

Our Ref: J250617.001/TN/1					
Rev	Status	Date	Detail	Author	Checked
-	Draft	01/09/2026	For client/design team comment	JP	MN

Transport Technical Note - Mixed-Use Development, Land Adjacent to Glovers Brow, Kirkby

1 Introduction

- 1.1.1 Skyline Plus Ltd has instructed Fastnet Transport Planning to prepare this Technical Note (TN) in support of a planning application to Knowsley Council (KMBC), reference 25/00489/FUL. The application seeks a proposed mixed-use scheme at Land Adjacent to Glovers Brow, Kirkby comprising 3 small commercial units, a bistro/wine bar and 7 residential apartments.
- 1.1.2 A Transport Statement (TS) was submitted in support of the application, and this considered the accessibility of the site, likely travel demands and the proposed parking provision.
- 1.1.3 The Local Highway Authority (LHA) has raised concerns regarding the level of parking proposed and has advised that nine spaces should be provided for the residential element based upon the standards set out in the 'Ensuring a Choice of Travel' SPD. It has also identified a theoretical requirement of 26 spaces for the commercial uses and raised concern regarding the potential for overspill parking, displacement and operational effects on Glovers Brow.
- 1.1.4 Since those comments were issued, the National Planning Policy Framework has been revised. The revised policy context places increased emphasis on sustainable locations, reducing dependence on the private car and assessing parking provision having regard to the location, nature and connectivity of development. The timing of the revised NPPF is material, as it took effect upon publication and therefore represents the most recent expression of national planning policy against which the application should now be considered. As national policy, it carries substantial weight in the decision-making process and provides the current framework within which the LHA's earlier comments must be reassessed.
- 1.1.5 This TN does not repeat the detailed accessibility assessment contained within the TS. Instead, it considers whether the proposed parking strategy is appropriate for this particular development in light of the revised national policy context and the parking evidence already submitted.
- 1.1.6 The parking strategy is based on two complementary considerations. The first is that the site is particularly well suited to households with low or no car ownership, given its accessibility by sustainable modes and proximity to local services and facilities. The second is that, even if residential parking demand were to occur at the level assumed within the TS, the combined parking demand from the

residential, commercial and wine bar uses can be accommodated within the proposed and wider parking resource.

- 1.1.7 The revised NPPF further reinforces this approach by placing greater emphasis on connectivity, sustainable travel and the consideration of parking provision in the context of the location and nature of development.

2 Policy Context

- 2.1.1 As noted above, since the LHA comments were issued, the National Planning Policy Framework has been substantially revised. The new Framework was published on 17th August 2026 and introduces a materially different policy context for the assessment of development within settlements, sustainable locations and parking provision.
- 2.1.2 Policy S4 establishes the starting point for development within settlements. It states that: *‘Development proposals within settlements should be approved unless the benefits of doing so would be substantially outweighed by any adverse effects, when assessed against the national decision-making policies in this Framework.’*
- 2.1.3 The application site lies within the defined settlement and therefore must be considered against this positive policy framework. The relevant consideration is not simply whether the proposal provides the maximum level of car parking identified within the SPD, but whether the proposed parking provision would result in adverse effects sufficient to justify refusal.
- 2.1.4 Policy TR3 is directly relevant to the location of the development. It seeks to ensure that development is located where it can support sustainable patterns of movement and states that: *‘This means the location should limit the need to travel, particularly by private car, and offer a genuine choice of transport modes for residents and users.’*
- 2.1.5 It also states that: *‘Opportunities should be taken to utilise existing or proposed transport infrastructure... especially where this can support more walking, wheeling, cycling and public transport use.’*
- 2.1.6 These principles are directly relevant to the present proposal. The TS has already demonstrated that the site benefits from good access to rail, bus services and local facilities (including food) and therefore provides realistic alternatives to private car travel.
- 2.1.7 Policy TR3 also now expressly states that: *‘The Connectivity Tool should be used alongside other relevant quantitative or qualitative evidence in assessing the connectivity of particular locations proposed for development.’*

- 2.1.8 The DfT Connectivity assessment therefore provides an additional national measure which can be considered alongside the site-specific accessibility evidence already presented within the TS.
- 2.1.9 Policy TR4 is particularly relevant to the assessment of parking. It requires development to: *‘Provide a suitable number of parking spaces for a range of transport modes where appropriate, reflecting the location and nature of the development (including its connectivity), any locally-set standards in the development plan.’*
- 2.1.10 The specific wording of the policy is important, in that it references location and connectivity. It does not require a fixed level of private car parking, but instead requires the appropriate level of provision to be considered in context.
- 2.1.11 This is particularly relevant because the local parking standards applicable to the development are expressed as maximum standards. Policy TR2 also confirms that *‘Maximum standards for car parking should be set where they will support efforts to encourage the use of sustainable transport modes and shared transport, optimise the density of development in well-connected locations, or where they are necessary for managing the local road network.’* In this case, there is a risk that maximum standards are applied irrespective of location, leading to an increased use of the private car.
- 2.1.12 Policy TR2 further states that parking standards should take account of: *‘The connectivity of development in different locations by different modes of transport, especially in terms of access to employment and day-to-day services’* and *‘Local car ownership levels and travel trends, and opportunities to promote car sharing and other schemes which may reduce vehicle parking requirements.’*
- 2.1.13 Although Policy TR2 is a plan-making policy rather than a decision-making policy, it provides important context as to how parking standards are intended to operate within the revised Framework. They are not intended to be applied without regard to accessibility, car ownership or the nature of the development.
- 2.1.14 Manual for Streets supports the same general approach. It recognises that the availability of car parking is a major influence on travel behaviour and that the context of residential development should be carefully considered when determining the appropriate amount of parking.
- 2.1.15 Finally, Policy TR6 establishes the relevant threshold for refusal on transport grounds. It states that: *‘Development proposals should be refused if they would have a severe adverse impact on the transport network... or an unacceptable impact on highway safety.’*
- 2.1.16 Policy TR6 also requires reasonable future scenarios to be considered, taking account of multimodal trip generation, sustainable modes and the transport vision for the development.

- 2.1.17 Accordingly, the parking provision should be assessed in the context of the site's location, connectivity, likely demand and the shared nature of the parking resource, rather than by reference to the theoretical maximum standards alone. The key consideration is whether the proposed arrangement would give rise to an unacceptable highway safety impact or a severe adverse effect on the transport network.

3 Accessibility and Sustainable Location

- 3.1.1 The TS provided a detailed assessment of the accessibility of the site by walking, cycling and public transport, together with access to local services and facilities. That assessment is not repeated in full within this TN.
- 3.1.2 The important point for the purposes of the present assessment is that the site performs strongly against the locational principles now set out in Policy TR3 of the revised NPPF. Policy TR3 seeks to locate development where the need to travel, particularly by private car, can be limited and where residents and users are offered a genuine choice of transport modes.
- 3.1.3 The application site satisfies those objectives. It is located close to Kirkby railway station and the local bus interchange, providing access to frequent public transport services and connections to a wider range of destinations. The site is also within walking distance of local shops, services and facilities, allowing a proportion of day-to-day needs to be met without use of a private car.
- 3.1.4 The wider site also includes a Tesco Express supermarket, providing convenient access to everyday food and convenience shopping. This further reduces the need for separate car-based trips for routine household requirements.
- 3.1.5 Since preparation of the TS, the Department for Transport has released its Connectivity Tool, which provides an additional nationally derived measure of accessibility by sustainable modes. The application site achieves an overall Connectivity Score of 72 and falls within Connectivity Band B within Knowsley, being the second-highest of the ten bands in the Borough.
- 3.1.6 This evidence provides valuable additional independent confirmation that the site occupies a comparatively well-connected location. Taken together, the accessibility assessment contained in the TS and the DfT Connectivity Tool score demonstrate that future residents would have realistic alternatives to private car travel and that a significant proportion of day-to-day journeys can be undertaken without reliance on a private car.
- 3.1.7 This is directly relevant to likely residential parking demand. The site provides the conditions necessary to support households with low or no car ownership and therefore gives a clear basis for expecting residential parking demand to be lower than would arise at a less accessible location.

- 3.1.8 It is important, however, that the parking case does not rely solely upon an assumption of reduced car ownership. As set out below, the TS also demonstrated that the wider site has sufficient capacity to accommodate the forecast combined parking demand, even during the identified peak period.

4 Parking Demand

- 4.1.1 The LHA has identified a theoretical requirement of nine spaces for the residential element and 26 spaces for the commercial uses by applying the relevant SPD standards to each element of the development.
- 4.1.2 As set out above, the SPD standards are expressed as maximum standards and do not establish the level of parking demand which will necessarily occur in practice.
- 4.1.3 This distinction is particularly important in the context of a mixed-use development. The residential, commercial and wine bar uses will not generate their maximum parking demand at the same time, and therefore simply adding together the maximum standard applicable to each use does not provide a realistic assessment of concurrent parking demand.
- 4.1.4 The TS addressed this by considering the parking accumulation associated with the different elements of the development across the course of the day. The assessment identified periods on both weekdays and weekends when the forecast combined demand would exceed the parking supply proposed as part of the development.
- 4.1.5 The maximum shortfall identified was two spaces. The TS also included a parking survey of the wider car park, which demonstrated that sufficient spare capacity exists elsewhere within the wider parking area to accommodate this limited level of overspill.
- 4.1.6 Accordingly, even on the basis of the parking demand assumed within the TS, the wider site has sufficient capacity to accommodate the combined parking demand generated by the development. The forecast shortfall within the development parking area is small and intermittent, and remains well within the available capacity of the wider car park.
- 4.1.7 This represents a robust assessment because it does not depend upon reduced residential car ownership in order for the development to operate satisfactorily.
- 4.1.8 Nevertheless, the strong accessibility of the site remains highly relevant. Given the proximity of rail and bus services, access to local facilities and the site's Connectivity Score, actual residential car ownership and parking demand can reasonably be expected to be lower than might otherwise occur in a less accessible location.

- 4.1.9 The parking assessment therefore represents a conservative position. Even if the assumed residential demand arises in full, the demand can be accommodated. If, as is reasonably expected, residential car ownership is lower as a consequence of the site's accessibility, the already limited peak exceedance would reduce further or may not arise at all.

5 Shared Parking

- 5.1.1 The mixed-use nature of the development provides an opportunity for the parking resource to be shared efficiently between the residential, commercial and wine bar uses.
- 5.1.2 The peak demands associated with those uses occur at different times. Residential parking demand is typically greater during the evening and overnight periods, whereas demand associated with the commercial uses is more strongly associated with daytime activity.
- 5.1.3 Shared parking therefore allows the available spaces to be used more efficiently than would be suggested by simply adding together the theoretical maximum requirement associated with each individual land use.
- 5.1.4 Where the peak demands of the different uses do not coincide, the cumulative maximum standard materially overstates the level of parking likely to be required at any one time.
- 5.1.5 The parking accumulation assessment undertaken within the TS provides the appropriate basis for considering this issue, as it assesses the combined demand across the day rather than relying upon a simple arithmetic sum of the SPD standards.
- 5.1.6 The results demonstrate that the parking resource can accommodate the combined demand for the substantial majority of the day and that the limited exceedance during the identified peak hour can be accommodated within the wider car park.

6 Potential for Overspill

- 6.1.1 The LHA has raised concern that parking associated with the development could result in overspill onto Glovers Brow or the surrounding adopted highway. The evidence contained within the TS does not indicate that this is likely to occur.
- 6.1.2 The proposed development parking is sufficient to accommodate the combined forecast demand for all but one hour of the day. During the single identified peak period, the small forecast exceedance can be accommodated within the wider car park, where the parking survey demonstrated available capacity.

- 6.1.3 There is therefore no operational requirement for parking associated with the development to be displaced onto Glovers Brow.
- 6.1.4 The accessibility of the site provides an additional factor which further reduces the likelihood of overspill. The site's sustainable transport connections and access to local services make it well suited to households with low or no car ownership, and actual residential parking demand is therefore reasonably likely to be below the level assumed within the parking assessment.
- 6.1.5 Even without relying upon that reduction, the surveyed wider parking resource is capable of accommodating the forecast demand. The likelihood of development-related parking being displaced onto the adopted highway is therefore considered negligible.

7 Parking Management

- 7.1.1 The on-site car park is managed by Euro Car Parks and will accommodate parking associated with both the residential and commercial elements of the development. The management arrangements will continue to ensure that the available parking resource is used efficiently and that inappropriate or unauthorised parking can be controlled.
- 7.1.2 The mixed-use nature of the development is particularly suited to managed shared parking because the peak demands associated with the different uses do not occur simultaneously. The same parking resource can therefore serve different elements of the development over the course of the day as their respective demands rise and fall.
- 7.1.3 The management regime also provides a mechanism to ensure that the parking area operates as intended and that spaces remain available for legitimate users of the development.
- 7.1.4 If considered necessary by the Local Planning Authority, the continued operation of appropriate parking management arrangements could be secured through an appropriately worded planning condition.

8 Conclusion

- 8.1.1 The proposed parking strategy should be considered in the context of the site's accessibility, the maximum nature of the local parking standards, the mixed-use nature of the development and the actual parking evidence contained within the TS.
- 8.1.2 The site is highly accessible and provides realistic alternatives to private car travel. This was demonstrated within the TS and is further supported by the DfT Connectivity Score of 72 and Band B classification.

- 8.1.3 These characteristics provide a clear basis for expecting residential car ownership and parking demand to be lower than would arise at a less accessible location. Importantly, however, the acceptability of the parking strategy does not depend upon reduced residential demand.
- 8.1.4 The TS assessed the combined parking demand associated with the residential, commercial and wine bar uses across the course of the day. This demonstrated that the proposed parking supply would be sufficient for all but one hour, during which the combined forecast demand would only marginally exceed the proposed provision.
- 8.1.5 The parking survey further demonstrated that sufficient spare capacity exists within the wider car park to accommodate that small temporary exceedance.
- 8.1.6 Therefore, even if the residential parking demand assumed within the TS were to occur in full, the wider site has sufficient capacity to accommodate the combined demand.
- 8.1.7 Given the strong connectivity of the site, actual residential demand is reasonably likely to be lower, further reducing the already limited potential for any temporary overspill.
- 8.1.8 The parking standards within the SPD are maximum standards and the simple addition of the maximum requirement associated with each land use does not reflect the actual concurrent demand likely to arise from the mixed-use development.
- 8.1.9 The submitted evidence demonstrates that the parking demand can be satisfactorily accommodated within the available parking resource and that there is no operational need for development-related parking to be displaced onto Glovers Brow.
- 8.1.10 There is therefore no evidence that the proposed parking arrangements would result in an unacceptable impact on highway safety or a severe adverse effect on the transport network.
- 8.1.11 On that basis, particularly given the new emphasis provided in the August 2026 update of the NPPF, the level of parking proposed should not provide a highway reason for refusal.

Appendix A DfT Connectivity Tool Output

DRAFT