldebornet.gov.uk


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 ISO 9001


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks

John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com


Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasqow | London | Manchester
Follow us on: Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

From:

## Sent:

To:
Subject:
@ $\quad$ @realestate.bnpparibas>
22 April 2021 15:57
Griffiths, Carl
RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl, many thanks for sending this over. I will be able to take a look tomorrow - can we arrange a time to discuss in the afternoon?

Many thanks

|  | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK |
| :--- | :--- |
| Senior Assoclate Director | 5 Aldermanbury Square |
|  | London EC2V 7BP |
|  | Tel : |
|  | Mob: |
| Click here to find out more about our | realestate.Dnppanibas.co.uk |
| Development Consulting services |  |

Connect with us 2 You 19 5 Aldermanbury Square Tel: realestate.onppanoas.co.uk

This email is subject to our disclaimer. Corporate details can be found here,
Do not print this document unless it is necessary, consider the environment.


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:57
To: @realestate.bnpparibas>
Subject: FW: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High


Please see the attached response and email below from the applicant on this.

Once you've had a chance to review, could we perhaps have a catch up tomorrow or Friday please?

Thanks

Carl
Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the
information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks
John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com

Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.
This message and any attachments (the "message") is intended solely for the intended addressees and is confidential. If you receive this message in error, or are not the intended recipient(s), please delete it and any copies from your systems and immediately notify the sender. Any unauthorized view, use that does not comply with its purpose,
dissemination or disclosure, either whole or partial, is prohibited. Since the internet cannot guarantee the integrity of this message which may not be reliable, BNP PARIBAS (and its subsidiaries) shall not be liable for the message if modified, changed or falsified. Do not print this message unless it is necessary, consider the environment.

Ce message et toutes les pieces jointes (ci-apres le "message")
sont etablis a l'intention exclusive de ses destinataires et sont confidentiels.
Si vous recevez ce message par erreur ou s'il ne vous est pas destine, merci de le detruire ainsi que toute copie de votre systeme et d'en avertir immediatement l'expediteur. Toute lecture non autorisee, toute utilisation de ce message qui n'est pas conforme a sa destination, toute diffusion ou toute publication, totale ou partielle, est interdite. L'Internet ne permettant pas d'assurer l'integrite de ce message electronique susceptible d'alteration, BNP Paribas (et ses filiales) decline(nt) toute responsabilite au titre de ce message dans l'hypothese ou il aurait ete modifie, deforme ou falsifie.
N'imprimez ce message que si necessaire, pensez a l'environnement.

From:

## Sent:

23 April 2021 11:29
To:
Griffiths, Carl
Subject:
RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl - can we schedule a call on Monday morning instead?

Many thanks

## From

Sent: 22 April 2021 15:57
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl, many thanks for sending this over. I will be able to take a look tomorrow - can we arrange a time to discuss in the afternoon?

Many thanks

REAL ESTATE
Real Estate for a changing world

|  | BNP Paribas Real Estate UK |
| :--- | :--- |
| senior Assoclate Director | 5 Aldermanbury Square |
|  | London EC2V 7BP |
|  | Tel : |
|  | Mob: |
| Click here to find out more about our | realestare.onpparnoas.co.uk |
| Development Consulting services |  |

This email is subject to our disclaimer. Corporate details can be found here,

Do not print this document unless it is necessary, consider the environment.


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:57
To: @ @realestate.bnpparibas>
Subject: FW: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High
Hi

Please see the attached response and email below from the applicant on this.

Once you've had a chance to review, could we perhaps have a catch up tomorrow or Friday please?

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks
John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director, Planning


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 15:15 |
| To: | Daniel Chaney |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane, London NW2 1ES (Planning Ref: 20/3564/OUT) - |
|  | Near Cricklewood Station |

Hello Daniel - Just following up on my email below and wondering if Network Rail have issued any comments on the above application? I note that the applicant submitted a revised Transport Assessment earlier this month but unsure if you had received this (if not I can forward the link to you). Thanks.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
${ }^{\infty}$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Daniel Chaney [Daniel.Chaney@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:Daniel.Chaney@networkrail.co.uk)
Sent: 18 March 2021 09:40
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: London Borough of Barnet - Consultation of Planning Applications (Hendon and Cricklewood Rail Stations)

Hi Devinda,

Just to advise, I have forwarded this to our town planning team for review. The team have a process for responding to these applications including feedback from all teams in the business and they should be in touch soon. As part of this I will be asked for a response and this will be issued out (though I have begun looking at what data is held in readiness).

Thanks for consulting with us and if you do not hear anything from Town Planning please let me know.

Thanks,
Daniel

Daniel Chaney

Senior Station Capacity Planner | London Eversholt St
For urgent queries, please contact me via Microsoft Teams due to poor mobile coverage.

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 09 March 2021 09:58
To: Daniel Chaney [Daniel.Chaney@networkrail.co.uk](mailto:Daniel.Chaney@networkrail.co.uk)

Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: London Borough of Barnet - Consultation of Planning Applications (Hendon and Cricklewood Rail Stations)
Hello Daniel,

I was given your contact details by my colleague Paul Bowker and was wanting to know if you are aware of the following planning applications that are listed below and which we are currently considering:

2. B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane, London NW2 1ES (Planning Ref: 20/3564/OUT) - Near Cricklewood Station
Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including up to 1100 residential units (Use Class C3), and up to 1200 sqm of flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Classes A3/B1/D1 and D2) in buildings ranging from 3 to 25 storeys along with car and cycle parking landscaping and associated works.

The above applications are both in vicinity of railway stations (Hendon and Cricklewood) and would potentially result in additional demands on services. Further information of the schemes can be obtained from the Council's Planning Portal if required, but please feel free to call me should you have any further queries.

I would appreciate if you could please let us know if you have any comments which we should take into consideration whilst assessing the applications. Please note that the Crown Honda site application is soon to be heard at our April Committee so a quick response would be much appreciated.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-ltd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
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Carter, Richard

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 16:26 |
| To: | @iceniprojects.com |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl; Dillon, Andrew |
| Subject: | B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |
| Attachments: | B\&Q Site Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood - LBB Transport Team Comments 270421.pdf |

## Hello

As my colleague Carl is on leave this week, please find attached comments from the LB Barnet Transport team in relation to the above application.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
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## B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) - LB Barnet Transport Comment

The London Borough of Barnet Transport Team have reviewed the revised Transport Assessment (TA) submission supporting the above outline planning application.

A summary of the proposal is as follows:
"Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including residential C3 and flexible commercial and community floorspace in use classes A3/B1/D1 and D2; car and cycle parking; landscaping; and associated works."

Our comments are set out below and should be read in conjunction with our previously issued comments dated 9 September 2020 and more recently 30 March 2021.

## Proposed Development

It is understood that the development will be up to 1,100 new homes ( $35 \%$ affordable) and 1,200 sqm of commercial / community use. The residential element shall consist of 148 studio flats, $413 \times 1$ bed flats, $434 \times$ 2 bed flats and $105 \times 3$ bed flats. Vehicle access shall be from Depot Approach, a private access road, with the closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane.

As queried previously, what is the anticipated year of opening for Phases 1, 2 and 3 ? A detailed TA would need to be submitted to support each Phase (as part of the reserved matters applications).

The closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane will require a s278 Agreement and should include improvements to the pedestrian environment. The proposed new landscaped routes through Cricklewood Green are expected to be secured by means of a legal agreement (s278/s106).

The site / access layout plans should be fully dimensioned for review purposes if approval is sought as part of this application (e.g. access if it is not a reserved matter). This should also be supported by full swept path analysis showing two-way vehicle movement at the access points and internal roads (covering normal passenger vehicles and larger service / delivery / refuse vehicles). The swept path analysis provided only considers the one-way movement of a refuse vehicle larger than the large refuse vehicle. Is it anticipated that there shall be vehicles larger than a refuse vehicle permitted on site? Consideration should also be given to the provision of a pedestrian refuge at the main vehicular access points to improve safety (fully dimensioned plans have not been provided to support the case being put forward).

It is noted that the layout is a reserved matter and full details will be provided as part of any reserved matters application. All vehicles should enter and exit the site in a forward direction with collections made in accordance with standard trolleying distances. The swept path analysis provided does not show how a refuse vehicle turns around near the D1 collection point. As queried previously, it is not clear what P1, P2 and P3 represent in Figure 4.3.

A Delivery and Servicing Plan should be conditioned. This would include the dimensions of the largest vehicles permitted on site.

Parking

The TA states that as the layout is a reserved matter 'the total number of car and cycle parking spaces are not defined as part of this application.' We shall await the reserved matters applications for confirmation of numbers and design.

It is mentioned that there shall be a minimum of 1,846 long-stay and 28 short-stay cycle parking spaces for the residential use. At this stage, the non-residential uses are proposed to have 12 long-stay and 32 short-stay
cycle parking spaces. The phased provision / design / location of long and short term cycle parking should be detailed as part of the reserved matters submissions.

Cycle parking provision should be provided in line with the London Plan (not Intend to Publish London Plan) and the London Cycle Design Standard guidance (via planning condition).

The TA mentions that the illustrative masterplan has been tested to demonstrate that it can accommodate 110 car parking spaces (suitable for disabled persons), though it is not understood what proportion shall be allocated between the residential and non-residential land uses hence more detailed comments cannot be provided at this stage other than to say that parking should be provide in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan and the new London Plan (noting that accessible spaces are also required for non-residential uses and therefore more spaces than are currently proposed may be required).

In addition to the above, reduced levels of parking proposed would only be supported if there is to be improved accessibility measures, suitable overspill parking control / protection and the provision of sustainable transport measures. Future residents of the development should not be eligible for on-street parking permits (s106).

More than just the 1 car club space should be provided. This facility should be provided on-site in a visible location.

It is suggested that car and cycle parking provision will be controlled and regulated by means of a Parking Design and Management Plan (PDMP). A PDMP would need to be conditioned.

There appears to be potential for overspill on-street parking on Depot Approach. As it is a private road, the TA suggests that the developer / owner will be able to implement private enforcements measures. The suggested private enforcement measures should be proposed and detailed further to support the lower levels of parking proposed.

There are surrounding roads in vicinity of the site and within LBB boundaries that are not suitability protected by a CPZ. Therefore, there is concern that the proposed development with low on-site car parking provision would have potential for overspill parking onto the surrounding road network resulting a negative impact on the local amenity. Some roads such as Litchfield Road have no restrictions whilst others are protected from commuter parking with a weekday 1 hr restriction (Mon-Fri 10am-11am) which would not directly address residential overspill demand times. It is considered that the proposed development should help enable a review of the CPZ to address the above concerns.

The above issue has been discussed with the LB Barnet Parking Team who have confirmed that the surrounding area is under review and have noted that the control times may need to be revised to help manage parking stress as a result of the development. The LB Barnet Parking Team have requested a financial contribution of $£ 42,000$ towards a CPZ review / upgrade (secured via s106 agreement).

## Transport Implementation Strategy

The Framework Travel Plan (FTP), Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be secured by a planning condition. A Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) should also be conditioned.

We are awaiting comments from the LB Barnet Travel Planner.

## Trip Generation

The reported vehicle trips generated by the existing site appears to be relatively high and are significantly higher than the average trips generated by the TRICS sites ( 694 versus 4591 daily trips) which raises queries on the analysis and sites used. Our comments issued dated end of March don't seem to have been taken fully on board.

Related to the above, it is not clear how the through site traffic for the existing site was established (approx. 40 and 41 during the AM and PM peak hour periods respectively). Please provide clarification as we need to understand the methodology to have confidence that site traffic and through traffic are correctly quantified.

The traffic flow diagrams do not appear to match the vehicle trips summarised within the tables in the main body the report (e.g. Table 11.5 suggests 232 and 278 vehicles during the AM and PM peak hour periods for the existing site, whilst in the traffic flow diagrams the numbers are 144 and 194 during the AM and PM peak hour periods). Please clarify the discrepancies and what represents the existing scenario. It is noted that the raw survey data was not included in Appendix $B$ of the submission.

Depending on the above and taking into account the closure of the Cricklewood Lane access (traffic reassignment), it is noted that there would be additional vehicles at the Depot Approach / A5 signalised junction (and to a lesser extent the Cricklewood Lane / A5 junction) which have not been considered in terms of impacts (particularly during the AM peak hour period e.g. right turn movements). This also need to account for the newly diverted traffic which would have previously run through the site.

The assumptions for committed development / cumulative impact have not been set out for review.
The reserved matters applications would need to detail the cumulative impact assessment relevant to each of the respective Phases.

The new submission provides an analysis which considered Census data. It is noted that Census data would normally only be used to inform public transport mode split from the overall percentages derived from TRICS as is considered relevant particularly for peak hour weekday trips. In any event, the point in relation to rail travel is noted. However, there is a large discrepancy in term of bus travel (assumed 17\% versus $\mathbf{4 7 \%}$ from Census for bus travel).

We await TfL comments in relation to bus impacts.

We await Network Rail comments in relation to train impacts.

## Transport Improvements

## The following improvements / contributions are noted / required:

- New pedestrian/cycle route between Depot Approach and Cricklewood Lane (needs to be secured with further design detail provided at the reserved matters stage);
- Removal vehicle access from Cricklewood Lane (requires s278);
- New public realm including a new public square, open space and play areas (requires s106/s278 agreement);
- Improvements to existing public realm, including Cricklewood Green enhancements to be secured by s106/s278 agreement;
- New Car Club space to provide for new residents and the wider local community (may require more than 1 space on-site, should be included in layout plans and Travel Plan);
- Land safeguarded so as not to preclude future southern access into Cricklewood Station;
- Travel Plan monitoring contributions and Travel Plan incentives;
- s278 agreement for improvements to the pedestrian environment which includes controlled crossing facility on Cricklewood Lane and improvements to the pedestrian route beneath the rail bridge. This would require further work with Council's Highways Team and TfL;
- s106 contribution towards CPZ review ( $£ 42,000$ );
- Neighbourhood measures scheme for Cricklewood (proposed scheme)(s106 contribution - cost to be defined);
- School streets scheme at Childs Hill School (s106 contribution - cost to be defined); and
- Possible improvements following response to junction impact assessment queries.

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 17:11 |
| To: | Dillon, Andrew |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |

Good afternoon Andrew,

I understand that Carl is on leave this week and thus I wanted to get in touch about this one.

You'll see from the attached that a revised offer on the affordable housing has been made following discussions between all parties. Do you have any commentary on this as yet?

Also, it would be helpful if you could clarify whether you feel producing and sharing a Members Brochure is acceptable and appropriate, and if members are receiving paper copies of these documents at this time. We would also really appreciate being able to arrange an initial meeting with Councillor Ryde \& Officers and potentially an opportunity to take committee members down onto site to discuss the proposals, prior to Committee. We are conscious of the rule of six, and if the entire committee were unable to attend we would be happy to take a smaller group, including the chair and vice chair.

Also, Carl previously informed me that there would be an additional Committee meeting on the $26^{\text {th }}$ May to consider the application. Is this still the case as I note that it is not in the Committee calendar?

Look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks

John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director, Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

| From: | Dillon, Andrew |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 17:25 |
| To: | John Mumby |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |
| Attachments: | Change of date and location for meeting 12/05/2021, 19:00, Strategic Planning Committee |

Hi John, the Planning Committee which was scheduled to be held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ May has now been moved to the $1^{\text {st }}$ June as is shown in the attached email from earlier today.

In terms of member engagement, we would be happy and would expect to arrange a meeting with Cllr Ryde prior to committee wither virtually or in person. I am not sure of the arrangements of site visits for the $1^{\text {st }}$ June and whether this will be a physical site visit, however normally such site visits are undertaken by officers advising members about the scheme rather than developers. Sending an information brochure to members would however be acceptable and is done by many developers.

Kind Regards,

Andrew Dillon MRTPI
Planning Manager
Major Projects Team
Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
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Anyone with COVID-19
symptoms can get tested.
barnet.gov.uk/testandtrace

From: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 27 April 2021 17:11
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Good afternoon Andrew,

I understand that Carl is on leave this week and thus I wanted to get in touch about this one.

You'll see from the attached that a revised offer on the affordable housing has been made following discussions between all parties. Do you have any commentary on this as yet?

Also, it would be helpful if you could clarify whether you feel producing and sharing a Members Brochure is acceptable and appropriate, and if members are receiving paper copies of these documents at this time. We would also really appreciate being able to arrange an initial meeting with Councillor Ryde \& Officers and potentially an opportunity to take committee members down onto site to discuss the proposals, prior to Committee. We are conscious of the rule of six, and if the entire committee were unable to attend we would be happy to take a smaller group, including the chair and vice chair.

Also, Carl previously informed me that there would be an additional Committee meeting on the $26^{\text {th }}$ May to consider the application. Is this still the case as I note that it is not in the Committee calendar?

Look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks

John

## John Mumby BA (Hons)

Director,Planning
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The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 17:26 |
| To: | Dillon, Andrew |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |

Thanks Andrew - just to confirm, it is the intention to get the B\&Q app to the Committee on the $1^{\text {st }}$ June?

Many thanks. John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 5:25 PM
To: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Hi John, the Planning Committee which was scheduled to be held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ May has now been moved to the $1^{\text {st }}$ June as is shown in the attached email from earlier today.

In terms of member engagement, we would be happy and would expect to arrange a meeting with Cllr Ryde prior to committee wither virtually or in person. I am not sure of the arrangements of site visits for the $1^{\text {st }}$ June and whether this will be a physical site visit, however normally such site visits are undertaken by officers advising members about the scheme rather than developers. Sending an information brochure to members would however be acceptable and is done by many developers.

Kind Regards,

## Major Projects Team

Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
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From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 27 April 2021 17:11
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Good afternoon Andrew,

I understand that Carl is on leave this week and thus I wanted to get in touch about this one.

You'll see from the attached that a revised offer on the affordable housing has been made following discussions between all parties. Do you have any commentary on this as yet?

Also, it would be helpful if you could clarify whether you feel producing and sharing a Members Brochure is acceptable and appropriate, and if members are receiving paper copies of these documents at this time. We would also really appreciate being able to arrange an initial meeting with Councillor Ryde \& Officers and potentially an opportunity to take committee members down onto site to discuss the proposals, prior to Committee. We are
conscious of the rule of six, and if the entire committee were unable to attend we would be happy to take a smaller group, including the chair and vice chair.

Also, Carl previously informed me that there would be an additional Committee meeting on the $26^{\text {th }}$ May to consider the application. Is this still the case as I note that it is not in the Committee calendar?

Look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks

John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning

```
telephone:
mobile
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com
```
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| From: | Dillon, Andrew |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 27 April 2021 17:30 |
| To: | John Mumby |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES |

Hi John,

Carl will need to advise next week what he considers is achievable. Obviously we will need to have all outstanding matters resolved to our satisfaction, and I saw that our highway officer sent comments earlier today asking for additional information.

## Andrew Dillon MRTPI

Planning Manager
Major Projects Team
Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
( please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
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From: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 27 April 2021 17:26
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Thanks Andrew - just to confirm, it is the intention to get the B\&Q app to the Committee on the $1^{\text {st }}$ June?
Many thanks. John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning

```
telephone:
mobile
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com
```
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[^10]From: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 5:25 PM
To: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Hi John, the Planning Committee which was scheduled to be held on the $12^{\text {th }}$ May has now been moved to the $1^{\text {st }}$ June as is shown in the attached email from earlier today.

In terms of member engagement, we would be happy and would expect to arrange a meeting with Cllr Ryde prior to committee wither virtually or in person. I am not sure of the arrangements of site visits for the $1^{\text {st }}$ June and whether this will be a physical site visit, however normally such site visits are undertaken by officers advising members about the scheme rather than developers. Sending an information brochure to members would however be acceptable and is done by many developers.

Kind Regards,

Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
( please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
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From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 27 April 2021 17:11
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Good afternoon Andrew,

I understand that Carl is on leave this week and thus I wanted to get in touch about this one.

You'll see from the attached that a revised offer on the affordable housing has been made following discussions between all parties. Do you have any commentary on this as yet?

Also, it would be helpful if you could clarify whether you feel producing and sharing a Members Brochure is acceptable and appropriate, and if members are receiving paper copies of these documents at this time. We would also really appreciate being able to arrange an initial meeting with Councillor Ryde \& Officers and potentially an opportunity to take committee members down onto site to discuss the proposals, prior to Committee. We are conscious of the rule of six, and if the entire committee were unable to attend we would be happy to take a smaller group, including the chair and vice chair.

Also, Carl previously informed me that there would be an additional Committee meeting on the $26^{\text {th }}$ May to consider the application. Is this still the case as I note that it is not in the Committee calendar?

Look forward to hearing back from you.

Many thanks

John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning

```
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com
```
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From:

Sent:
To:
Cc:
Subject:
@iceniprojects.com>
30 April 2021 11:52
Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Griffiths, Carl; Dillon, Andrew; John Mumby
RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi Devinda,
Thanks again for sharing your comments with us directly this week. Entran have had an opportunity to consider this and have prepared the attached response for your review.

In many cases, Entran have provided further clarification or confirmed where the required information can be found in the TA. The additional swept paths are now appended to the document.

Please also find attached the survey data which comprises a set of automatic traffic counts (ATC), manual turning counts at four junctions; and a specific survey quantifying the unauthorised 'rat-runs' through the site.

I trust this information is helpful. Please let me know if you have any further queries.
Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

## From: @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 27 April 2021 17:48
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Thanks Devinda,
I've shared your comments with Richard at Entran. We will come back with a response shortly.
Andrew - with Carl away this week please could you advise on a suitable date for a members briefing in May? We are keen to get this fixed with our team.


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasqow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 27 April 2021 16:26
To @iceniprojects.com>
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Hello ,
As my colleague Carl is on leave this week, please find attached comments from the LB Barnet Transport team in relation to the above application.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
A Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

Cricklewood - Wednesday 26th June 2019
B\&Q Rat Runs

|  | Location 1-2 |  |  |  | Location 2-1 |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Right In - Left Out |  |  |  | Left/Right in to Left Out |  |  |  |
| TIME | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL |
| 0730-0745 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0745-0800 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 20 | 0 | 0 | 20 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0800-0815 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0815-0830 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 4 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 0830-0845 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 0845-0900 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 41 | 0 | 0 | 41 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |
| 0900-0915 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 0915-0930 | 10 | 0 | 0 | 10 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 25 | 0 | 0 | 25 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coact | TOTAL | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL |
| TOTAL | 86 | 0 | 0 | 86 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 5 |


|  | Right In - Left Out |  |  |  | Left/Right in to Left Out |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| TIME | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coact | TOTAL | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL |
| 1630-1645 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1645-1700 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Hourly Total | 15 | 0 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1700-1715 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 11 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1715-1730 | 7 | 0 | 0 | 7 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| 1730-1745 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 13 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1745-1800 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 40 | 0 | 0 | 40 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 1800-1815 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1815-1830 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 9 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Hourly Total | 21 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
|  | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL | Lights | HGV | Bus/Coach | TOTAL |
| TOTAL | 76 | 0 | 0 | 76 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 3 |



Junction: (1) Access Road/Car Park

$\Gamma$ Peak Hour


Note: The above diagram represents the Junction surveyed, although may not be the exact layout of the actual location.

Important This spreadsheet \& Interactive Vehicle Flow Diagram was produced based on specific
Note: parameters. Consequently, alteration to the spreadsheet format or it's properties may result in malfunction.

Junction: (2) Car Park / Cricklewood Lane

| Vehicle Class: | ALL CLASSES |
| ---: | :--- |
| Start Time: | 1) 0800 |
| End Time: | 1) 0900 |
|  | $\nabla$ Peak Hour |

0800-0900


Note: The above diagram represents the Junction surveyed, although may not be the exact layout of the actual location.

Important This spreadsheet \& Interactive Vehicle Flow Diagram was produced based on specific
Note: parameters. Consequently, alteration to the spreadsheet format or it's properties may result in malfunction.

## Junction: (3) A5 / Depot Approach / Ashford Road

```
Vehicle Class: ALL CLASSES -
    Start Time:
                            1) \(0800 \quad\) -
    End Time:
                                1) \(0900 \rightarrow\)
                \(V\) Peak Hour
```



Note: The above diagram represents the Junction surveyed, although may not be the exact layout of the actual location.

Important This spreadsheet \& Interactive Vehicle Flow Diagram was produced based on specific
Note: parameters. Consequently, alteration to the spreadsheet format or it's properties may result in malfunction.

Junction: (2) A5 / Cricklewood Lane / Chichele Road



Note: The above diagram represents the Junction surveyed, although may not be the exact layout of the actual location.

Important This spreadsheet \& Interactive Vehicle Flow Diagram was produced based on specific
Note: parameters. Consequently, alteration to the spreadsheet format or it's properties may result in malfunction.

From:

## Sent:

To:
Subject:
@ @realestate.bnpparibas>
04 May 2021 14:25
Griffiths, Carl
RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl, yes that will be fine - am free from 10.30 onwards tomorrow
Kind regards


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 04 May 2021 13:55
To:
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES


Sorry for the delay in coming back on this, I was unexpectedly on an external site visit on $22^{\text {nd }} / 23^{\text {rd }}$ and was on leave last week. Do you have any scope tomorrow for a very quick call?

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration

Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
来 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-ltd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Drealestate.bnpparibas>
Sent: 23 April 2021 11:29
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl - can we schedule a call on Monday morning instead?

Many thanks
$\square$

From
Sent: 22 April 2021 15:57

To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES

Hi Carl, many thanks for sending this over. I will be able to take a look tomorrow - can we arrange a time to discuss in the afternoon?

Many thanks


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:57
To: @realestate.bnpparibas>
Subject: FW: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

## Hi

Please see the attached response and email below from the applicant on this.
Once you've had a chance to review, could we perhaps have a catch up tomorrow or Friday please?

Thanks

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects

## Strategic Planning and Regeneration

Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
$\operatorname{Re}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey
 Why LABC Barnet? Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.

$\square$


Certificate Number 18180-QMS-081 1509001


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 21 April 2021 16:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Broadway Retail Park Cricklewood Lane London NW2 1ES
Importance: High

Good afternoon Carl, hope you are well,

Following our discussions the affordable housing provision within the above referenced planning application and the associated viability testing, please see attached correspondence. Subject to a number of factors set out in the letter from Montagu Evans, the Applicant is willing to amend the affordable housing provision by changing the proposed Affordable Rent units to London Affordable Rent units. I would be grateful if you could please review the information as set out by Montagu Evans and provide your response, however should you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.

I ask if you could please confirm receipt of this mail.

I look forward to hearing back from you.


Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.
This message and any attachments (the "message") is intended solely for the intended addressees and is confidential. If you receive this message in error, or are not the intended recipient(s), please delete it and any copies from your systems and immediately notify the sender. Any unauthorized view, use that does not comply with its purpose, dissemination or disclosure, either whole or partial, is prohibited. Since the internet cannot guarantee the integrity of this message which may not be reliable, BNP PARIBAS (and its subsidiaries) shall not be liable for the message if modified, changed or falsified. Do not print this message unless it is necessary, consider the environment.

Ce message et toutes les pieces jointes (ci-apres le "message")
sont etablis a l'intention exclusive de ses destinataires et sont confidentiels. Si vous recevez ce message par erreur ou s'il ne vous est pas destine, merci de le detruire ainsi que toute copie de votre systeme et d'en avertir immediatement l'expediteur. Toute lecture non autorisee, toute utilisation de ce message qui n'est pas conforme a sa destination, toute diffusion ou toute publication, totale ou partielle, est interdite. L'Internet ne permettant pas d'assurer l'integrite de ce message electronique susceptible d'alteration, BNP Paribas (et ses filiales) decline(nt) toute responsabilite au titre de ce message dans l'hypothese ou il aurait ete modifie, deforme ou falsifie.
N'imprimez ce message que si necessaire, pensez a l'environnement.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

Carter, Richard

| From: | Dillon, Andrew |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 30 July 2021 14:58 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q, Broadway Retail Park |

So ground plus 12 not 12 , and no change to the other towers. Can't see this ever getting through.

## Andrew Dillon MRTPI

Planning Manager
Major Projects Team
Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
素 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet. Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

## Local Plan 2021-2036

## Gonsultation: 28 June to 9 August

## visit: www.engage.barnet.gov.uk



RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk) Sent: 30 July 2021 14:52
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q, Broadway Retail Park

Don't suppose Cllr Greenspan got back to you did she?

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-ltd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey

## Logal Plan 2021-2036

Gonsultation: 28 June to 9 August

## visit: www.engage.barnet.gov.uk


tasamana

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 30 July 2021 14:33
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: @montreaux.co.uk>
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q, Broadway Retail Park

Good afternoon Carl,
As promised, please see attached the following for formal submission for variations to the current planning application:

- Updated parameter plan concerning heights
- Updated Design Guidelines
- ES Statement of Conformity prepared by Aecom.

I would be grateful if you could please confirm i) receipt of the information and ii) when the 14 day re-consult has commenced.

Any questions, please let me know.
Many thanks. John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director,Planning

```
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@IcenIprojects.com
```

Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

| $x$ |  | $x$ |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | $x$ |

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 12 May 2021 22:14 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

Good evening Carl,
I write to submit further documentation to support Montreaux's proposal for the redevelopment of the B\&Q Site in Cricklewood. Montreaux have instructed Citydesigner to produce an independent design assessment of townscape effects of the proposed development. The assessment is based upon the illustrative design framed by the submitted parameter plans and design guidelines and I trust it is helpful in the consideration of the planning application currently with you for determination.

Please see link below.

Any questions, let me know.
Many thanks. John
John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director, Planning


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasqow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog


[^11]Carter, Richard

| From: | John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 13 May 2021 09:38 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl; Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| Cc: | Richard Fitter; |
| Subject: | FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |
|  |  |
| Importance: | High |

Good morning Carl,
Richard and I have reviewed the attached and think it would be beneficial for a short call to run through them. Preferably all on this e-mail but if its easier / quicker for Richard \& Devinda to liaise direct them so be it.

Please let me know.
Many thanks. John

## John Mumby BA (Hons)

Director,Planning

```
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@iceniprojects.com
```



Find Us : Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog


The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 2:57 PM
To: @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com)
[LHowes@iceniprojects.com](mailto:LHowes@iceniprojects.com)
Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

FYI see attached, comments in blue

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration

Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
( please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
 Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 12 May 2021 14:36
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Hello Carl - Further to the email below, please find attached LB Barnet Transport team comments in relation to the above scheme (responses in blue).

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172 . Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
A Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

## From:

## @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 30 April 2021 11:52
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi Devinda,
Thanks again for sharing your comments with us directly this week. Entran have had an opportunity to consider this and have prepared the attached response for your review.

In many cases, Entran have provided further clarification or confirmed where the required information can be found in the TA. The additional swept paths are now appended to the document.

Please also find attached the survey data which comprises a set of automatic traffic counts (ATC), manual turning counts at four junctions; and a specific survey quantifying the unauthorised 'rat-runs' through the site.

I trust this information is helpful. Please let me know if you have any further queries.
Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

[^12]I've shared your comments with Richard at Entran. We will come back with a response shortly.
Andrew - with Carl away this week please could you advise on a suitable date for a members briefing in May? We are keen to get this fixed with our team.

Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 27 April 2021 16:26
To: @iceniprojects.com>
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello

As my colleague Carl is on leave this week, please find attached comments from the LB Barnet Transport team in relation to the above application.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
$A$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.

This message has been scanned by Exchange Online Protection.

## B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) - LB Barnet Transport Comment

The London Borough of Barnet Transport Team have reviewed the revised Transport Assessment (TA) submission supporting the above outline planning application.

A summary of the proposal is as follows:
"Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and comprehensive redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including residential C3 and flexible commercial and community floorspace in use classes A3/B1/D1 and D2; car and cycle parking; landscaping; and associated works."

Our comments are set out below and should be read in conjunction with our previously issued comments dated 9 September 2020 and more recently 30 March 2021.

## Proposed Development

It is understood that the development will be up to 1,100 new homes ( $35 \%$ affordable) and 1,200 sqm of commercial / community use. The residential element shall consist of 148 studio flats, $413 \times 1$ bed flats, $434 \times 2$ bed flats and 105 $x 3$ bed flats. Vehicle access shall be from Depot Approach, a private access road, with the closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane.

As queried previously, what is the anticipated year of opening for Phases 1,2 and 3 ? A detailed TA would need to be submitted to support each Phase (as part of the reserved matters applications). This is addressed in the Entran cover letter dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021. The submitted TA assesses the completed development in an assumed year of completion of 2026. If detailed TAs are required for individual phases, these can be secured by condition and delivered as part of any full or reserved matters applications.

We have looked at the Entran cover letter (dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021) and cannot find the information as suggested in relation to the anticipated year of opening for Phases 1, 2 and 3. Please provide clarification where this is contained in the letter.

The assumed 2026 full completion year assumed in the TA is noted. It is agreed that applications for individual phases should be supported by detailed Transport Assessments and that this should be secured by planning condition.

The closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane will require a s278 Agreement and should include improvements to the pedestrian environment. Agreed The proposed new landscaped routes through Cricklewood Green are expected to be secured by means of a legal agreement (s278/s106). Agreed, although more likely to be S106 as any works within the public highway will be covered in the S278 mentioned above.

The site / access layout plans should be fully dimensioned for review purposes if approval is sought as part of this application (e.g., access if it is not a reserved matter). The description of development is clear that means of access is to be determined but layout is a reserved matter. Accordingly, the internal roads are illustrative only. The access junctions have been designed around the swept paths of the largest vehicles expected to enter the site ( 11.3 m 4 axle refuse vehicle) and visibility splays included at Appendix D. New plans are attached showing the access junction dimensions (SK305).
Is tactile paving / dropped kerbs to be provided at the main vehicle access points? This is not shown on plan and the access arrangement for the second most southern access is also queried (no kerb radii, no dropped kerbs / tactile paving, what is the larger pedestrian crossing distance and would this require a refuge, is there a raised threshold).

This should also be supported by full swept path analysis showing two-way vehicle movement at the access points and internal roads (covering normal passenger vehicles and larger service / delivery / refuse vehicles). We have attached further swept path analyses showing two cars passing at the site accesses. These also show a car passing a van, however, in order to keep the junction geometry to a minimum (for the benefit of pedestrians) a large refuse vehicle will use both sides of the carriageway when manoeuvring. This accords with the principles of Manual for Streets. The swept path analysis provided only considers the one-way movement of a refuse vehicle larger than the large refuse vehicle. Is it anticipated that there shall be vehicles larger than a refuse vehicle permitted on site? No. The vehicle used is an 11.3 m long 4 -axle refuse vehicle. This is larger than currently used by LBB in Cricklewood and less manoeuvrable than most rigid pantechnicons such as removal lorries. This is a worst-case assessment. A Service and Delivery Management Plan would need to be conditioned (with the maximum size of vehicles specified).

Consideration should also be given to the provision of a pedestrian refuge at the main vehicular access points to improve safety (fully dimensioned plans have not been provided to support the case being put forward). This is addressed in the Entran cover letter dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021 (p2) and the revised TA para 4.10. A pedestrian refuge would require the junctions to be wider with larger radii, encouraging higher vehicle speeds.
Manual for Streets and TfL guidance advocates minimum junction radii and in-line pedestrian crossings wherever practical. If required, a side road entry treatment (SRET) could be included here to further reduce speeds. Means of access is to be determined but detailed design matters such as the inclusion of a SRET can be secured by condition and included in any detailed layout and landscape design to be determined as part of a reserved matters application.
Please refer to above comments in relation to the second most southern access. Detail access design to be conditioned (reserved matters application).

It is noted that the layout is a reserved matter and full details will be provided as part of any reserved matters application. All vehicles should enter and exit the site in a forward direction with collections made in accordance with standard trolleying distances. Agreed The swept path analysis provided does not show how a refuse vehicle turns around near the D1 collection point. Drawing SK201A at Appendix G shows the refuse vehicle reversing to a point $<10 \mathrm{~m}$ from collection point D1. NB, internal layout is a reserved matter.
We have reviewed Appendix $G$ of the TA and cannot see a reversing movement to the D1 collection point. A reversing movement of a large vehicle along the internal road and across a junction would be queried in terms of safety and operation. In any event, it is noted that the internal layout is a reserved matter.

As queried previously, it is not clear what P1, P2 and P3 represent in Figure 4.3. These are bin presentation areas as described in paragraph 8.4, 8.6 and 8.7 of the TA.
The need for a Manage Waste Strategy is noted.
A Delivery and Servicing Plan should be conditioned. This would include the dimensions of the largest vehicles permitted on site. Agreed, as set out in Section 8.

## Parking

The TA states that as the layout is a reserved matter 'the total number of car and cycle parking spaces are not defined as part of this application.' We shall await the reserved matters applications for confirmation of numbers and design. Agreed

It is mentioned that there shall be a minimum of 1,846 long-stay and 28 short-stay cycle parking spaces for the residential use. At this stage, the non-residential uses are proposed to have 12 long-stay and 32 short-stay cycle parking spaces. The phased provision / design / location of long and short term cycle parking should be detailed as part of the reserved matters submissions. Agreed

Cycle parking provision should be provided in line with the London Plan (not Intend to Publish London Plan) and the London Cycle Design Standard guidance (via planning condition). Agreed

The TA mentions that the illustrative masterplan has been tested to demonstrate that it can accommodate $\mathbf{1 1 0}$ car parking spaces (suitable for disabled persons), though it is not understood what proportion shall be allocated between the residential and non-residential land uses This is explained in paragraph 5.8 of the TA hence more detailed comments cannot be provided at this stage other than to say that parking should be provide in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan and the new London Plan (noting that accessible spaces are also required for non-residential uses and therefore more spaces than are currently proposed may be required).
It is reiterated that parking should be provided in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan and the new London Plan (noting that accessible spaces are also required for non-residential uses and therefore more spaces than the 110 currently proposed may be required). Reserved matter.

In addition to the above, reduced levels of parking proposed would only be supported if there is to be improved accessibility measures, suitable overspill parking control / protection and the provision of sustainable transport measures. The proposed development will deliver a suite of improved accessibility measures as set out in full in the TA Future residents of the development should not be eligible for on-street parking permits (s106). Agreed, although S106 cannot legally be used for this purpose; need to use S16 of the GLCGPA 1974. More than just the 1 car club space should be provided. The principle of a Car Club will be secured by condition (or S106); the number of spaces will be determined at the reserved matters stage in consultation with LBB and potential commercial operators. The uptake of Car Club membership will be monitored as part of the Travel Plan; this will inform the number of spaces in successive phases. This facility should be provided on-site in a visible location. Agreed

It is suggested that car and cycle parking provision will be controlled and regulated by means of a Parking Design and Management Plan (PDMP). A PDMP would need to be conditioned. Agreed, as stated in paragraph 5.27.

There appears to be potential for overspill on-street parking on Depot Approach. As it is a private road, the TA suggests that the developer / owner will be able to implement private enforcements measures. The suggested private enforcement measures should be proposed and detailed further to support the lower levels of parking proposed. These measures will form part of the PDMP, secured by condition.

There are surrounding roads in vicinity of the site and within LBB boundaries that are not suitability protected by a CPZ. Figure 3.6 demonstrates that all roads within a 200 m walking distance of the site are subject to private enforcement, or public highway covered by waiting restrictions or a CPZ. This is stated in paragraph 3.36. A small number of roads further afield allow unrestricted parking, but these are beyond a reasonable walking distance for residential parking. The figure of 200m is taking from the Lambeth Parking Stress methodology which is widely accepted as best practice across all London Boroughs. Therefore, there is concern that the proposed development with low on-site car parking provision would have potential for overspill parking onto the surrounding road network resulting a negative impact on the local amenity. Some roads such as Litchfield Road have no restrictions whilst others are protected from commuter parking with a weekday 1 hr restriction (Mon-Fri 10am-11am) which would not directly address residential overspill demand times. It is considered that the proposed development should help enable a review of the CPZ to address the above concerns. The development is not expected to have any effect on parking stress within a reasonable distance of the site. Any financial contribution towards a review of the CPZ should be commensurate with the anticipated effects, not simply a pro-rata contribution based on unit numbers.

We disagree with the statement that 'the development is not expected to have any effect on parking stress within a reasonable distance of the site.' Therefore, our previous comments in relation to CPZ are reiterated.

The above issue has been discussed with the LB Barnet Parking Team who have confirmed that the surrounding area is under review and have noted that the control times may need to be revised to help manage parking stress as a result of the development. The LB Barnet Parking Team have requested a financial contribution of $£ 42,000$ towards a CPZ review / upgrade (secured via s106 agreement). A breakdown of this sum is requested, including clarification of contributions requested from recently approved developments in the area.
I have requested further information from the Council's Parking team and will forward this once received. However, please note that with no reinforcement of the CPZ there is a potential negative impact on the local amenity as a direct result of the application and we would therefore not be in a position to support the application.

## Transport Implementation Strategy

The Framework Travel Plan (FTP), Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be secured by a planning condition. A Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) should also be conditioned. Agreed

We are awaiting comments from the LB Barnet Travel Planner. The Framework Travel Plan (FTP) was included in the original TA (March 2020). As stated in the FTP, individual TPs will be prepared for the residential and commercial elements of the development, based on the principles set out in the submitted FTP. These will be secured by appropriate condition.
We are still awaiting comment from the LB Barnet Travel Planner.

## Trip Generation

The reported vehicle trips generated by the existing site appears to be relatively high and are significantly higher than the average trips generated by the TRICS sites ( 694 versus 4591 daily trips) which raises queries on the analysis and sites used. All analysis of the proposed development is based on the observed vehicle trips. The TRICS assessment of retail uses was carried out as a comparison. The sites selected were the best available data in the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ database and the most comparable to the application site. This is explained in Section 11 of the TA. Our comments issued dated end of March don't seem to have been taken fully on board. All LBB comments have been given careful consideration and addressed in full in the revised TA and explained further in the submitted cover letter.
Please refer to our comments March comments (attached for ease of reference). It is not clear how these comments have been taken into account (for example under the title 'Trip Generation'). A review of the TRICS database suggests that more comparable trip rate could potentially have been achieved. However, it is noted that existing vehicle generation of the site is based on surveyed flows.

Related to the above, it is not clear how the through site traffic for the existing site was established (approx. 40 and 41 during the AM and PM peak hour periods respectively). Please provide clarification as we need to understand the methodology to have confidence that site traffic and through traffic are correctly quantified.
The 'rat-run' was brought to our attention by LBB highway officers in pre-app discussions, prior to any survey work being conducted. During the traffic surveys an enumerator stood in the car park so that they could see both accesses, specifically to count those drivers that used the car park as a through-route. This was included in the survey data, provided to LBB in Excel format.
The survey data has now been provided for review and it is noted that 44 and 42 vehicles were observed to rat run during the weekday AM and PM peak hour periods.

The traffic flow diagrams do not appear to match the vehicle trips summarised within the tables in the main body the report (e.g., Table 11.5 suggests 232 and 278 vehicles during the AM and PM peak hour periods for the existing site, whilst in the traffic flow diagrams the numbers are 144 and 194 during the AM and PM peak hour periods). The link flow diagram titles state 'excl rat-run'. In the AM there are 44 vehicles rat-running, each representing one arrival and one departure from site, making 88 trips. This is the noted difference between 232 and 144 . The same principle applies to the PM there are 42 rat-running vehicles, making 84 trips the difference between 278 and 194. This is not a discrepancy; the 'existing' situation includes the through vehicles, but the effects of development should be judged against a baseline where those vehicles are using the public highway as intended.
There are queries in relation to the robustness of the net impact assessment. The comparison for the net impact assessment (Table 12.1) should consider the extant planning permission. That is the proposed development versus the existing development (excluding rat-running traffic i.e. 144 and 194 vehicles in the weekday AM and PM peak hour period respectively).

Please clarify the discrepancies and what represents the existing scenario See above. It is noted that the raw survey data was not included in Appendix B of the submission. Apologies, this was an omission. Please can we have an email address for the highway officer so that we can issue the extensive survey data (or a data-share link) directly.
Thank you, data has now been provided.

Depending on the above and taking into account the closure of the Cricklewood Lane access (traffic re-assignment), it is noted that there would be additional vehicles at the Depot Approach / A5 signalised junction (and to a lesser extent the Cricklewood Lane / A5 junction) which have not been considered in terms of impacts (particularly during the AM peak hour period e.g., right turn movements). This also need to account for the newly diverted traffic which would have previously run through the site. The re-directed through-traffic is already taken into account; however, this is not a result of the development. This traffic should already be using the public highway and could be prevented from rat-running through B\&Q's car park today without the need for planning permission. As stated in the TA, vehicle trip assumptions are very robust (i.e., assuming $100 \%$ private housing etc). Even taking account of this robust assessment, the net change in vehicle movements through any junction is negligible, there are minor increases on some arms and decreases on others. These are not expected to have any materiel effect on the operation of those junctions. The overall development will result in a reduction in vehicle trips in the peak hours and across the day as a whole, and will therefore have a positive effect on the on the local highway network throughout Cricklewood and beyond.
As noted previously, taking into account site traffic re-assignment due to the closure of the Cricklewood Lane access, it is noted that there would be additional vehicles at the already congested Depot Approach / A5 and the Cricklewood Lane / A5 signalised junctions. For example, the right turn movement from the A5 at its signalised junction with Depot Approach experiences an increase in traffic which may impact the operation at that arm where there are available lane width / length constraints, the A5 / Cricklewood Lane junction would also experience increases in traffic which may impact its performance. We are not sure of how or what assessment has be done in order to conclude that the development is 'not expected to have any material effect on the operation of those junctions.'

The assumptions for committed development / cumulative impact have not been set out for review.
No response has been provided
The reserved matters applications would need to detail the cumulative impact assessment relevant to each of the respective Phases. Agreed

The new submission provides an analysis which considered Census data. It is noted that Census data would normally only be used to inform public transport mode split from the overall percentages derived from TRICS as is considered relevant particularly for peak hour weekday trips. In any event, the point in relation to rail travel is noted. Noted, it was LBB who suggested the use of Census data.

However, there is a large discrepancy in term of bus travel (assumed $17 \%$ versus $47 \%$ from Census for bus travel).
This is explained in paragraph 11.31; the Census data is Journey to Work whereas the TRICS data is all journeys.
There are inevitable differences.
We await TfL comments in relation to bus impacts.
We await Network Rail comments in relation to train impacts.
Transport Improvements
The following improvements / contributions are noted / required:

1. New pedestrian/cycle route between Depot Approach and Cricklewood Lane (needs to be secured with further design detail provided at the reserved matters stage); Agreed
2. Removal vehicle access from Cricklewood Lane (requires s278); Agreed
3. New public realm including a new public square, open space and play areas (requires s106/s278 agreement); S106, not S278 as no work within the public highway
4. Improvements to existing public realm, including Cricklewood Green enhancements to be secured by s106/s278 agreement; Agreed but probably S106 as any S278 matters will be addressed by item 2.
5. New Car Club space to provide for new residents and the wider local community (may require more than 1 space on-site, should be included in layout plans and Travel Plan); Agreed
6. Land safeguarded so as not to preclude future southern access into Cricklewood Station; Agreed
7. Travel Plan monitoring contributions and Travel Plan incentives; Agreed
8. s278 agreement for improvements to the pedestrian environment which comprises controlled crossing facility on Cricklewood Lane and improvements to the pedestrian route beneath the rail bridge. This would require further work with Council's Highways Team and TfL; Agreed
9. s106 contribution towards CPZ review ( $£ 42,000$ ); Breakdown of sum to be provided by LBB. See comments above.
10. Neighbourhood measures scheme for Cricklewood (proposed scheme)(s106 contribution cost to be defined); Details required from LBB
A design for the scheme is to be developed (refer to study area below). Estimates of costs are in the region of $£ 200,000-£ 250,000$.

11. School streets scheme at Childs Hill School (s106 contribution - cost to be defined); Details required from LBB and We will forward information at a later date.
12. Possible improvements following response to junction impact assessment queries Not required Still queried, refer to comments above.

Carter, Richard

| From: | Planning Vetting |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 14 May 2021 13:00 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: $20 / 3564 /$ OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood |

Hi Carl,

Hope you are well.

Will get this done this afternoon and will send a confirmation to you once completed.

Just wanted to check if the re- consultation is only for the neighbours or do you want it for the consultees as well?

Kind Regards,

London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel:
Web:barnet.gov.uk


Re

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet. Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

## From

 @Barnet.gov.uk>Sent: 14 May 2021 08:19
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Planning Vetting [planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood

Good Morning Carl

I have copied in planning vetting as they will deal with this

Regards

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.

## KEEP <br> sarnet <br> SAFE

## GET TESTED

Anyone with COVID-19
symptoms can get tested.
barnet.gov.uk/testandtrace


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 08:18
To:
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood

Morning

I hope you are well.

We have received additional information on this one which requires a reconsultation. If possible, please could we do a 14 day reconsultation? (sorry I know it's a big one).

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
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Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


Certificate Number 15180-QMS-081 1509001

## CiM/D-19 <br> can cost you everything

For more information go to: wrw.barnet.gov.ul/fovidoancost

Carter, Richard

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 14 May 2021 14:10 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Cc: | Bowker, Paul |
| Subject: | FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

## fyi

Regards

## Devinda Kumarasinghe

Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
( Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Richard Fitter [richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk](mailto:richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 12:57
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Thanks for your time earlier Devinda.

We will send over the updated access layout plans and a revised Traffic Impact Assessment note ASAP next week; however, in the meantime please find attached the construction chapter from the ES which includes the phasing programme on page 4. This shows the completion dates for Phases 1 to 3 as discussed.

Kind regards,

Richard Fitter
Director

Tel: 02039499922
Mob
www.entranltd.com


78 York Street | London | W1H 1DP | 02039499922
$2^{\text {nd }} \& 3^{\text {rd }}$ Floors | Northgate House | Upper Borough Walls | Bath | BA1 1RG | 01179374077

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 13 May 2021 14:54
To: Richard Fitter [richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk](mailto:richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Richard - Is tmrw 10am ok?
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Richard Fitter [richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk](mailto:richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk)
Sent: 13 May 2021 14:02
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi Devinda,

Following Carl's email, could you let me know your availability tomorrow or early next week for a short call or Teams meeting to run through your latest comments?

Many thanks,

Richard Fitter
Director

Tel: 02039499922
Mob:
www.entranltd.com


[^13]From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 13 May 2021 13:12
To: John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com); Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Richard Fitter [richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk](mailto:richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk); @iceniprojects.com>; Bowker, Paul
[Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi All

I am happy for Richard and Devinda to liaise directly but please let me know if you arrange a call and I will make myself available.

## Kind Regards

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
㰦 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for



## can cost you

 everythingFor more information go to: www.barnet.gov.uk/covidcancost

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com)
Sent: 13 May 2021 09:38
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk) Cc: Richard Fitter [richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk](mailto:richardfitter@entranltd.co.uk); @iceniprojects.com>; Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Importance: High

Good morning Carl,
Richard and I have reviewed the attached and think it would be beneficial for a short call to run through them. Preferably all on this e-mail but if its easier / quicker for Richard \& Devinda to liaise direct them so be it.

Please let me know.
Many thanks. John

John Mumby BA (Hons)
Director, Planning
telephone:
mobile:
email:jmumby@Iceniprojects.com

Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester

## Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | Ian's Blog



The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Wednesday, May 12, 2021 2:57 PM
To: @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby [jmumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:jmumby@iceniprojects.com);

> @iceniprojects.com>

Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

FYI see attached, comments in blue

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-ltd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London

Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for worrying " A Hom 3 Eive
can cost you everything

For more information go to: wwrw.barnet.gov.ulk/covidcancost

R|A|R|N|F|T

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 12 May 2021 14:36
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Carl - Further to the email below, please find attached LB Barnet Transport team comments in relation to the above scheme (responses in blue).

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
A Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

## From:

## @iceniprojects.com>

Sent: 30 April 2021 11:52
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); John Mumby
[imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com);
@iceniprojects.com>
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hi Devinda,
Thanks again for sharing your comments with us directly this week. Entran have had an opportunity to consider this and have prepared the attached response for your review.

In many cases, Entran have provided further clarification or confirmed where the required information can be found in the TA. The additional swept paths are now appended to the document.

Please also find attached the survey data which comprises a set of automatic traffic counts (ATC), manual turning counts at four junctions; and a specific survey quantifying the unauthorised 'rat-runs' through the site.

I trust this information is helpful. Please let me know if you have any further queries.
Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
From
Sent: 27 April 2021 17:48
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Thanks Devinda,
I've shared your comments with Richard at Entran. We will come back with a response shortly.
Andrew - with Carl away this week please could you advise on a suitable date for a members briefing in May? We are keen to get this fixed with our team.

Many thanks,


Find Us: Edinburgh | Glasgow | London | Manchester
Follow us on : Instagram | Linkedln | Twitter | Vimeo | lan's Blog

The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 27 April 2021 16:26
To @ @iceniprojects.com>
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

## Hello <br> 

As my colleague Carl is on leave this week, please find attached comments from the LB Barnet Transport team in relation to the above application.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
$A$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

This email and any attachments to it are intended solely for the individual to whom it is addressed. It may contain sensitive or confidential material and should be handled accordingly. However, it is recognised that, as an intended recipient of this email, you may wish to share it with those who have a legitimate interest in the contents.

If you have received this email in error and you are not the intended recipient you must not disclose, distribute, copy or print any of the information contained or attached within it, all copies must be deleted from your system. Please notify the sender immediately.

Whilst we take reasonable steps to identify software viruses, any attachments to this email may contain viruses which our anti-virus software has failed to identify. No liability can be accepted, and you should therefore carry out your own anti-virus checks before opening any documents.

Please note: Information contained in this e-mail may be subject to public disclosure under the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or the Environmental Information Regulations 2004.
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## B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) - LB Barnet Transport Comment

The London Borough of Barnet Transport Team have reviewed the Technical Note 5 submission supporting the above outline planning application. Our comments are set out below and should be read in conjunction with our previously issued comments.

## Proposed Development

It is understood that the development will be up to 1,100 new homes ( $35 \%$ affordable) and 1,200sqm of commercial / community use. The residential element shall consist of 148 studio flats, $413 \times 1$ bed flats, $434 \times 2$ bed flats and 105 $x 3$ bed flats. Vehicle access shall be from Depot Approach, a private access road, with the closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane.

As queried previously, what is the anticipated year of opening for Phases $\mathbf{1 , 2} 2$ and 3 ? A detailed TA would need to be submitted to support each Phase (as part of the reserved matters applications). This is addressed in the Entran cover letter dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021. The submitted TA assesses the completed development in an assumed year of completion of 2026. If detailed TAs are required for individual phases, these can be secured by condition and delivered as part of any full or reserved matters applications.

We have looked at the Entran cover letter (dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021) and cannot find the information as suggested in relation to the anticipated year of opening for Phases 1, 2 and 3. Please provide clarification where this is contained in the letter.

The assumed 2026 full completion year assumed in the TA is noted. It is agreed that applications for individual phases should be supported by detailed Transport Assessments and that this should be secured by planning condition.

The draft construction programme has been provided indicating the following:

- Phase 1: Block A shall be completed on March 2025 and Block B shall be completed on September 2024
- Phase 2: Block C shall be completed on December 2025
- Phase 3: Block D shall be completed on July 2026.

As noted previously a detailed TA would need to be submitted to support each of the above Phases (as part of the reserved matters applications).

The closure of the existing vehicle access onto Cricklewood Lane will require a s278 Agreement and should include improvements to the pedestrian environment. Agreed The proposed new landscaped routes through Cricklewood Green are expected to be secured by means of a legal agreement (s278/s106). Agreed, although more likely to be S106 as any works within the public highway will be covered in the S278 mentioned above.

The site / access layout plans should be fully dimensioned for review purposes if approval is sought as part of this application (e.g., access if it is not a reserved matter). The description of development is clear that means of access is to be determined but layout is a reserved matter. Accordingly, the internal roads are illustrative only. The access junctions have been designed around the swept paths of the largest vehicles expected to enter the site ( 11.3 m 4 axle refuse vehicle) and visibility splays included at Appendix D. New plans are attached showing the access junction dimensions (SK305).
Is tactile paving / dropped kerbs to be provided at the main vehicle access points? This is not shown on plan and the access arrangement for the second most southern access is also queried (no kerb radii, no dropped kerbs / tactile paving, what is the larger pedestrian crossing distance and would this require a refuge, is there a raised threshold).

The revised drawings of the two vehicle access points are now noted (Dwg. No. SK305 Rev A). Detail access design to be conditioned (reserved matters application).

This should also be supported by full swept path analysis showing two-way vehicle movement at the access points and internal roads (covering normal passenger vehicles and larger service / delivery / refuse vehicles). We have attached further swept path analyses showing two cars passing at the site accesses. These also show a car passing a van, however, in order to keep the junction geometry to a minimum (for the benefit of pedestrians) a large refuse vehicle will use both sides of the carriageway when manoeuvring. This accords with the principles of Manual for Streets. The swept path analysis provided only considers the one-way movement of a refuse vehicle larger than the large refuse vehicle. Is it anticipated that there shall be vehicles larger than a refuse vehicle permitted on site? No. The vehicle used is an 11.3 m long 4 -axle refuse vehicle. This is larger than currently used by LBB in Cricklewood and
less manoeuvrable than most rigid pantechnicons such as removal lorries. This is a worst-case assessment. A Service and Delivery Management Plan would need to be conditioned (with the maximum size of vehicles specified).

Consideration should also be given to the provision of a pedestrian refuge at the main vehicular access points to improve safety (fully dimensioned plans have not been provided to support the case being put forward). This is addressed in the Entran cover letter dated $12^{\text {th }}$ March 2021 (p2) and the revised TA para 4.10. A pedestrian refuge would require the junctions to be wider with larger radii, encouraging higher vehicle speeds.
Manual for Streets and TfL guidance advocates minimum junction radii and in-line pedestrian crossings wherever practical. If required, a side road entry treatment (SRET) could be included here to further reduce speeds. Means of access is to be determined but detailed design matters such as the inclusion of a SRET can be secured by condition and included in any detailed layout and landscape design to be determined as part of a reserved matters application.
Please refer to above comments in relation to the second most southern access. Detail access design to be conditioned (reserved matters application).

It is noted that the layout is a reserved matter and full details will be provided as part of any reserved matters application. All vehicles should enter and exit the site in a forward direction with collections made in accordance with standard trolleying distances. Agreed The swept path analysis provided does not show how a refuse vehicle turns around near the D1 collection point. Drawing SK201A at Appendix G shows the refuse vehicle reversing to a point $<10 \mathrm{~m}$ from collection point D1. NB, internal layout is a reserved matter.
We have reviewed Appendix $G$ of the TA and cannot see a reversing movement to the D1 collection point. A reversing movement of a large vehicle along the internal road and across a junction would be queried in terms of safety and operation. In any event, it is noted that the internal layout is a reserved matter.

As queried previously, it is not clear what P1, P2 and P3 represent in Figure 4.3. These are bin presentation areas as described in paragraph 8.4, 8.6 and 8.7 of the TA.
The need for a Manage Waste Strategy is noted.
A Delivery and Servicing Plan should be conditioned. This would include the dimensions of the largest vehicles permitted on site. Agreed, as set out in Section 8.

Parking
The TA states that as the layout is a reserved matter 'the total number of car and cycle parking spaces are not defined as part of this application.' We shall await the reserved matters applications for confirmation of numbers and design. Agreed

It is mentioned that there shall be a minimum of 1,846 long-stay and 28 short-stay cycle parking spaces for the residential use. At this stage, the non-residential uses are proposed to have 12 long-stay and 32 short-stay cycle parking spaces. The phased provision / design / location of long and short term cycle parking should be detailed as part of the reserved matters submissions. Agreed

Cycle parking provision should be provided in line with the London Plan (not Intend to Publish London Plan) and the London Cycle Design Standard guidance (via planning condition). Agreed

The TA mentions that the illustrative masterplan has been tested to demonstrate that it can accommodate 110 car parking spaces (suitable for disabled persons), though it is not understood what proportion shall be allocated between the residential and non-residential land uses This is explained in paragraph 5.8 of the TA hence more detailed comments cannot be provided at this stage other than to say that parking should be provide in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan and the new London Plan (noting that accessible spaces are also required for non-residential uses and therefore more spaces than are currently proposed may be required).
It is reiterated that parking should be provided in accordance with Barnet's Local Plan and the new London Plan (noting that accessible spaces are also required for non-residential uses and therefore more spaces than the 110 currently proposed may be required). Reserved matter.

In addition to the above, reduced levels of parking proposed would only be supported if there is to be improved accessibility measures, suitable overspill parking control / protection and the provision of sustainable transport measures. The proposed development will deliver a suite of improved accessibility measures as set out in full in the TA Future residents of the development should not be eligible for on-street parking permits (s106). Agreed, although S106 cannot legally be used for this purpose; need to use S16 of the GLCGPA 1974. More than just the 1 car club space should be provided. The principle of a Car Club will be secured by condition (or S106); the number of spaces will be determined at the reserved matters stage in consultation with LBB and potential commercial
operators. The uptake of Car Club membership will be monitored as part of the Travel Plan; this will inform the number of spaces in successive phases. This facility should be provided on-site in a visible location. Agreed

It is suggested that car and cycle parking provision will be controlled and regulated by means of a Parking Design and Management Plan (PDMP). A PDMP would need to be conditioned. Agreed, as stated in paragraph 5.27.

There appears to be potential for overspill on-street parking on Depot Approach. As it is a private road, the TA suggests that the developer / owner will be able to implement private enforcements measures. The suggested private enforcement measures should be proposed and detailed further to support the lower levels of parking proposed. These measures will form part of the PDMP, secured by condition.

There are surrounding roads in vicinity of the site and within LBB boundaries that are not suitability protected by
a CPZ. Figure 3.6 demonstrates that all roads within a 200 m walking distance of the site are subject to private enforcement, or public highway covered by waiting restrictions or a CPZ. This is stated in paragraph 3.36. A small number of roads further afield allow unrestricted parking, but these are beyond a reasonable walking distance for residential parking. The figure of 200 m is taking from the Lambeth Parking Stress methodology which is widely accepted as best practice across all London Boroughs. Therefore, there is concern that the proposed development
with low on-site car parking provision would have potential for overspill parking onto the surrounding road network resulting a negative impact on the local amenity. Some roads such as Litchfield Road have no restrictions whilst others are protected from commuter parking with a weekday 1 hr restriction (Mon-Fri 10am-11am) which would not directly address residential overspill demand times. It is considered that the proposed development should help enable a review of the CPZ to address the above concerns. The development is not expected to have any effect on parking stress within a reasonable distance of the site. Any financial contribution towards a review of the CPZ should be commensurate with the anticipated effects, not simply a pro-rata contribution based on unit numbers.
We disagree with the statement that 'the development is not expected to have any effect on parking stress within a reasonable distance of the site.' Therefore, our previous comments in relation to CPZ are reiterated.

The above issue has been discussed with the LB Barnet Parking Team who have confirmed that the surrounding area is under review and have noted that the control times may need to be revised to help manage parking stress as a result of the development. The LB Barnet Parking Team have requested a financial contribution of $£ 42,000$ towards a CPZ review / upgrade (secured via s106 agreement). A breakdown of this sum is requested, including clarification of contributions requested from recently approved developments in the area.
I have requested further information from the Council's Parking team and will forward this once received. However, please note that with no reinforcement of the CPZ there is a potential negative impact on the local amenity as a direct result of the application and we would therefore not be in a position to support the application.

The environment committee approved the development of a programme to create new and review existing controlled parking zones in January of this year. We have identified that the Cricklewood CPZ requires a review following an assessment of recent complaints, petitions, historical parking issues and forthcoming planned developments. Our programme will also take into account housing growth in the area, modal shift, new stations and the Ultra-Low Emission Zone.

Cricklewood CPZ area review - the zone was first introduced in July 2001 and this CPZ has had no wider review since that time. There was a small extension to the zone in May 2016, although there was no review of the surrounding area. The review will be an opportunity to ask residents and businesses if the CPZ is working well and if any amendments will help with their parking needs.

The vast majority of the CPZ operates Mon - Fri 10am - 11am, however there are a number of roads within the zone that has a mix of operational times. We will look to align the operational times and days where possible as this provides an opportunity to declutter the CPZ by removing unnecessary signage.

There are a number of roads in proximity to the development that do not have controls and we will consult residents and business to ascertain if there is support to extend the CPZ. As a result of this redevelopment, other adjoining CPZs may require reviews in the future.

Some of the keys drivers in terms of complaints is that the area experiences high parking occupancy due to the proximity to local shops. We have identified that there are weekend parking issues due to lack of controls.

- In terms of transport issues, we have Cricklewood Station which is a trip attractor, limiting parking opportunities outside of the controlled times.
- And we have a new rail station, 'Brent Cross West' planned to open in 2022. It is expected that two million passengers will use the station in the first year.

There is lots of development taking place in the area, such as the Brent Cross redevelopment. And this area likely requires a review due to associated commuter parking and construction site workers.

- Some of the other developments in the Cricklewood area are the Beacon Bingo, Broadway Retail Park and Granville Road Estate. So the area in all is expected to see significant housing growth for the next 2-3 years
- In this area we have 7 Primary and 1 prep school, and as we all know schools are the cause of some of the parking traffic congestion issues during school pick up and drop off.
And some of the shopping areas is that we have the Brent Cross and the new Brent Cross Town nearby and Finchley Road \& Cricklewood Lane.

Due to all of the reasons above and as previously expressed, a CPZ contribution, from this proposed development, towards the review and/or implementation of CPZ infrastructure is sought as follows:

- Scheme design $=8 \mathrm{k}$
- Informal consultation $=8 \mathrm{k}$
- $\quad$ TROs - stat consultation $=8 \mathrm{~K}$
- Implementation (infrastructure, signs, lines \& stats) $=18 \mathrm{~K}$

Total $=42 \mathrm{k}$

## Transport Implementation Strategy

The Framework Travel Plan (FTP), Delivery and Servicing Plan (DSP) and Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) should be secured by a planning condition. A Construction Worker Travel Plan (CWTP) should also be conditioned. Agreed

We are awaiting comments from the LB Barnet Travel Planner. The Framework Travel Plan (FTP) was included in the original TA (March 2020). As stated in the FTP, individual TPs will be prepared for the residential and commercial elements of the development, based on the principles set out in the submitted FTP. These will be secured by appropriate condition.
We are still awaiting comment from the LB Barnet Travel Planner.

## Trip Generation

The reported vehicle trips generated by the existing site appears to be relatively high and are significantly higher than the average trips generated by the TRICS sites (694 versus 4591 daily trips) which raises queries on the analysis and sites used. All analysis of the proposed development is based on the observed vehicle trips. The TRICS assessment of retail uses was carried out as a comparison. The sites selected were the best available data in the TRICS ${ }^{\circledR}$ database and the most comparable to the application site. This is explained in Section 11 of the TA. Our comments issued dated end of March don't seem to have been taken fully on board. All LBB comments have been given careful consideration and addressed in full in the revised TA and explained further in the submitted cover letter.

Please refer to our comments March comments (attached for ease of reference). It is not clear how these comments have been taken into account (for example under the title 'Trip Generation'). A review of the TRICS database suggests that more comparable trip rate could potentially have been achieved. However, it is noted that existing vehicle generation of the site is based on surveyed flows.

Related to the above, it is not clear how the through site traffic for the existing site was established (approx. 40 and 41 during the AM and PM peak hour periods respectively). Please provide clarification as we need to understand the methodology to have confidence that site traffic and through traffic are correctly quantified.
The 'rat-run' was brought to our attention by LBB highway officers in pre-app discussions, prior to any survey work being conducted. During the traffic surveys an enumerator stood in the car park so that they could see both accesses, specifically to count those drivers that used the car park as a through-route. This was included in the survey data, provided to LBB in Excel format.
The survey data has now been provided for review and it is noted that 44 and 42 vehicles were observed to rat run during the weekday AM and PM peak hour periods.

The traffic flow diagrams do not appear to match the vehicle trips summarised within the tables in the main body the report (e.g., Table 11.5 suggests 232 and 278 vehicles during the AM and PM peak hour periods for the existing site, whilst in the traffic flow diagrams the numbers are 144 and 194 during the AM and PM peak hour periods). The link flow diagram titles state 'excl rat-run'. In the AM there are 44 vehicles rat-running, each representing one arrival and one departure from site, making 88 trips. This is the noted difference between 232 and 144. The same principle applies to the PM there are 42 rat-running vehicles, making 84 trips the difference between 278 and 194. This is not a discrepancy; the 'existing' situation includes the through vehicles, but the effects of development
should be judged against a baseline where those vehicles are using the public highway as intended.
There are queries in relation to the robustness of the net impact assessment. The comparison for the net impact assessment (Table 12.1) should consider the extant planning permission. That is the proposed development versus the existing development (excluding rat-running traffic i.e. 144 and 194 vehicles in the weekday AM and PM peak hour period respectively).

Please clarify the discrepancies and what represents the existing scenario See above. It is noted that the raw survey data was not included in Appendix B of the submission. Apologies, this was an omission. Please can we have an email address for the highway officer so that we can issue the extensive survey data (or a data-share link) directly.
Thank you, data has now been provided.

Depending on the above and taking into account the closure of the Cricklewood Lane access (traffic re-assignment), it is noted that there would be additional vehicles at the Depot Approach / A5 signalised junction (and to a lesser extent the Cricklewood Lane / A5 junction) which have not been considered in terms of impacts (particularly during the AM peak hour period e.g., right turn movements). This also need to account for the newly diverted traffic which would have previously run through the site. The re-directed through-traffic is already taken into account; however, this is not a result of the development. This traffic should already be using the public highway and could be prevented from rat-running through B\&Q's car park today without the need for planning permission. As stated in the TA, vehicle trip assumptions are very robust (i.e., assuming $100 \%$ private housing etc). Even taking account of this robust assessment, the net change in vehicle movements through any junction is negligible, there are minor increases on some arms and decreases on others. These are not expected to have any materiel effect on the operation of those junctions. The overall development will result in a reduction in vehicle trips in the peak hours and across the day as a whole, and will therefore have a positive effect on the on the local highway network throughout Cricklewood and beyond.
As noted previously, taking into account site traffic re-assignment due to the closure of the Cricklewood Lane access, it is noted that there would be additional vehicles at the already congested Depot Approach / A5 and the Cricklewood Lane / A5 signalised junctions. For example, the right turn movement from the A5 at its signalised junction with Depot Approach experiences an increase in traffic which may impact the operation at that arm where there are available lane width / length constraints, the A5 / Cricklewood Lane junction would also experience increases in traffic which may impact its performance. We are not sure of how or what assessment has be done in order to conclude that the development is 'not expected to have any material effect on the operation of those junctions.'

Technical Note 5 suggests that the forecast residential vehicle trips for the proposed development shall be 35 and 24 two-way trips in the AM and PM peak hour periods respectively (with a daily total of 265 vehicle trips). This compares with the original Transport Assessment that forecasted 118 and 85 two-way vehicle trips in the AM and PM peak hour respectively (with a daily total of 898 vehicle trips). The new assessment now suggests forecasted vehicle trips that are approximately $30 \%$ of the original forecasts.

The methodology set out within Technical Note 5 is not a standard process. It is not clear why the combined 'Residential M - Mixed private / Affordable housing' land use was not selected as per the proposed development, but instead private and affordable were calculated individually. The reason given for calculating residential vehicle trip rates per parking space are noted. However, this is not standard practice when using the TRICS database. It is advised that 'trip rate calculations per parking space are only available for land uses where it can be considered with good confidence that the vast majority of parking takes place on-site and where it is also considered most relevant.' The TRICS trip rate parameters for residential land consist of site area, dwellings, housing density and bedrooms. It is also noted that the standard TRICS methodology uses weighted averages for the standard parameters and that the calculations undertaken within Technical Note 5 do not.

However, the LB Barnet Transport team have undertaken an initial assessment for comparison purposes and have concluded that the forecast vehicle trips are acceptable.

The existing retail use peak hour traffic generation reported in Table 5.1 includes 'rat-run' traffic and is therefore not suitable to use when undertaking a net comparison review of land use generation. Therefore, the net reduction in peak hour vehicle trips shown in Table 5.3 and stated in Paragraph 5.2 is queried.

The traffic generation numbers shown in Tables 5.1 and 5.2 is not reflective in the traffic flow diagrams. It is also not understood why there are negative numbers shown on the traffic flow diagrams. Clarification on the development distribution assumptions is sought (it is noted that in the TA one distribution diagram is provided however we are not sure of the assumptions behind this and to what peak hour period it relates to). Perhaps a direct discussion with the Transport consultant would help address / clarify this issue.

The assumptions for committed development / cumulative impact have not been set out for review.
No response has been provided

No response received as yet
The reserved matters applications would need to detail the cumulative impact assessment relevant to each of the respective Phases. Agreed

The new submission provides an analysis which considered Census data. It is noted that Census data would normally only be used to inform public transport mode split from the overall percentages derived from TRICS as is considered relevant particularly for peak hour weekday trips. In any event, the point in relation to rail travel is noted. Noted, it was LBB who suggested the use of Census data.

However, there is a large discrepancy in term of bus travel (assumed 17\% versus $47 \%$ from Census for bus travel).
This is explained in paragraph 11.31; the Census data is Journey to Work whereas the TRICS data is all journeys.
There are inevitable differences.
We await TfL comments in relation to bus impacts.
We await Network Rail comments in relation to train impacts.

## Transport Improvements

## The following improvements / contributions are noted / required:

1. New pedestrian/cycle route between Depot Approach and Cricklewood Lane (needs to be secured with further design detail provided at the reserved matters stage); Agreed
2. Removal vehicle access from Cricklewood Lane (requires s278); Agreed
3. New public realm including a new public square, open space and play areas (requires s106/s278 agreement); S106, not S278 as no work within the public highway
4. Improvements to existing public realm, including Cricklewood Green enhancements to be secured by s106/s278 agreement; Agreed but probably S106 as any S278 matters will be addressed by item 2.
5. New Car Club space to provide for new residents and the wider local community (may require more than 1 space on-site, should be included in layout plans and Travel Plan); Agreed
6. Land safeguarded so as not to preclude future southern access into Cricklewood Station; Agreed
7. Travel Plan monitoring contributions and Travel Plan incentives; Agreed
8. s278 agreement for improvements to the pedestrian environment which comprises controlled crossing facility on Cricklewood Lane and improvements to the pedestrian route beneath the rail bridge. This would require further work with Council's Highways Team and TfL; Agreed
9. s106 contribution towards CPZ review ( $£ 42,000$ ); Breakdown of sum to be provided by LBB. See comments above. Refer to comments above.
10. Neighbourhood measures scheme for Cricklewood (proposed scheme)(s106 contribution cost to be defined); Details required from LBB
A design for the scheme is to be developed (refer to study area below). Estimates of costs are in the region of $£ 200,000$ - $£ 250,000$.

11. School streets scheme at Childs Hill School (s106 contribution - cost to be defined); Details required from LBB and We will forward information at a later date.
12. Possible improvements following response to junction impact assessment queries Not required Still queried, refer to comments above.
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## 6. Demolition and Construction

### 6.1 Introduction

6.1.1 This chapter of the ES describes the demolition and construction works to be undertaken for the Proposed Development and outlines the environmental management measures committed to by the Applicant to manage the potential environmental effects associated with the construction and demolition activities (collectively referred to as 'demolition and construction phase' effects).
6.1.2 AECOM Infrastructure \& Environment UK Limited (AECOM) has prepared this chapter in conjunction with the Applicant and members of the wider design team including Stace LLP, WWA Cost Consultants and Entran Ltd. (refer to Table 1-1 within Chapter 1: Introduction). The methodology for construction is necessarily broad at this stage and will be subject to modification during future detailed construction planning and Reserved Matters Applications. However, it is considered that the assessment of the demolition and construction phase effects set out in this ES are based on reasonable assumptions related to the construction programme and the collective experience of the Applicant and wider design team from working on similar projects of this scale and nature.
6.1.3 This chapter and the ES outline mitigation measures for the management of potential demolition and construction phase effects which will need to be included within a Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (or equivalent) that will be prepared by the demolition and construction contractors with further Reserved Matters Applications for the Proposed Development prior to the start of works.
6.1.1 The assessment of potential environmental effects arising from the demolition and construction works identified within this chapter is presented in each of the technical chapters of this ES (i.e. Chapters 8 16 and ES Volume II: TVBHIA). Where required, the environmental management and mitigation measures applicable to the demolition and construction phase are further discussed within the respective technical chapters (i.e. Chapters $8-16$ and ES Volume II: TVBHIA). A summary of all mitigation measures is provided in Chapter 17: Summary of Mitigation.

### 6.2 Programme of Works

6.2.1 An indicative development programme has been prepared in order to enable assessment of the likely environmental effects during the demolition and construction phase of the Proposed Development. The indicative programme is based on a number of assumptions, including the likely phasing of the demolition and construction works technical considerations and professional experience.
6.2.2 The Proposed Development has been divided into 3 Phases with Development Parcels A and B located in Phase 1, Development Parcels C in Phase 2, and Development Parcel D in Phase 3, which will be built out separately, as shown in Figure 6-1. It is noted that prior to the start of construction, the phasing of individual Development Parcels and areas of public realm to be delivered with each Parcel will be confirmed.
6.2.3 For the purpose of the EIA, and as detailed in Figure 6-2, it has been assumed that the demolition and construction works will be undertaken from January 2021 to July 2026, each phase taking two to three years to complete. For the purposes of this Environmental Statement it has been considered that early phases of the Proposed Development may be occupied during the construction of latter phases and therefore a qualitative assessment has been undertaken and included within the technical chapters. Whilst the phasing of the Proposed Development is indicative the effects on early occupants would not change if the order of phasing varied.



### 6.3 Description of Works

6.3.1 The following sections provide a description of the works involved in the demolition and construction phase of the Proposed Development.

## Demolition/Site Clearance

6.3.2 Prior to the start of demolition, the enabling works on Site are likely to comprise:

- Installation of hoarding around the entire Site Boundary;
- Installation of an access gate;
- Welfare set up;
- Wheel wash installation;
- Additional site investigations, if necessary; and
- Installation of environmental monitoring equipment.
6.3.3 The Site clearance will include removal of all but one of the existing structures on-site within the Site boundary. The structures to be removed are shown Figure 6-4. Vegetation clearance will be undertaken outside the bird nesting season (February to August), if possible, or vegetation will be checked for nesting birds by a suitably qualified ecologist prior to removal, if clearance is required during the bird nesting season.
6.3.4 Before demolition commences, protective screens and scaffolding will be installed, as required. Following the installation of these measures, long reach 360 ' excavators will progressively remove the superstructures of existing buildings on site. Measures to minimise dust during this period are likely to include the following:
- Excavators mounted with concrete pulveriser tools and hydraulic hammers, sized appropriately to the task; and
- Water suppression applied at source by high powered hoses. A further mist creating water cannon will maintain a blanket of mist over the entire demolition area, as an additional precautionary measure.
6.3.5 Demolition arisings will be processed on-site to maximise recycling and reuse and to minimise the need to take material off site, thus reducing the number of Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGV) trips entering and departing the Site. Any waste steel will be extracted for recycling off-site and a crusher will be used to process bulk material, foundations and hard standing for re-use on-site, where possible, for use as back fill and piling mats, reducing the amount of new materials needed for construction.
6.3.6 Following the removal demolition works, existing utilities will be diverted, and the Site will be remediated to bring the existing brownfield areas to an acceptable standard for new development (refer to Chapter 12: Ground Conditions and Contamination). Whilst further investigation will be required to develop a detailed method statement, it is anticipated that the existing foundations will be removed, this material will be crushed on site for re use a piling mat and laid following the completion of the formation level excavation.
6.3.7 Site Access \& Site Construction Roadways. As the site is mainly covered by Car parking Areas and roads to access and egress the site, it would be prudent for the Main Contractor to retain sections of these roads to the configurations/areas as noted on the Site Logistics Plans for use a temporary construction roadway. This would significantly reduce the amount of dust arising from construction traffic on the site during construction operations.


## Piling and Substructure

6.3.8 Following remediation and the removal of any existing foundations and utilities, a piling mat will be installed. The bearing piles will be installed with a suitably sized Continuous Flight Auger (CFA) piling
rig, or equipment of a similar scale. This will be serviced by a 360 ' excavator and a crane to lower reinforcement cages and place concrete via a concrete skip.

Pile caps will be formed, and all underground drainage will be installed prior to casting the ground level slab.

## Super Structure

6.3.10 Following completion of all substructures, tower crane bases will be installed, and tower cranes will be erected. (See Appendix 6.5 Crane Logistics Plan). Static concrete pumps will be positioned to service all superstructure concrete pours. These will be appropriately positioned and acoustically housed to minimise adverse noise impacts to local residential receptors, with dedicated washout facilities.
6.3.11 The main cores will be built up, followed by horizontal slabs and vertical elements, formed using proprietary false work systems, and serviced by a tower crane. A concrete placing boom will assist the tower crane, pumping concrete from a static pump position.
6.3.12 At height, a full protective screen is likely to be erected to totally enclose the buildings' structural formation - this will encompass three full levels and will move up the building as it is constructed. All Building Parcels will have full screens.
6.3.13 Slab edge protection will be installed progressively as the building rises and will be left in place until removed by façade contractor. Reinforcement will be delivered in flat bed lorries and off loaded using the tower cranes. Materials will be lifted into position directly to reduce on-site storage.

## Envelope

6.3.14 The façades will be constructed with a light weight steel metsec frames to support the windows for the earliest watertight envelope, followed by brick and cladding. Installation of the façade elements will be via temporary scaffold with elements distributed to the required level via hoists and cantilever loading platforms, where they will be craned out and installed on to the façade.
6.3.15 Balconies will be installed on to preformed spigots attached to the structure following the completion of the façade and removal of the scaffold.
6.3.16 Roof finishes will be applied to a water proofed slab, with final façade capping to close the façade system. Ground level commercial glazing will follow the main façade works to seal the building completely. Roof landscaping will be installed following completion of all façade installations.

## Fit-Out

6.3.17 The fit-out stage will include the installation of floors and suspended ceilings, the fitting of mechanical and electrical services and the finishing of internal surfaces.

## Public Realm

6.3.18 The public realm works will include the landscaping of the Site, as set out in the Design and Access Statement and the indicative Landscape Strategy. This will incorporate planting of trees and other vegetation, as well as the installation of hard landscaping, roads and street furniture.


Figure 6-4 Demolition Plan


Figure 6-5 Site Accommodation and Materials Storage Logistics Plan




### 6.4 Construction, Excavation and Demolition Waste

6.4.1 Waste arising from Site clearance, earthworks and installation of foundations is expected to comprise of demolition rubble, vegetation, topsoil, and arisings from piling activities.
6.4.2 Any clean excavated material that cannot be reused on-site will be removed by licensed waste carriers and sent for reuse at another development site or for disposal at appropriately licensed facilities (these are expected to be inert waste landfill sites).
6.4.3 Waste expected to be generated during construction includes packaging (including wooden pallets, cable drums etc), plasterboard, timber, cement and plaster, insulation, metal, dry concrete products (blocks, slabs etc), plastic products, ceramic material and landscape materials. Other waste types including doors, frames, partitioning, fixtures and fittings etc. may also be generated. All relevant contractors will be required to investigate opportunities to minimise and reduce waste generation in line with WRAP's 'Halving Waste to Landfill' 'initiative by:

- Agreeing with material suppliers to reduce the amount of packaging or to participate in a packaging take-back scheme;
- Implementing a 'just-in-time' material delivery system to avoid materials being stockpiled, which increases the risk of their damage and disposal as waste;
- Using standard size components in design detailing to eliminate risk at source where possible to do so;
- Paying attention to material quantity requirements to avoid over-ordering and generation of waste materials;
- Re-using materials wherever feasible, e.g. re-use of excavated soil for landscaping (the Government has set broad targets of the use of reclaimed aggregate, and in keeping with best practice, contractors will be required to maximise the proportion of materials recycled);
- $\quad$ Segregating waste at source where practical;
- Re-using and recycling materials off-site where re-use on-site is not practical (e.g. through use of an off-site waste segregation facility and re-sale for direct re-use or re-processing);
- Colour coding and signposting skips to reduce risk of cross contamination and covered to prevent dust and debris blowing around the site, these will be cleared on a regular basis; and
- Not burning waste or unwanted materials on-site.
6.4.4 Anticipated volumes of demolition waste at the Site are shown in Table 6-1, and equate to a total 2,295 tonnes.

Table 6-1 Estimated Enabling Works and Demolition Works Waste

| Waste Stream | Estimated Quantity (Tonnes) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Concrete | 1500 |
| Steel | 100 |
| General Waste | 500 |
| Bricks | 100 |
| Electrical | 5 |


| Waste Stream | Estimated Quantity (Tonnes) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Hazardous | TBC |
| Plasterboard | 50 |
| Timber | 40 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 , 2 9 5}$ - Approx. |

6.4.5 The relevant contractors will be required to carry out works in such a way that, as far as is reasonably practicable, the amount of spoil and waste to be disposed of by landfill is minimised and that any waste arisings from the Site are transported and disposed of in accordance with relevant legislation including the following:

- The Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2018 (as amended);
- The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 (as amended);
- The Waste Management (England and Wales) Regulations 2006; and
- Clean Neighbourhoods and Environment Act 2005.
6.4.6 In addition, the contractors, in consultation with the LBB, and the Environment Agency, will identify disposal sites and routes. When assessing the most suitable option for landfill disposal, the mode of waste transportation and alternatives to reduce adverse environmental effects, transport times and landfill capacity will be considered.
6.4.7 Due to the fact that waste generated during construction will be minimised and reused wherever feasible, there is not predicted to be any significant effect upon landfill capacity as a result of the construction waste volumes.
6.4.8 The Principal Contractor will be required to prepare a Construction Resource Management Plan (CRMP) (or equivalent) in line with the Building Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Methodology (BREEAM) UK New Construction Technical Manual (2014) (refer to BREEAM PreAssessment submitted with the planning application). The CRMP will aim to promote the reuse, recycling and recovery of waste rather than disposal, thereby improving efficiency and profitability; reduce fly-tipping; and increase environmental awareness.
6.4.9 The CRMP will set out the principles for construction waste management, identify measures to minimise waste by design, estimate construction waste quantities, set targets for waste minimisation and a framework for construction waste monitoring that the Principal Contractor will be required to implement on Site. Furthermore, the CRMP will set out measures required for compliance with waste legislation and relevant planning policies.

Table 6-2 Estimated Construction Works Waste

Estimated Construction Waste Arisings Waste Estimated Quantity (tonnes) Stream

| Packaging | 500 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Plaster / Cement | 1250 |
| Miscellaneous | 2500 |
| Timber | 700 |
| Concrete | 14,000 |

Estimated Construction Waste Arisings Waste Estimated Quantity (tonnes)
Stream

| Insulation | 3000 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Metal | 2500 |
| Plastics | 1750 |
| Total | $\mathbf{2 6 , 2 0 0}$ |

## Plant and Equipment

6.4.10 The assumed plant and equipment associated with each key phase of the demolition and construction process are set out in Table 6-3 as follows.

Table 6-3 Indicative Plant and Equipment

| Plant and Equipment |  | әэиелеәノ әџ!S pue ио!!!!ошәа | әınłэnıısqns pue sулом чдееヨ |  | бu!ppeəэ pue бu!ןooy |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tower cranes |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Passenger/goods hoists |  |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Excavators and breakers | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Cutters, drills and small tools | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Crushers |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |
| Floodlights |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |
| Fork lift truck |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Hydraulic benders and cutters |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Lorries and Vans | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Mobile Cranes |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |
| Mobile Lorry mounted concrete pump |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Poker v brator |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |
| Ready mixed concrete lorry |  |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |


| Plant and Equipment |  | әэиедеәן әџ!ऽ pue ио!!!!ошәа |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Concrete splitters/concrete saws |  | $\checkmark$ | $\checkmark$ |  |  |  |

### 6.5 Hours of Works

6.5.1 It is anticipated that the core working hours for both the demolition and construction phases would be as follows, with no working normally undertaken on Sundays or Bank Holidays:

- 08:00-18:00 weekdays; and
- 08:00-13:00 Saturday.
6.5.2 Further to this it is noted that there may be the requirement for some out of hours works (e.g. for pouring piles) that will continue to 23:00, in exceptional circumstances only, subject to prior approval from the LBB. All works will be within the agreed hours, unless or in the event of exceptional circumstances such as;
- An emergency or health and safety issue demands continuation of works (e.g. if safety hoarding is dislodged and needs to be replaced);
- Works are being carried out within the containment of the building envelope;
- Completion of an operation that would otherwise cause greater interference with the environment / general public if left unfinished;
- A requirement to complete concrete pours due to unforeseen overruns caused by, for example, offsite batching plant issues and traffic delays; and/or
- Weekend periods when partial road closures may be required for works, such as tower crane installation and decommissioning, and craning plant onto roof spaces, so not as to disrupt traffic during a weekday when the area will be busier.
6.5.3 Although night-time working will not normally be undertaken, it is possible that some deliveries may be required at night and that certain works may be undertaken during this period. Any night-time work activities would be discussed and agreed with the LBB and carried out subject to reasonable notice.
6.5.4 It is recognised that approval from the LBB will be required for any works that need to be undertaken outside of these permitted hours, and that the LBB might may vary these hours (by agreement) where the works are in close proximity to sensitive businesses and/or residential properties.


### 6.6 Traffic Management

6.6.1 It is anticipated that the largest vehicle accessing the Site will be an articulated lorry. As the Site and surrounding road network is capable of receiving deliveries from large vehicles, it is not deemed necessary for large loads to be broken down into smaller delivery vehicles prior to being delivered to Site. This will reduce the overall volume and impact of deliveries upon the road network and neighbours. It may be necessary to limit the use of large vehicles during peak commuting times.
6.6.2 Figure $6-8$ shows the Estimated Monthly Vehicle Movements (EMVM) associated with each phase of works at the Site.

Figure 6-8 Estimated Monthly Vehicle Movements (EMVM)

6.6.3 The estimates of the construction material quantities, together with the outline construction programme, have been used to estimate the peak vehicle movements over the 66 months demolition and construction period. Construction knowledge and historic data have been applied to the anticipated programme and construction methodology (as summarised within this ES chapter) to develop the estimates below. During the peak months, there will be approximately 1,100 construction HGV vehicles accessing the site per month and approximately 750 LGV vehicles per month. On this basis, the average number of vehicles in a peak month is approximately 40 HGV (two way) vehicles per day and approximately 30 LGV (two way) vehicles based on a 5.5 day working week.
6.6.4 A Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP), will be conditioned as part of the planning permission to ensure that construction traffic is appropriately managed. This will be agreed with the LB Barnet Highways Department and the Local Police Traffic Section. Oversize vehicles will be transported to site at the hours agreed with the local Traffic Police Department. These will normally be transported in the early hours of the morning to avoid traffic delays and disruption.
6.6.5 Access routes to and from the Site which will be utilised by HGVs will be agreed with the LBB prior to the start of the demolition and construction works. At this stage, it is anticipated that the strategic road network will be used as far as possible by construction traffic, with vehicles assumed to access the site from the east and west along the A406 and into Barnet via the A5 and avoiding the most congested areas of Barnet.
6.6.6 The exact location of site accesses for demolition/construction vehicles is yet to be determined. Any local traffic management measures will be agreed with LBB and TFL prior to the start of the demolition and construction works. At this stage it is anticipated that the strategic road network will be used as far as possible by construction traffic, with vehicles assumed to access the Site from east and west along the A406 and into Cricklewood Lane via the A5. (refer to ES Volume I Chapter 15 Traffic and Transport for further details).
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## Construction Logistics Plan

6.6.7 A Construction Logistics Plan (CLP) will be produced and submitted alongside the Reserved Matters Applications, which will provide a framework for the management of construction vehicle movements to and from the Site. The CLP will set out measures so that construction materials can be delivered, and demolition and construction waste can be removed in a safe, efficient and sustainable manner.
6.6.8 The CLP will implement a series of measures to reduce the impact of construction vehicle traffic upon the highway network, these include;

- The provision of clear signed and uncongested routes for construction vehicles, and providing drivers with access route maps;
- Encouraging construction workers to travel to the Site using alternative modes of travel to cars;
- Encouraging contractors to use local materials, reducing the number of deliveries and distance of vehicles travelled;
- Publish details of construction facilities and procedures to workers and contractors to indicate the most suitable times for deliveries, delivery locations, and preferred suppliers and couriers.
- The use of a centralised area for loading and unloading of construction materials, if possible, in close proximity to materials storage area, to minimise construction vehicle movements within the Site;
- Freight Operator Recognition System (FORS) - the use of companies who are FORS members and encourage contractors to sign up to FORS scheme to increase the sustainability of freight movements to improve safety/fuel efficiency and the reduction of carbon dioxide emissions. FORS also promotes awareness of cyclists and associated vehicle safety measures;
- Implementation of a vehicle booking system, to manage and schedule deliveries to the Site; and
- Managing access and egress through a 'Just in Time’ operating system, with vehicles travelling to the Site held in a holding yard until notified by the site operative, to prevent multiple vehicles from entering and leaving the Site at the same time.
6.6.9 The CLP also provides a framework for future on site contractors for construction to develop targets including, the number of construction vehicle trips during AM and PM peak hours, the proportion of servicing and delivery companies to be members of FORS and a percentage of vehicles to be 'green' or low emission vehicles.


## Track out and Wheel Washing

6.6.10 Mud and debris on the road is one of the main environmental nuisance and safety problems arising from construction sites. In the early stages of the construction, vehicle wheel washing facilities will be made available. Where utilised, a wash bay area will be impermeable and isolated from the surrounding area by a raised kerb or roll over bund to contain solids, with effluent directed to the foul sewer (foul and surface water drainage will be connected to the existing Thames Water networks).
6.6.11 The contractor(s)'s on-site supervisors will assess if wheel washing is needed to ensure that mud/detritus originating from the Site is not deposited on the public highway, and they will be responsible for carrying out a subsequent inspection.
6.6.12 No vehicles will be permitted to leave the Site if it is considered they pose any risk to the public highway. To ensure highways are maintained in good order it is anticipated that the contractor(s) will undertake cleaning of the surrounding roads as necessary to remove any unwanted material from the wearing course.
6.6.13 Muck away vehicles will be fully sheeted to minimise the risk of any mud over-spilling onto the highway and watering down will be carried out as required to suppress dust on:

- Unpaved areas that are subject to traffic or wind;
- Sand, spoil and aggregate stockpiles; and
- During loading/unloading of dust generating materials.
6.6.14 The following procedure is intended to ensure no mud, dirt, debris or other loose material is deposited outside the Site on the public highway:
- During the earthworks phase of the Proposed Development, facilities for wheel washing will be installed and maintained at the main site vehicle entrance;
- All loads of loose or dusty materials transported from the Site shall be securely sheeted; and
- Sufficient road sweeping equipment and personnel will be provided to keep the highways clean.


### 6.7 Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)

6.7.1 An ISO 14001 (or equivalent) compliant CEMP is to be prepared by the Principal Contractor and submitted prior to the start of construction works in each Parcel (or part therein). The aim of the CEMP is to provide an overarching and strategic framework for the management of environmental effects and the implementation of measures prior to, and during, the demolition and construction phase of the Proposed Development. The CEMP will be a 'live' document and will be continually reviewed and updated by the Principal Contractor, following the submission and approval of the Reserved Matters Application in accordance with the measures agreed under the approved reserved matters.
6.7.2 The CEMP will include the following information (but not be limited to):

- Site information:
- Location of the works, including a Site plan, showing construction site boundaries and any sensitive receptors (e.g. retained trees, water courses, local residents etc.);
- Detailed management structure and key contacts (such as the appointed Liaison Manager, Site Environmental Manager, the relevant LBE contacts and contacts at the Environment Agency and Highways Agency in the event of an emergency); and
- Procedures for environmental training of all permanent and temporary Site staff, which staff will be covered within the 'Toolbox Talks', a series of training sessions relating to specific health and safety issues relating to the construction industry.
- Construction information:
- A description of the works to be undertaken and a detailed programme of the construction activities;
- Proposed working hours during construction, including any abnormal hours;
- Details of the main haulage routes and Site access points;
- Proposed dates and sequence of the works;
- Equipment and plant to be used; and
- Method of delivery / removal of materials and plant.
- Environmental Management:
- An internal environmental audit programme, e.g. ISO 14001 or details of policies specific to the Applicant;
- An Environmental Mitigation Register with associated procedures, which show how environmental risks will be addressed for each activity;
- Schedule of potential environmental effects relating to each activity (based on the effects identified in the ES);
- Procedure for neighbourhood liaison and dealing with complaints;
- Measures to exclude the public from the vicinity of the Site during construction and ensure maintenance of public safety;
- Measures to reduce visual impact of the construction Site, including nuisance from construction lighting;
- $\quad$ Arrangements for the removal of contaminated material, where appropriate;
- Arrangements for the storage of raw materials on-site (including potentially contaminative material, such as fuels);
- Waste storage and removal arrangements (either as part of the CEMP or a separate SWMP, or equivalent);
- Measures to be followed to minimise noise, dust and vibration levels during demolition and construction, including limits to be complied with for certain activities (such as piling), as appropriate;
- Any specific management plans relating to archaeological works;
- Measures to minimise effects on ecology;
- Measures to deal with waste water generated during construction activities, to minimise the risk of potentially contaminative material entering the local drainage network; and
- Emergency procedures to be followed in the event of an environmental incident (e.g. spillage).
- Monitoring:
- $\quad$ Targets for continuous improvement on construction environmental performance, such as energy and water use, carbon emissions, and waste;
- $\quad$ Monitoring requirements and procedures for recording and reporting the results and for taking remedial action in the event of a non-compliance with specified limited (if appropriate);Monitoring proposals, which should include details on the receptors for which monitoring will be undertaken; frequency of monitoring; factors against which the monitoring results will be analysed; threshold levels; list of organisations / individuals to whom results will be distributed; and actions to be taken in the event that thresholds are breached;
- Procedures for monitoring construction processes against the project environmental objectives and for the appropriate action if thresholds have been breached; and
- $\quad$ Procedures for co-ordinating the monitoring results to ensure that the combined effect of the works in different locations does not trigger threshold levels.
- Legal requirements:
- $\quad$ Schedule of appropriate environmental legislation and good practice that will be adhered to, which is both current at the time of contract and which may come into force during the course of the contract;
- A list of specific objectives and targets that have been imposed by planning conditions and agreed in consultation with third parties; and
- A register of permissions and consents required, with responsibilities allocated and a programme for obtaining them.
6.7.3 The CEMP will be updated and developed throughout the demolition and construction phases in consultation with LBB. The CEMP will be regularly monitored during the construction works and revised to reflect any changes to programme or events and activities on-site.
6.7.4 Further details on specific measures to be included within the CEMP to mitigate potential effects identified within this ES are provided within technical chapters (Chapters 8-16), ES Volume II: TVBHIA and Chapter 17: Summary of Mitigation.


## Considerate Constructors Scheme

6.7.5 The Site will be registered with the 'Considerate Constructors Scheme'. This is a national initiative through which construction sites and companies registered with the scheme are monitored against a Code of Considerate Practice, designed to encourage best-practice beyond statutory requirements.

## Neighbour and Public Relations

6.7.6 A key aspect of the successful management of the Proposed Development will be the maintenance of good relations with neighbours and the general public. The project team is engaged in consultation with a range of stakeholders and neighbours and this will continue through the various phases of the Proposed Development.
6.7.7 To successfully develop and implement a Neighbour and Public Relations Strategy during demolition and construction works, the following actions will be undertaken:

- Initial Contact: Prior to the submission of Reserved Matters Applications, the project team will make formal contact with the nearest neighbours and those who would be affected by the Proposed Development; and
- Contact during the Works Period: A single point of contact will be established, with a senior member of the project team nominated for the role. This person would usually be the Construction or Logistics Manager. Outside normal working hours, site security will act as the main point of contact via a dedicated phone number. Security will alert the Construction or Logistics Manager if necessary (available 24 hours). Any complaints will be logged, fully investigated and reported to the relevant department within the LBB as soon as possible. The complainant will be informed as to what action has been taken.
6.7.8 Contact with neighbours and the general public will be proactively maintained throughout the construction period, with regular update meetings on a quarterly basis and the issuing of a newsletter with an update on progress.


## Management of Trade Contractors

6.7.9 Individual contractor contracts will incorporate relevant requirements in respect of environmental control, based largely on the standard of 'good working practice' as outlined within the CEMP, as well as statutory requirements. All trade contractors will be required to demonstrate how they will adhere to procedures set out within the CEMP, satisfying regulations and best-practices regarding environmental control.

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 17 May 2021 09:33 |
| To: | Kearns, Patrick |
| Cc: | Griffiths, Carl; Pillai, Gangan; Pelham, Richard; Torto, Francis; Bowker, Paul; Dillon, Andrew |
| Subject: | RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

Hello Patrick,

Thanks for your email below clarifying your position. I did not know this. The only time I recall that you mentioned that you can't review Travel Plans was specifically in relation to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme. I did not know that you don't look at schemes within the whole Cricklewood Regeneration / Opportunity Area as well.

The $B \& Q$ site planning application is not linked and is independent to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme. Therefore the last two paragraph in your email below does not really apply for this application.

Can I please ask anyone copied into this email, who would be able to best provide advice on Travel Plans for individual developments that are not related to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme (in this particular case the site is located within the Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon regeneration area)? Many thanks.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager
Re
Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
, Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 17:36
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Pillai, Gangan [Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk); Pelham, Richard [Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk); Torto, Francis [Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Importance: High

Hi Devinda,

As previously explained I am unable to comment on Travel Plan proposals designated within the Cricklewood Regeneration and within the Brent Cross and Cricklewood Opportunity Area.

Given the scale and number of years over which the BXC regeneration scheme is expected to take to fully roll-out its travel plan thresholds and obligations sit beyond that of the SPD 2013.

As advised previously, in order to fully understand the proposals and the context of each proposed development, ensure that it is comprehensively planned for from a strategic level and avoid Travel Plan objectives coming forward in a piecemeal, non-co-ordinated manner, a dedicated 'go-to' LBB resource needs to be appointed oversee the co-
ordination, implementation and monitoring of the wider travelling planning objectives for the entire BXC regeneration scheme and for all BXC development related travel planning queries moving forwards.

Regards,

## Patrick Kearns

Development Travel Plan Coordinator
Re Highways Service
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
www.re-limited.co.uk
www.capitalocalgovernment.co.uk

## $11)^{4}$ $n^{4}$

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England and Wales 08615172. Registered Office: 65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 16:03
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

I think the B\&Q TP is probably more priority than the DBP site. Thanks
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

## Re

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 14:41
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick - just following up on my email below. We have just had a meeting with the applicant for the above scheme and one of the outstanding issues was comment in relation to the Framework Travel Plan. Are you please able to have a look at it and provide comment soon. Many thanks

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 27 April 2021 14:12
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick - I am about to issue my response for the above application to Planning (scale of development is in my email below). Did you have any comments to add? To make it easier I am wondering if it would be very similar to the comments you made for the Homebase Site, 679 High Road, North Finchley (Planning ref: 20/3823/FUL) as below:

A $£ 15,000$ Index Linked Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution is required prior to commencement.

A sum of $£ 92,100$ Index Linked towards Travel Plan Incentives to be applied towards funding of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives up to a value of $£ 300$ per Residential Unit as set out below (this fund is to remain under the developer’s control / management):

First time occupiers of each household are to be offered to select 2 of the following 3 incentives to the value of $£ 300$ :
Oyster card with $£ 150$ credit
2. Cycle shop voucher to the values of $£ 150$
3. Car club credit/membership to the value of $£ 150$

At least 2 car club space must be provided on the development with a commitment to monitor use and to add additional spaces should demand be demonstrated.

A Welcome Travel Information Pack designed and printed to a professional standard at the Developer/Owner's expense directed at and distributed to Resident Occupiers displaying in an engaging form a summary of the Travel Plan together with details of the Travel Plan Incentives, the Car Club, and information about all existing travel opportunities to, from and within the Development for all Modes of Travel.

An annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Report summarising how the Travel Plan Incentive Fund is being used providing accurate records of expenditure and the balance remaining in the Travel Plan Incentive Fund in the event of any dispute with residents or the Council.

Please find attached standard terms in relation to Travel Plan monitoring. This should be included within the s106 Agreement.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT
A Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 19 April 2021 11:30
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick,

We are looking to condition a Travel Plan for the above proposed missed use development at Broadway Retail Park (Travel Plan attached). Could you please let me know what contributions / fees you would want secured as part of the Residential TP monitoring for example? This is planned to be heard at the next committee so your timely response would be appreciated.

A summary of the proposal is as follows:
'Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including up to 1100 residential units (Use Class C3), and up to 1200 sqm of flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Classes A3/B1/D1 and D2) in buildings ranging from 3 to 25 storeys along with car and cycle parking landscaping and associated works.'

Thanks.

Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT
$\checkmark$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Carter, Richard

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 17 May 2021 09:47 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Subject: | RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

Yup - thought we are all working together
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager
Re
Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 09:08
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Very helpful response from Patrick...

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
考 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey

can cost you everything

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 17:36
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Pillai, Gangan [Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk); Pelham, Richard [Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk); Torto, Francis [Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Importance: High

Hi Devinda,

As previously explained I am unable to comment on Travel Plan proposals designated within the Cricklewood Regeneration and within the Brent Cross and Cricklewood Opportunity Area.

Given the scale and number of years over which the BXC regeneration scheme is expected to take to fully roll-out its travel plan thresholds and obligations sit beyond that of the SPD 2013.

As advised previously, in order to fully understand the proposals and the context of each proposed development, ensure that it is comprehensively planned for from a strategic level and avoid Travel Plan objectives coming forward in a piecemeal, non-co-ordinated manner, a dedicated 'go-to' LBB resource needs to be appointed oversee the coordination, implementation and monitoring of the wider travelling planning objectives for the entire BXC regeneration scheme and for all BXC development related travel planning queries moving forwards.

Regards,

## Patrick Kearns

Development Travel Plan Coordinator
Re Highways Service
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
www.re-limited.co.uk

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.

Registered in England and Wales 08615172. Registered Office: 65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 16:03
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

I think the B\&Q TP is probably more priority than the DBP site. Thanks

## Regards

## Devinda Kumarasinghe

Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
, Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 14:41
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick - just following up on my email below. We have just had a meeting with the applicant for the above scheme and one of the outstanding issues was comment in relation to the Framework Travel Plan. Are you please able to have a look at it and provide comment soon. Many thanks

## Regards

## Devinda Kumarasinghe

Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
A Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 27 April 2021 14:12

To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick - I am about to issue my response for the above application to Planning (scale of development is in my email below). Did you have any comments to add? To make it easier I am wondering if it would be very similar to the comments you made for the Homebase Site, 679 High Road, North Finchley (Planning ref: 20/3823/FUL) as below:

A $£ 15,000$ Index Linked Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution is required prior to commencement.
A sum of $£ 92,100$ Index Linked towards Travel Plan Incentives to be applied towards funding of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives up to a value of $£ 300$ per Residential Unit as set out below (this fund is to remain under the developer's control / management):

First time occupiers of each household are to be offered to select 2 of the following 3 incentives to the value of $£ 300$ :

1. Oyster card with $£ 150$ credit
2. Cycle shop voucher to the values of $£ 150$
3. Car club credit/membership to the value of $£ 150$

At least 2 car club space must be provided on the development with a commitment to monitor use and to add additional spaces should demand be demonstrated.

A Welcome Travel Information Pack designed and printed to a professional standard at the Developer/Owner's expense directed at and distributed to Resident Occupiers displaying in an engaging form a summary of the Travel Plan together with details of the Travel Plan Incentives, the Car Club, and information about all existing travel opportunities to, from and within the Development for all Modes of Travel.

An annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Report summarising how the Travel Plan Incentive Fund is being used providing accurate records of expenditure and the balance remaining in the Travel Plan Incentive Fund in the event of any dispute with residents or the Council.

Please find attached standard terms in relation to Travel Plan monitoring. This should be included within the s106 Agreement.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
$\Delta$ Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 19 April 2021 11:30
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)

Hello Patrick,

We are looking to condition a Travel Plan for the above proposed missed use development at Broadway Retail Park (Travel Plan attached). Could you please let me know what contributions / fees you would want secured as part of the Residential TP monitoring for example? This is planned to be heard at the next committee so your timely response would be appreciated.

A summary of the proposal is as follows:
'Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including up to 1100 residential units (Use Class C3), and up to 1200 sqm of flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Classes

A3/B1/D1 and D2) in buildings ranging from 3 to 25 storeys along with car and cycle parking landscaping and associated works.'

Thanks.

## Regards

Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita ple and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

| From: | Kumarasinghe, Devinda |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 17 May 2021 09:57 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl; Dillon, Andrew |
| Cc: | Bowker, Paul |
| Subject: | RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) |

Yes a Travel Plan condition is normally applied in any event, but one of the parameters that vary depending on the scale and type of development are the financial commitments sought by the Borough from the applicant (as highlighted in yellow in the example below). I thought those factors should ideally be agreed at this stage but if not then ok.
A $£ 15,000$ Index Linked Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution is required prior to commencement.
A sum of $£ 92,100$ Index Linked towards Travel Plan Incentives to be applied towards funding of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives up to a value of $£ 300$ per Residential Unit as set out below (this fund is to remain under the developer’s control / management):
First time occupiers of each household are to be offered to select 2 of the following 3 incentives to the value of $£ 300$ :

1. Oyster card with $£ 150$ credit
2. Cycle shop voucher to the values of $£ 150$
3. Car club credit/membership to the value of $£ 150$

At least 2 car club space must be provided on the development with a commitment to monitor use and to add additional spaces should demand be demonstrated.
A Welcome Travel Information Pack designed and printed to a professional standard at the Developer/Owner's expense directed at and distributed to Resident Occupiers displaying in an engaging form a summary of the Travel Plan together with details of the Travel Plan Incentives, the Car Club, and information about all existing travel opportunities to, from and within the Development for all Modes of Travel. An annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Report summarising how the Travel Plan Incentive Fund is being used providing accurate records of expenditure and the balance remaining in the Travel Plan Incentive Fund in the event of any dispute with residents or the Council.
Please find attached standard terms in relation to Travel Plan monitoring. This should be included within the s106 Agreement.
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
走 Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 09:50
To: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); Kumarasinghe, Devinda
[Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Yes, unless Patrick has a change of heart we will take a view on it ourselves and include what we think is necessary.
Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
素 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
Re
Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London

Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


Certificate Number 15180-QMS-081 1509001

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?
From: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 09:47
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) I presume that this will effectively mean we just include the usual S106 travel plan requirements in the recommendation as doubt a new person will be employed to provide comments prior to taking this application to Committee.
Andrew Dillon MRTPI
Planning Manager
Major Projects Team
Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
差 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet. Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this email?


BAAR|NETT

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 09:33
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Pillai, Gangan [Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk); Pelham, Richard [Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk); Torto, Francis [Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk); Bowker, Paul [Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Paul.Bowker@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT) Hello Patrick,
Thanks for your email below clarifying your position. I did not know this. The only time I recall that you mentioned that you can't review Travel Plans was specifically in relation to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme. I did not know that you don't look at schemes within the whole Cricklewood Regeneration / Opportunity Area as well. The $B \& Q$ site planning application is not linked and is independent to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme. Therefore the last two paragraph in your email below does not really apply for this application.
Can I please ask anyone copied into this email, who would be able to best provide advice on Travel Plans for individual developments that are not related to the Brent Cross Regeneration scheme (in this particular case the site is located within the Cricklewood, Brent Cross and West Hendon regeneration area)? Many thanks.
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe

## Transport Manager



Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
APlease consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
From: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 17:36
To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Pillai, Gangan [Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Gangan.Pillai@barnet.gov.uk); Pelham, Richard [Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Richard.Pelham@Barnet.gov.uk); Torto, Francis [Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Francis.Torto@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Importance: High

Hi Devinda,
As previously explained I am unable to comment on Travel Plan proposals designated within the Cricklewood Regeneration and within the Brent Cross and Cricklewood Opportunity Area.
Given the scale and number of years over which the BXC regeneration scheme is expected to take to fully roll-out its travel plan thresholds and obligations sit beyond that of the SPD 2013.
As advised previously, in order to fully understand the proposals and the context of each proposed development, ensure that it is comprehensively planned for from a strategic level and avoid Travel Plan objectives coming forward in a piecemeal, non-co-ordinated manner, a dedicated 'go-to' LBB resource needs to be appointed oversee the coordination, implementation and monitoring of the wider travelling planning objectives for the entire BXC regeneration scheme and for all BXC development related travel planning queries moving forwards.
Regards,

## Patrick Kearns

Development Travel Plan Coordinator
Re Highways Service
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
www.re-limited.co.uk
www.capitalocalgovernment.co.uk

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England and Wales 08615172. Registered Office: 65 Gresham Street, London, EC2V 7NQ
Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 16:03
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
I think the B\&Q TP is probably more priority than the DBP site. Thanks
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

* Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 14 May 2021 14:41
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: FW: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Hello Patrick - just following up on my email below. We have just had a meeting with the applicant for the above scheme and one of the outstanding issues was comment in relation to the Framework Travel Plan. Are you please
able to have a look at it and provide comment soon. Many thanks
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 27 April 2021 14:12
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Hello Patrick - I am about to issue my response for the above application to Planning (scale of development is in my
email below). Did you have any comments to add? To make it easier I am wondering if it would be very similar to the comments you made for the Homebase Site, 679 High Road, North Finchley (Planning ref: 20/3823/FUL) as below: A $£ 15,000$ Index Linked Travel Plan Monitoring Contribution is required prior to commencement.
A sum of $£ 92,100$ Index Linked towards Travel Plan Incentives to be applied towards funding of the Residential Travel Plan Incentives up to a value of $£ 300$ per Residential Unit as set out below (this fund is to remain under the developer's control / management): First time occupiers of each household are to be offered to select 2 of the following 3 incentives to the value of $£ 300$ :

1. Oyster card with $£ 150$ credit
2. Cycle shop voucher to the values of $£ 150$
3. Car club credit/membership to the value of $£ 150$

At least 2 car club space must be provided on the development with a commitment to monitor use and to add additional spaces should demand be demonstrated.
A Welcome Travel Information Pack designed and printed to a professional standard at the Developer/Owner's expense directed at and distributed to Resident Occupiers displaying in an engaging form a summary of the Travel Plan together with details of the Travel Plan Incentives, the Car Club, and information about all existing travel opportunities to, from and within the Development for all Modes of Travel. An annual Travel Plan Incentive Fund Report summarising how the Travel Plan Incentive Fund is being used providing accurate records of expenditure and the balance remaining in the Travel Plan Incentive Fund in the event of any dispute with residents or the Council. Please find attached standard terms in relation to Travel Plan monitoring. This should be included within the s106 Agreement.
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager


Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
Alease consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
From: Kumarasinghe, Devinda
Sent: 19 April 2021 11:30
To: Kearns, Patrick [Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Patrick.Kearns@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
Hello Patrick,
We are looking to condition a Travel Plan for the above proposed missed use development at Broadway Retail Park (Travel Plan attached). Could you please let me know what contributions / fees you would want secured as part of the Residential TP monitoring for example? This is planned to be heard at the next committee so your timely response would be appreciated.
A summary of the proposal is as follows:
'Outline planning application (including means of access with all other matters reserved) for the demolition of existing buildings and the comprehensive phased redevelopment of the site for a mix of uses including up to 1100 residential units (Use Class C3), and up to 1200 sqm of flexible commercial and community floorspace (Use Classes A3/B1/D1 and D2) in buildings ranging from 3 to 25 storeys along with car and cycle parking landscaping and associated works.'
Thanks.
Regards
Devinda Kumarasinghe
Transport Manager

Email Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk
Mobile 07849628576
Web www.re-Itd.co.uk
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, London NW9 2EW
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.
s. Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Carter, Richard

| From: |  |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 17 May 2021 10:29 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Cc: | Planning Vetting |
| Subject: | RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood |

Hi Carl

I have seen planning vetting have been copied it so it should be picked up

Regards

## Technical Officer

## Planning and Building Control

London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: | Mobile: | Web: barnet.gov.uk

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

## Re

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet.
Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 10:28
To:
@Barnet.gov.uk>
Cc: Planning Vetting [planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood

Good morning Vetting,

Please could I ask that someone has a look at this today. I am looking to do a 14 day reconsultaton for this app, based on additional information received (neighbours only, not stat consultees).

Thanks

## Carl Griffiths <br> Principal Planner <br> Major Projects

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


My anxiety
levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for

can cost you everything

For more information po to: www.barnet gov.uk/covidcancost

Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

## From:

## @Barnet.gov.uk>

Sent: 14 May 2021 08:19
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Planning Vetting [planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:planning.vetting@barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood

Good Morning Carl

I have copied in planning vetting as they will deal with this

## Regards

Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.


From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 14 May 2021 08:18
To: @Barnet.gov.uk>
Subject: 20/3564/OUT - B\&Q Cricklewood
Morning

I hope you are well.

We have received additional information on this one which requires a reconsultation. If possible, please could we do a 14 day reconsultation? (sorry I know it's a big one).

Thanks

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.aov.uk
please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet
Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.


Certificate Number 15180-QMS-081 1509001

## CiM/D-19 <br> can cost you everything

For more information go to: wrw.barnet.gov.ulu/covidoancost

Carter, Richard

| From: | Clarke, Cllr Anne |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 18 May 2021 17:20 |
| To: | Griffiths, Carl |
| Cc: | Arjun Mittra; Gaudin, Fabien; Dillon, Andrew; Members Enquiries |
| Subject: | Re: B\&Q site |

## Thanks Carl,

I note that there are no local notices on display, having walked around the entire site. I am again wondering how people will know about this new opportunity to comment?

It could be l've missed something.
-Anne

Cllr Anne Clarke
Childs Hill Ward, London Borough of Barnet
twitter @anne_clarke

Childs Hill food bank is open for all who need it 10AM-noon every Saturday at All Saints Church
More here- www.allsaintschildshill.com/childs-hill-food-bank/

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 1:33:11 PM
To: Clarke, Cllr Anne [CIIr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:CIIr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Arjun Mittra [Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk](mailto:Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk); Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); Members Enquiries [members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site
Dear Councillor Clarke

Thanks for your response.

In terms of the previous reconsultation, for application ref: 18/6353/FUL this was slightly different in that the revised full reconsultation was to take account of a reduction in the height of the scheme and the housing numbers, hence why it was reported as such within the officers report (i.e. they were different schemes). This current reconsultation for $B \& Q$ does not revise any of the details of the application that was consulted on last year and is solely based on the additional, supplementary document received. For the avoidance of doubt, the officer report will make reference to the full number of objections received which will all be taken into account in making a recommendation.

We took the view that it was prudent to undertake the reconsultation given that the applicant wanted us to take this additional document into consideration in the determination of the application.

I hope that helps but again please come back to me if you require anything else.

## Kind Regards

Carl

## Carl Griffiths

Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
thease consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-ltd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends 5 p to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Clarke, Cllr Anne [Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 18 May 2021 12:46
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk); Members
Enquiries [members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk); Arjun Mittra [Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk](mailto:Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk)
Subject: Re: B\&Q site

Dear Carl,

1. How is the council publicising this new consultation?
2. For a different Cricklewood application (18/6353/FUL), the recommendation to the committee stated
"4.1 Initial consultation was undertaken in October 2018 with letters being sent to 780 addresses. Following revisions to the scheme, an additional consultation was undertaken in June 2019. In total 480 objections were received, although it is important to note that only 81 of these objections were received in relation to the revised scheme."

Over a thousand objections have already been made to the current $B \& Q$ application. Will the recommendation to the committee also state that it is important to note that fewer objections were received in this new consultation or otherwise discount the thousand objections as uninformed?

Kind regards,
Anne

Cllr Anne Clarke
Childs Hill Ward, London Borough of Barnet
twitter @anne_clarke

Childs Hill food bank is open for all who need it 10AM-noon every Saturday at All Saints Church More here- www.allsaintschildshill.com/childs-hill-food-bank/

From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: Tuesday, May 18, 2021 10:49:41 AM
To: Clarke, Cllr Anne [Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk); Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk); Members
Enquiries [members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk); Arjun Mittra [Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk](mailto:Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: B\&Q site
Dear Councillor Clarke

The applicant commissioned an Urban Design/Townscape study which they would like us to take into consideration in assessing the application and the reconsultation is to allow this additional document to be considered by neighbours and stakeholders. All of the other application details and parameters remain the same and the additional Urban Design Study is a supplementary document so the 14 day period reflects this.

I can confirm that all of the consultation responses received to date will still be taken into account in addition to any received as a result of this reconsultation.

I hope that helps but if you need anything else on this matter please don't hesitate to get in contact.

Kind Regards

Carl

[^14]Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
www.re-Itd.co.uk
We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Clarke, Cllr Anne [Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Cllr.A.Clarke@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 17 May 2021 19:34
To: Members Enquiries [members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:members.enquiries@Barnet.gov.uk); Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk); Arjun Mittra [Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk](mailto:Arjun.Mittra@london.gov.uk)
Subject: B\&Q site

I note that there is a new period of consultation following the publication of additional documents.

Have all objectors been written to? It's a short window that ends 31 May.

Will all previous objections be taken into account?

Many thanks,
Anne

Cllr Anne Clarke

Childs Hill Ward, London Borough of Barnet twitter @anne_clarke

Childs Hill food bank is open for all who need it 10AM-noon every Saturday at All Saints Church More here- www.allsaintschildshill.com/childs-hill-food-bank/

| From: | Griffiths, Carl |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | 19 May 2021 15:38 |
| To: | Dillon, Andrew; Gaudin, Fabien |
| Subject: | RE: Press query FW: Consultation on development plans |
| Attachments: | Re: B\&Q site |

Hi Fab

Yes we did a 14 day reconsultation to give the public opportunity to view the additional document that has been submitted by the applicant (Urban Design / Townscape Study). It is a supplementary document with all other application details and parameters remaining as per the initial consultation however we considered prudent to reconsult given that the document will be referred to in any recommendation that is made. The 14 days is reflective of the point that this is supplementary information.

I have responded to Cllr Clarke on this (attached trail), who now appears to be trying to arrange a meeting with the Railway Terraces Group.

Thanks

Carl

Carl Griffiths
Principal Planner
Major Projects
Strategic Planning and Regeneration
Regional Enterprise
2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
T: 02083595400
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
寿 please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?
Re
$\mathbf{R e}$ (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172. www.re-Itd.co.uk

We are trying to improve our services. In order to do this we are surveying our clients on their thoughts on our services. For every reply received, this company sends $5 p$ to our supported charity, The North London Hospice. You can complete the survey at every stage of your application if you wish. It takes just a few minutes. The link to the survey is:- Please complete our Customer Satisfaction Survey


## Why LABC Barnet?

Our LABC Barnet Surveyors can guide and support you through the most technically complex projects and developments, from pre-planning, right through to completion.

02083594500
building.control甲bornet.gov.uk


Certificate Number 16180-QMS-081 1509001

## My anxiety levels have gone through the roof. I can't sleep for

 worrying " A HOME 3 SAVE can cost you everythingConsider the environment. Do you really need to print this emai?

From: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 19 May 2021 15:33
To: Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk); Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: RE: Press query FW: Consultation on development plans

Carl has consulted on some additional information the applicant has submitted. Carl has responded to Cllr Clarke on a similar query.

Andrew Dillon MRTPI
Planning Manager
Major Projects Team
Development and Regulatory Services
London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594729
Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
A. please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet.
Registered in England 08615172. Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.


[^15]

From: Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk)
Sent: 19 May 2021 15:32
To: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
Cc: Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: Fw: Press query FW: Consultation on development plans

Carl,

Did we reconsult or it is something else?

Fab

Fabien Gaudin MRTPI
Service Director

Planning and Building Control

London Borough of Barnet, 2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
Tel: 02083594258 | Web: barnet.gov.uk


Re
RE (Regional Enterprise) Limited is a joint venture between Capita plc and London Borough of Barnet. Registered in England $\mathbf{0 8 6 1 5 1 7 2}$. Registered Office $\mathbf{1 7}$ Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT.

Note that I will be on annual leave on Fridays until June

## From:

Sent: 19 May 2021 15:19
To: Gaudin, Fabien [fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk](mailto:fabien.gaudin@barnet.gov.uk)

Cc: Shaw, Cath [Cath.Shaw@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Cath.Shaw@Barnet.gov.uk)
Subject: Press query FW: Consultation on development plans

Hi Fabien

Please see below from the Hendon Times re the $B \& Q$ site in Cricklewood.

Is this a planning consultation which is being referred to here or could it be something the developers are running?

Thanks


## From: @newsquest.co.uk>

Sent: 19 May 2021 14:17


Subject: Consultation on development plans

Hi , apologies for another email in quick succession - I've seen a lot of posts on social media about a new consultation on the proposed development for the B\&Q site in Cricklewood (Reference: 20/3564/OUT). There have been comments that it is only two weeks long and residents haven't been adequately informed about it.

Please could you let me know if two weeks is standard practice for cases such as this, where it appears the developer has submitted extra documents? What has the council done to publicise it - and has it followed the standard procedure in this regard?

Thanks,


Barnet Times - Enfield and Tottenham Independent
Tel.

Advertising: All advertising is accepted subject to our terms and conditions of advertising which can be found here http://www.newsquest.co.uk/terms-of-advertising
Editorial: All content submitted, or licenced, to Newsquest is accepted pursuant to our Contributor Terms and Conditions http://www.newsquest.co.uk/contributor-terms

This document is private and confidential.
All property, copyright and other rights in it and its contents belong to Newsquest Media Group Limited.
It must not be read, copied, disclosed or otherwise used without Newsquest's authorisation. Newsquest may exercise its legal rights and remedies in the event of any such unauthorised use.

Newsquest Media Group Limited.
Registered in England, number 01676637. Registered office: Loudwater Mill, Station Road, Loudwater, High Wycombe, Bucks HP10 9TY.


[^0]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
    From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
    Sent: 30 March 2021 16:33
    To: @iceniprojects.com>
    Subject: FW: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

[^1]:    Re (Regional Enterprise) Ltd is a joint venture between Capita plc and The London Borough of Barnet Registered Office: 17 Rochester Row, London, England SW1P 1QT. Registered in England 08615172.
    www.re-ltd.co.uk

[^2]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
    From: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
    Sent: 08 April 2021 13:46
    To:
    @iceniprojects.com>
    Subject: RE: Cricklewood - Transport Letters (B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT))

    Thanks - yes I am ok for catch up tomorrow, speak then

    ## Carl Griffiths

    Principal Planner
    Major Projects
    Strategic Planning and Regeneration
    Regional Enterprise
    2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW
    T: 02083595400
    Barnet Online: www.barnet.gov.uk
    s. please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

[^3]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^4]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
    From: Martin Jones [Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk](mailto:Martin.Jones@london.gov.uk)
    Sent: 29 October 2020 12:29
    To: @iceniprojects.com>
    Cc: @iceniprojects.com>; John Mumby [imumby@iceniprojects.com](mailto:imumby@iceniprojects.com); Griffiths, Carl
    [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk)
    Subject: RE: B\&Q Cricklewood - GLA Response
    HI - it will go to the Mayor on the $9^{\text {th }}$ and you'll get the Stage 1 on that day.
    Thanks
    Martin

[^5]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^6]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^7]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^8]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^9]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^10]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^11]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended reciplent is prohibited. If you recelved this in error piease contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.

[^12]:    The information transmitted, including attachments, is intended only for the person(s) or entity to which it is addressed and may contain confidential and/or privileged material. Any review, retransmission, dissemination or other use of, or taking of any action in reliance upon this information by persons or entities other than the intended recipient is prohibited. If you received this in error please contact the sender and destroy any copies of this information.
    From:
    @iceniprojects.com>
    Sent: 27 April 2021 17:48
    To: Kumarasinghe, Devinda [Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Devinda.Kumarasinghe@Barnet.gov.uk)
    Cc: Griffiths, Carl [Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Carl.Griffiths@Barnet.gov.uk); Dillon, Andrew [Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk](mailto:Andrew.Dillon@Barnet.gov.uk)
    Subject: RE: B\&Q site, Broadway Retail Park, Cricklewood Lane, Cricklewood (Ref 20/3564/OUT)
    Thanks Devinda,

[^13]:    78 York Street | London | W1H 1DP | 02039499922
    $2^{\text {nd }} \& 3^{\text {rd }}$ Floors | Northgate House | Upper Borough Walls | Bath | BA1 1RG | 01179374077

[^14]:    Carl Griffiths
    Principal Planner
    Major Projects
    Strategic Planning and Regeneration
    Regional Enterprise
    2 Bristol Avenue, Colindale, NW9 4EW

[^15]:    Consider the environment. Do you really need to print this email?

