



*Basingstoke  
and Deane*



## **Residential Parking Standards**

Supplementary Planning Document

**July 2008**

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council  
Civic Offices  
London Road  
Basingstoke  
RG21 4AH

Version December 2012

## **CONTENTS**

|      |  |    |
|------|--|----|
| 1    | Introduction   | 3  |
| 1.1  | Purpose  | 3  |
| 1.2  | Context  | 3  |
| 2    | Car Ownership in the Borough                               | 4  |
| 3    | Visitor Parking  | 5  |
| 4    | Proposed Parking Standards                                 | 5  |
| 4.12 | Houses In Multiple Occupation (HMO's)<br>and Sub-Divisions | 8  |
| 5    | Design   | 9  |
| 6    | Transport Assessments & Transport Statements               | 11 |

## **Appendices**

1. National and Local Policy
2. References

# 1 INTRODUCTION

## Purpose

- 1.1 The purpose of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), is to:
- enable developers and the public to understand what parking provision would be appropriate, by setting out information about what residential parking standards will be sought, in which location.
  - provide high quality solutions, depending on location and type of housing scheme, that achieves safe and efficient, active streets with well designed parking provision as an integral part of the housing layout.
  - accommodate adequate and appropriate car parking levels to meet the needs of the users without dominating or detracting from the external environment.
  - ensure that new development positively responds to the local character of the area and maintains the amenity of the existing local community.

## Context

- 1.2 Hampshire County Council as Highway authority has withdrawn the County Council's Parking Standards and Strategy and it is now the responsibility of district councils to set parking standards. These standards supersede the residential element of the Borough Council's Parking Standards and Strategy (2003).
- 1.3 A review of parking policies for residential and non-residential development is to be undertaken as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. In the meantime, this Supplementary Planning Document reflects the change in emphasis set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF).
- 1.4 The NPPF recommends an approach that takes account of expected levels of car ownership in new development and the accessibility, type, mix, use and the opportunity for public transport. Sufficient provision should therefore be made for the amount of parking that is likely to be needed by residents with the emphasis on promoting good design. This is seen as a priority in the review of current standards with a greater emphasis on design and layout and greater use of communal (unallocated) spaces to provide a more flexible solution for both residents and visitors. Good design as set out in Section 5 is fundamental and needs to relate to how residents and visitors are likely to respond. Further information on relevant national and local policy is attached at Appendix 1.
- 1.5 The SPD seeks to ensure that parking provision is well designed and available in the right location. Modern housing layouts with higher density perimeter development and rear courtyard parking are encouraged through design guidance but, unless well designed, can result in residents having a preference for indiscriminate on-street parking to the front of the property for either convenience or security reasons.

## 2 CAR OWNERSHIP IN THE BOROUGH

- 2.1 Research '**What it's like to Live There**'<sup>1</sup> carried out by the Commission for Architecture & the Built Environment (CABE) found that throughout the country car parking remains a significant issue for residents and that many people feel that new development should accommodate typical levels of car ownership.
- 2.2 The 2001 Census<sup>2</sup> for Basingstoke and Deane shows a higher level of car ownership compared to the national average. Nationally 29.4% of households have two or more cars, but in Basingstoke some 43.8% of households have two or more cars. Conversely, 26.8% of households nationally have no car compared to 16.0% of households in Basingstoke having no car. This varies from Ward to Ward, where the highest number of households without a car is South Ham with 32.2% and the lowest number of households without a car is Hatch Warren and Beggarwood with 2.8%. However, this is more likely to be linked to the type of housing provision and social demographic profiles of existing housing areas in these locations and would not necessarily be reflected in new housing schemes.
- 2.3 The planning process seeks to allocate development in the more sustainable locations. However, it is acknowledged that even with good public transport provision, high levels of car ownership will remain as a consequence of multi car households or as a consequence of location and poor public transport facilities. Even if more sustainable modes of travel are available and a greater choice of travel for some journeys, residents may still want to retain the option of keeping a car to use for those journeys where it is needed for family visits, shopping, DIY collections, waste recycling, holidays or weekend trips. It is therefore important that proper provision should be made to reflect this characteristic.
- 2.4 There is no evidence to suggest that the general levels of car ownership will reduce over time. General forecasts to 2026 derived from the **TEMPRO**<sup>3</sup> model shows an increase in car ownership in the Borough taking into account forecasts of growth in population and households. These forecasts are shown in the Tables at Section 4.10. If parking provision is not made to meet the likely levels of car ownership for new developments, including house conversions and sub-division, it is probable that cars will be parked in areas not designed for such purposes, such as grass verges and landscaped areas. There is evidence of these effects in newer housing developments where some occupiers and visitors are frustrated by an apparent shortage of parking spaces. Furthermore, such situations can also impact on surrounding areas and adjoining roads as new residents look further afield to find parking spaces. The town centre residents' on-street parking permit scheme will not be available to owners or occupiers of additional town centre residential development.
- 2.5 However, it is acknowledged that there will be exceptions where the anticipated level of car ownership may well be more or less in some development schemes and any proposed increase or reduction in the application of parking standards would need to be supported by a Transport Assessment / Travel Plan as set out in Section 6, including any proposed transport improvements or financial contributions. Provision below predicted demand can work successfully, as outlined in '**Manual for Streets**',<sup>4</sup> where it is possible for residents to reach day to day destinations, such as jobs, schools and shops, without the use of the car. However, whilst car usage may be

---

<sup>1</sup> What it's Like to Live There: CABE 2005

<sup>2</sup> Source 2001 Census, ONS

<sup>3</sup> TEMPRO: Department of Transport forecasting programme

<sup>4</sup> Manual for Streets: Department for Transport March 2007

less in certain circumstances, car ownership levels may not be reduced and provision for adequate parking will remain a priority.

### 3 Visitor Parking

- 3.1 **'Car Parking – What Works Where'**<sup>5</sup> states – “generally parking standards project a level of provision for visitors of about one space for every five homes, or 20%.” – but references in the document indicate that no special provision need be made for visitors parking when at least half of the parking provision associated with a housing development is unallocated (i.e. communal parking). However, if less than half the parking was to be unallocated in this way, then an extra 0.2 spaces per dwelling (20%) are needed to provide for visitors. The use of unallocated spaces can therefore significantly reduce the overall number of parking spaces to be provided in any scheme.
- 3.2 It is considered therefore, that if a significant proportion of residents parking is communal parking spaces (unallocated) this allows for greater flexibility where spaces are then available to both visitors and residents. **'Residential Car Parking Research'**<sup>6</sup> and 'Manual for Streets' supports this approach and advises that not all parking spaces need to be allocated to individual properties. Unallocated parking spaces can be either off-street communal parking areas or designated spaces forming part of the street layout.
- 3.3 This provides a common resource for a neighbourhood or a specific development. A combination of both types of parking can often be the most appropriate solution. The advice recommends a presumption in favour of unallocated communal parking. The key considerations in using unallocated parking are that it:
- only needs to provide for average levels of car ownership within an area;
  - allows for changes in car ownership between individual dwellings over time;
  - provides for both residents' and visitors' needs; and
  - can cater for parking demand from non-residential uses in mixed-use areas.
- 3.4 Unallocated communal parking must be readily apparent from a visitor's viewpoint and easily accessible from the street. It must also be equably distributed through development to enable residents to derive benefit. Complementary signing may also be required to identify the status and location of unallocated communal parking spaces.

### 4 PROPOSED PARKING STANDARDS

- 4.1 The Council seeks a well designed solution to parking provision in residential schemes that accommodates the likely level of car ownership in the area and a reduced level of off-street parking to that previously advocated with a view to providing the flexibility offered by some unallocated communal parking which also caters for visitor use.
- 4.2 "Manual for Streets", advises that the context of a new residential development needs to be carefully considered when determining the appropriate amount of parking. This will be informed by the Transport Assessment, together with any accompanying Travel Plan and the local authority's residential parking policies. The Department for Transport has issued guidance on Transport Assessments and Transport Statements. Further information on their requirement is contained at Section 6.

---

<sup>5</sup> Car Parking: What Works Where: English Partnerships 2006

<sup>6</sup> Residential Car Parking Research: DCLG May 2007

- 4.3 The design and provision of parking spaces in recent and many older developments does not make best use of the level of on-site parking provided in development proposals. This is apparent in higher density housing schemes where parking is located in areas away from the street frontage, such as rear courtyard parking and appears to lead to indiscriminate on-street parking and no obvious parking areas for visitors, raising issues of highway safety and residents amenity.
- 4.4 Parking provision on new housing developments generally allocates spaces to specific dwellings. This approach, though desirable for buyers and therefore attractive to developers, does not always represent the most efficient use of the parking provided. The level of car ownership varies between households and in some instances there will be under provision of spaces and in others there will be overprovision of spaces.
- 4.5 There is also the potential in mixed-use developments involving residential, commercial or retail proposals, to accommodate a level of parking that has a combined usage e.g. town centre developments comprising parking used by offices during the day and residential use at night.
- 4.6 The proposed parking standards therefore seek a different approach that places a greater emphasis on need, location and design of parking spaces in the way that they are provided. The revision of former 2003 standards with increased provision for **visitor parking** is considered sufficient to meet demand based on levels of car ownership provided there is a combination of off-street (allocated parking) and communal (unallocated parking). Proposals must also address future responsibilities for the maintenance and management of unallocated communal parking spaces.
- 4.7 Table 4.10 recommends levels of parking provision in residential development schemes including small scale developments and extensions to dwellings involving an increase in the number of bedrooms. The overall number of parking spaces will normally be rounded up. Where garages are provided to the minimum internal dimension as set out at paragraph 5.4, then these would count as contributing towards the overall parking standard. Existing garages not conforming to the minimum internal dimensions will be assessed flexibly with respect to their ability to cater for the modern motor vehicle.
- 4.8 The Council require a minimum of 20% (unallocated) communal parking spaces. The revised standards reflect the standards adopted in 2003 and subsequently modified where more than 50% of spaces provided are unallocated.
- 4.9 Where between 20% and 50% of spaces are unallocated the standards include an additional 0.25 spaces per dwelling for unallocated use including **visitors parking** and any overspill. This provides for the typical level of additional demand for unallocated parking suggested in the Residential Car Parking Research: DCLG May 2007. No additional provision need be made for visitors where at least half (50%) of the parking provision associated with development is unallocated.
- 4.10 The following table shows how the total demand for car parking spaces varies according to the extent to which car parking spaces are allocated. The table takes into account average car ownership levels in Basingstoke Wards, forecast to 2026 for both urban and rural areas. The zones in the Parking Standards (2003) have not been retained in the new residential standards as significant variations in car ownership patterns exist in these areas. However, the zones now refer to the Inner Urban area within the Ring Road, the Outer Urban area beyond the Ring Road, including the Rural Settlements; and the Rural area.

## General Residential Parking Standard

| Type               | *Inner Urban                          |   | *Outer Urban & Rural Settlements      |   | *Rural                                |   |
|--------------------|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------------------|---|
|                    | with more than 50% spaces unallocated | with between 20% and 50% spaces unallocated | with more than 50% spaces unallocated | With between 20% and 50% spaces unallocated | with more than 50% spaces unallocated | With between 20% and 50% spaces unallocated |
| 1 bedroom          | 0.75                                  | 1.0   | 1.0                                   | 1.25  | 1.0                                   | 1.25  |
| 2 or 3 bedroom     | 1.25                                  | 1.5   | 1.5                                   | 1.75  | 2.0                                   | 2.25  |
| 4 or more bedrooms | 2.0                                   | 2.25  | 2.5                                   | 2.75  | 3.0                                   | 3.25  |

\*Inner Urban: includes town area inside Ring Road

\*Outer Urban: includes town area outside Ring Road, Chineham, Old Basing – \*Rural Settlements: includes Baughurst, Bramley, Oakley, Overton, Tadley, Whitchurch

\*Rural: includes the remainder of the Borough

## Special Needs Parking Standard

| Type                               | *Inner Urban  | *Outer Urban & Rural Settlements                    | *Rural  |
|------------------------------------|---|---|---|
| Active elderly with warden control | 0.75  | 1.0   | 1.0   |
| Nursing and Rest Homes             | 1 space per 6 residents<br>Plus 0.5 space per staff | 1 space per 6 residents<br>Plus 1.0 space per staff | 1 space per 4 residents<br>Plus 1.0 space per staff |

A minimum of 5% of the parking provision must be designed for disabled driver use.

## Cycle Parking Standard

|                    | Long Stay | Short Stay |
|--------------------|-----------|------------|
| 1 bedroom          | 1.0       | 1.0        |
| 2 or 3 bedroom     | 2.0       | 1.0        |
| 4 or more bedrooms | 2.0       | 1.0        |

Long stay cycle parking, for dwelling houses requires secure covered parking for residents' cycles, such as within a garage or shed, with short stay provision by way of a secure loop attached to the house or garage.

Purpose built cycle storage will be required for communal cycle parking on higher density / flatted schemes with provision for short stay parking provided in the form of the 'Sheffield Stand' or equivalent.

- 4.11 Vertically arranged bicycle racks, or similar requiring lifting, are not suitable for all prospective cyclists. Horizontally arranged racks at ground level are always preferred. Full details must be submitted with any proposal for vertically arranged racks, and must not contribute more than 40% of the overall racking provision. The overall requirement for cycle parking spaces may reduce on larger development proposals involving higher density flatted schemes.

- 4.12 Any likelihood of under provision of parking spaces is to be avoided although it may be appropriate in specific circumstances and if proposed can be addressed through the submission of an appropriate Transport Appraisal / Statement with full supporting information to explain the development proposals.

#### *Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO's) and Sub-Divisions*

- 4.13 Conversions of dwellings to multiple occupation and sub-divisions generally intensify the use of the property and can increase demand for parking because of the greater number of adult occupants living in the property. There may also be a greater demand for visitor parking than if it were in single family occupation.

#### *For Houses in Multiple Occupation*

- 4.14 The required level of parking provision may vary depending on the location and the specifics of the proposal. However, the Council's intended starting point will be for the provision of 1 parking space per bedroom either on-site or on-street depending on the parking capacity available in the area, unless otherwise justified by providing details, for example, as to what measures will be taken to deal with anticipated traffic impacts of the scheme. Applications will normally be expected to include a parking survey.

#### *For sub-divisions of houses*

- 4.15 For sub-divisions of houses into flats the standards will be as per the Residential Parking Standards set out in Paragraph 4.10 of this document. Planning applications will normally be expected to include a parking survey.

#### *Parking Surveys*

- 4.16 Inconsiderate parking can also lead to harm and adverse impact on highway safety. In order to minimise any potential impact of new developments with less than optimum parking on site and competition for existing on-street parking a Parking Survey and Assessment will be required to be submitted with an application where the use of off-site parking facilities is proposed to meet the needs of the development.
- 4.17 The Parking Survey shall be accompanied by a scaled plan (in the form of a dimensioned sketch) annotated to indicate private accesses, on-street parking bays, unmarked roadside parking, waiting restrictions (single yellow lines), and public car parks up to 100 metres distance from the development. The plan should also indicate areas unsuitable for parking within this distance.

The information submitted with the parking survey will also need to include:

- the likely levels of car ownership amongst occupants;
- an assessment of parking activity in an identified vicinity of the application site. The parking activity would need to be recorded regularly and typically between 6am and 11pm on one weekday and one weekend day by an independent assessor.
- the results of the survey would be required to provide mapped records of the parked vehicle locations at each regular count interval and vehicle identities and would need to be at a time unaffected by seasonal variation (not in school holidays, or leading up to Christmas, for example);;
- Proximity to public transport

## 5 Design

- 5.1 The main objective of the standards is to provide high quality solutions, that takes into account the location and type of housing scheme and achieves safe and efficient, active streets with well designed parking provision as an integral part of the housing layout.
- 5.2 The following key principles, adapted from 'Manual for Streets' and based on 'Car Parking: What Works Where', should be followed when designing housing layouts and provision of car parking:
- the design and quality of the development is paramount;
  - there is no single best solution to providing car parking – a combination of on-plot, off-plot and on-street parking will usually be appropriate with simple access arrangements;
  - on-street parking is efficient in land use terms, understandable and can increase vitality and safety in the street, if properly designed into a development scheme;
  - parking within a block to the rear of properties, should be pursued only after parking at the front and on-street parking has been fully considered – rear courtyards should support on-street parking, not replace it, increased bay widths will assist accessibility
  - car parking needs to be designed with security and accessibility in mind;
  - consideration needs to be given to parking for visitors and disabled parking;
  - the use of SUDS is seen as a primary objective in dealing with surface water drainage, Permeable surfacing can be considered however, loose surface materials should not be used within 5m of a carriageway and not for disabled parking.
- 5.3 In addition to 'Manual for Streets', design guidance on car parking is available in a number of publications, including '**Better Places to Live**'<sup>7</sup>; 'The Urban Design Compendium'; '**Car Parking: What Works Where**'<sup>8</sup> and the Council's urban design guidance '**Places to Live**'<sup>9</sup>.
- 5.4 How car parking is marked and laid out is crucial to the quality of a housing development. The level of parking provision and its location are both equally important. The combination of allocated and unallocated communal parking and the scope for on-street parking incorporated into the overall design can work well. Curtilage parking or garages can be set back to avoid the street being dominated by parked cars. Although evidence suggests garages are not always used for car parking the Council requires garages to have minimum internal dimensions of 6m by 3m with 2.3m headroom to enable the use for storage and parking. The garage shall be level and communicating doors must not open into or obstruct the garage area.
- A minimum clear opening of 2.3 metres between the frames of the garage door must be provided.
  - The front of the garage must be set-back into the plot by a minimum 5.5m from a footway or highway boundary.

---

<sup>7</sup> Better Place to Live: DTLR and CABE 2000

<sup>8</sup> Urban Design Compendium: English Partnerships 2000

<sup>9</sup> Places to Live: Basingstoke & Deane BC 2002 (update 2008)

- The minimum recommended unconfined parking bay dimensions are 2.4 by 4.8m for perpendicular parking and 2.0m by 6.0m for parallel parking.
- Generous sizing of parking bays can make a positive contribution in providing for use by disabled drivers and in designing for 'lifetime' homes.
- Disabled parking bays must be a minimum 5 metres long by 3.6 metres wide, including 1.2 metre wide accessibility hatching.
- Parking bays confined by walls and or fences, etc. require additional width for drivers and passengers - the recommended minimum width is 3 metres.
- To avoid overhang of footpaths and footways adjacent perpendicular bay length increases to 5.5m.
- Where the driveway or hardstand also serves as the primary pedestrian access path to property an additional minimum 0.9m width is also required.
- Parking spaces are for loading, unloading and parking of motor vehicles. They must not be obstructed by storage or other residential paraphernalia, i.e. refuse/recycling containers.
- Tandem parking spaces provided in line one behind the other, are acceptable on-plot within the curtilage of a dwelling, if no more than two cars are parked in tandem; additional parking spaces will not contribute towards the overall parking standard. However, tandem parking is discouraged in areas of general unallocated communal parking (rear parking courts).
- The secure bicycle storage requirement for a typical house could be accommodated in a garage meeting the minimum dimensions.

5.5 Rear courtyard parking designed as an integral part of the housing layout may deter indiscriminate on-street parking and offer opportunity for enhanced security and accessibility. To be effective courtyard parking design must be easily accessible from the street and be convenient for residents and visitors. Courtyard parking may be considered as the least preferred option where displaced parking could cause hazard or obstruction.



Russell Road: BDBC

5.6 Well designed communal parking, either on-street or as part of the development site, can accommodate variations in car ownership between different households and provide some flexibility in their use and provision for visitor parking. The parking schemes can add to the overall appearance of the street and, in the case of central parking bays forming part of the carriageway, can minimise the impact on the built frontage, be well overlooked, have a traffic calming effect and provide an opportunity

for good landscaping – such as the examples shown in the photographs.



Crown copyright: Better Places to Live

5.7 Whilst 'Manual for Streets' identifies some issues with on-street parking if it is not well designed – the overall benefits can be:

- a common resource, catering for residents', visitors' and service vehicles in an efficient manner;
- able to cater for peak demands from various users at different times of the day;
- adds more activity to the street;
- typically well overlooked, providing improved security;
- popular and likely to be well-used;
- can provide a useful buffer between pedestrians and traffic; and
- potentially allows the creation of areas within perimeter blocks that are free of cars.

5.8 Other options may also be appropriate where multi storey, underground or undercroft parking is proposed or mechanised parking arrangements which allow cars to be parked automatically in closed systems at high density. Underground parking presents opportunities to improve land use and density.

## 6 Transport Assessments & Transport Statements

6.1 NPPF states that, all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a **Transport Assessment** or, a simplified report in the form of a **Transport Statement** where the transport issues are limited in order to identify suitable mitigation.

6.2 A Transport Assessment is a comprehensive and systematic process that sets out transport issues relating to a proposed development and what measures will be taken to deal with the anticipated traffic impacts of the scheme. '**Guidance on Transport Assessment**'<sup>10</sup> is intended to assist stakeholders in determining whether an assessment may be required and, if so, it's appropriate scope and content.

6.3 Where a Transport Assessment indicates a need to improve public transport, pedestrian and cycling provision a S106 Agreement (Planning Obligation) will normally be entered into to enable appropriate contributions to be made to support development proposals. Further information on the Council's '**Planning Obligations and Community Infrastructure Guidance**'<sup>11</sup> requirements can be found on the

<sup>10</sup> Guidance on Transport Assessment: Department for Transport March 2007

<sup>11</sup> Section 106 Planning Obligations & Community Infrastructure: BDBC 2006

Council's web site.

- 6.4 Appendix B to the Guidance on Transport Assessment provides the likely thresholds as follows:

|                 | <b>No assessment required</b> | <b>Transport Statement required</b> | <b>Transport Assessment required</b> |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Dwelling houses | Less than 50 units            | Between 50 & 80 units               | More than 80 units                   |

- 6.5 These thresholds are for guidance purposes and will be reviewed as part of the LDF programme. In some circumstances, a Transport Assessment may be appropriate for smaller developments than suggested and a Transport Statement will normally be required to support planning applications for Houses in Multiple Occupation and sub divisions.

### National Policy

The National Planning Policy Framework<sup>12</sup> (NPPF) sets out the Government's national policies on aspects of planning in England.

The NPPF states - If setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels; and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

### Manual for Streets

'Manual for Streets'<sup>13</sup> DCLG and Department for Transport provides advice on the design, construction, adoption and maintenance of new residential streets, including 'Parking' and emphasises the importance of properly considering the parking of vehicles in the design process.

### Local Policy

The planning policies in the Basingstoke & Deane Adopted Local Plan (1996-2011) are automatically saved for a period of three years from adoption in July 2006 (unless any have been replaced by subsequent Development Plan Documents). The policies may be saved beyond the three year period where these are still considered to be relevant and with the consent of the Secretary of State. This would enable relevant policies to continue in operation until they are replaced by a Development Plan Document.

The Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) on Parking Standards in January 2003 as a material consideration in determining planning applications through the Development Control process. These local standards were largely based upon the '**Hampshire County Council Standards**' (2002) but revised to accommodate local circumstances and based upon "accessibility zones" for the whole Borough. Current saved policies regarding car and secure bicycle parking under **Policies A1** and **A2** of the Adopted Local Plan 1996-2011 relate to the revised Residential Parking Standards SPD which replaces the residential element of the above SPG.

---

<sup>12</sup> National Planning Policy Framework

<sup>13</sup> Manual for Streets 2 September 2010

### References

- 1 [What it's Like to Live There: CABE 2005](#)
- 2 [Source 2001 Census, ONS](#)
- 3 [TEMPRO: Department of Transport forecasting programme](#)
- 4 [Manual for Streets: Department for Transport March 2007](#)
- 5 [Car Parking: What Works Where: English Partnerships 2006](#)
- 6 [Residential Car Parking Research: DCLG May 2007](#)
- 7 [Better Place to Live: DTLR and CABE 2000](#)
- 8 [Urban Design Compendium: English Partnerships 2000](#)
- 9 [Places to Live: Basingstoke & Deane BC 2002](#)
- 10 [Guidance on Transport Assessment: Department for Transport March 2007](#)
- 11 [Section 106 Planning Obligations & Community Infrastructure: BDBC 2006](#)
- 12 [National Planning Policy Framework](#)
- 13 [Manual for Streets 2 September 2010](#)