



Regulation 12 Consultation Statement

Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document

June 2026

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Regulation 12 of 'The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)' requires Local Authorities to prepare a statement prior to the adoption of a supplementary planning document (SPD) which sets out:
- Who was consulted
 - A summary of the main issues raised
 - How those issues have been addressed in the SPD
- 1.2 This Statement relates to the consultation which took place in relation to the Draft Parking Standards SPD.
- 1.3 The role of the Parking Standards SPD is to provide guidance on the application of Bracknell Forest Local Plan policies (as adopted in March 2024) in relation to the following policies:
- Policy LP 25 Transport Principles
 - Policy LP 26 Transport Infrastructure Provision
 - Policy LP 28 Design Principles
 - Policy LP 60 Assessing Transport Impacts and Requirements
 - Policy LP 61 Travel Plans
 - Policy LP 62 Parking
- 1.4 The purpose of the consultation was to seek the views of those living and working in the Borough, and those who submit planning applications on the approach to be taken to planning applications in relation to parking standard matters.
- 1.5 A four-week (plus two days to allow for public holidays) public consultation on the draft SPD took place between 13^h January and 10th February 2026, and involved the following:
- Update of the 'Parking Standards SPD' webpage on the Council's website [Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document | Bracknell Forest Council](#)
 - Publication of the consultation documents on the Council's consultation portal
 - Email (or letters to those without an email address) to those on the Council's planning policy consultation database which included:
 - Local residents
 - Developers
 - Adjoining local authorities
 - Parish/Town Councils
 - Statutory consultees
 - Provision of a hard copy of the draft SPD during the consultation period at the Council office at Time Square, Bracknell and Bracknell Town library. Warfield and Crowthorne Parish Councils also requested hard copies.
 - Press release at the start of the consultation on the Council's web page
 - Information on the Council's Facebook and other social media pages

- Item in the 'Your Bracknell Forest extra' (a Borough newsletter)

1.6 Twenty-three individuals/organisations responded to the consultation. **Appendix A** provides a summary of the main issues raised and how they have been addressed in the final version of the SPD.

Appendix A – Summary of representations and Council's response

Please note that all document references relate to the consultation draft SPD, and these may differ from the adopted version.

New text added to the SPD is shown in **bold and underlined**.

A ~~strike through~~ has been applied to text that is deleted from the SPD.

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
Representor 1: Binfield Parish Council		
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles	<p>4.10 – 4.17 Electric vehicle charging Proposals to ensure that ducting etc. is in place for future expansion of EV charging points are good and supported by the Parish Council. The ducting should also be provided on street as well as in designated places within residential areas for residents without access to off-street parking.</p> <p>Most chargers provided in public car parks should be high-speed chargers to allow an adequate amount of charge to be added within a reasonable time frame. Some rapid/super-fast chargers will be required in any on-street provision also. There is a place for 7KW chargers to provide top ups, or for plug-in hybrid EVs. Generally, the Parish Council believes that 7KW charging is adequate for charging at home, providing a full charge overnight for all but the largest car batteries.</p>	<p>Noted with thanks. The point about also including ducting for on-street EV provision is well made and the Council will also include ducting where appropriate in the street but not this is not a requirement of the SPD but other operations of the Council.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p> <p>“Rapid / super fast” refers to in bold: 1. 3kW to 7.9kW = standard 2. 8kW to 49kW = standard plus 3. 50kW to 149kW = rapid 4. 150kW+ = ultra-rapid</p> <p>They generally aren’t deployed in on-street locations as they require substantial supporting infrastructure – i.e. large electrical supply cabinets or even small substations. The charger units themselves are also bulkier.</p> <p>It is agreed 7kw chargers are adequate for home charging, and this tends to be accepted across the industry and is likely what we will see in on-street locations for the present time. This will be kept under review.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	Public chargers, including those on residential developments, should be time limited to prevent vehicles overstaying and stopping others from charging their vehicles.	This is not a matter for the SPD but other functions of the Council such as highways enforcement. No changes required to the SPD.
	Paragraphs 4.18 – 4.20 On-Street Waiting Restrictions Parking restrictions in some areas, particularly those on roads required for through traffic including through housing estates, will also need to have some kind of enforcement to ensure that the roads are clear. Without any consequences, people will continue to park despite restrictions on roads	This is noted and agreed although the enforcement of parking is not a matter for the operational side and the emerging parking strategy. The comments have been passed to the relevant service for consideration. No changes required to the SPD.
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations	5.6 -5.8 Flexibility Zone Appendix A The Parish Council is not totally sure about the 0.9 spaces per dwelling in the flexibility zone. There is sense in not needing a car for daily commuting etc. if people can walk to the train or bus station, but that doesn't cover all needs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Couples who don't both commute by train, • Evening and weekend visits, • Major shopping trips, • Weekends away etc. • Disabled parking that people want to have a car for.	The type of development in that zone will be higher density and smaller sized properties similar to those in the town centre. The 0.9 standard has proven to be adequate in those areas and could be lower in terms of standard parking spaces provided evidence allows other measures as an equivalence such a travel plan measures and car clubs. No changes required to the SPD.
	The car shares look good in principle but seem to be somewhat unproven. Where is the evidence that car shares of this kind work well and keep the number of required parking spaces down? What are the indicative costs to residents for such schemes? Has research been done on their financial viability? The major problem of using these schemes to determine the parking standards on new housing development is that the true effects of such schemes is unknown until it is too late to do anything about it.	There is clear evidence from car clubs already in operation across the UK and Europe that they reduce private car ownership and therefore the need for home parking. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CoMoUK, the national organisation for shared transport, estimates that every car club vehicles replaces 27 privately owned cars (CoMoUK Annual car club report 2024.pdf, p21). The Council takes a more cautious approach in applying how many parking spaces a car club replaces to 9 spaces rather than 27. • A UK Government evidence review estimates that between 10% and 33% of car club users decreased their vehicle ownership after joining and

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		<p>average car ownership of car club participants decreases by 0.1 to 0.4 vehicles after joining (Car clubs rapid evidence assessment, p16).</p> <p>Bracknell town centre has many of the factors which studies have found to be key for use and financial viability of car clubs, most notably a high population density and good public transport links (Car Clubs in New Developments, Melia et al, p18). With this in mind, there is a good evidence base in principle that a car club is a viable solution in the town centre. However, developers wishing to make use of the flexibility in the parking standards will need to show that the measures they will take, including any car club proposals, are sufficient to reduce parking need to the level they offer and this will be assessed on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>In terms of viability and their costs, they vary, but typically there is a joining fee (around £25) then costs are roughly £4 - £9 per hour, plus 0.15p per mile. Or there are discounted full day rates, e.g. £40 - £70 per day. The costs depend on the size of the car. Fuel, insurance etc is all included.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD</p>
	Residential Parking Standards Garage size standards and parking are good.	Comments noted with thanks
	5.10 Home Working The rules on room size for defining office vs bedroom seem sensible. There is a need for a rule here. Current residents may claim rooms will be offices, but the next occupants may have different needs.	Noted with thanks No changes required to the SPD.
	Appendix II Table 1 One point of confusion for Nursery parking, i.e. for Bloom House (Arto House) It is difficult to work out which Use Class should be applied for. Is it E or F1? It is hard to tell from the description provided. E. Land Use - Creche, day nursery or day centre (not including a residential use) E(f)	Table 6 section "F1 (Learning and non-residential institution) for Provision of Education and formerly D1 (Non – residential institutions)" needs to be changed, as both surgeries and nurseries are now within class E. Within Table 6 section F1 the following text needs to be moved from 'standard car parking spaces' and 'cycle parking' sections and placed separately in the table with text for use classes E(e) and E(f).

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action														
	<p>Standard car parking spaces All development Staff/visitors: 1 space per 4 staff members/visitors at busiest time Parent Drop-off and Pick-up: 1 space per 4 children</p> <p>F1 (Learning and non-residential institution) for Provision of Education and formerly D1 (Non-residential institutions)</p> <p>Standard car parking spaces All development Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff: 1 space per staff member Parents/Visitors: 1 space per 4 children.</p>	<p>Remove from Table 6 section F1:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1144 328 1809 1350"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1144 328 1323 453">Row of Table 6 F1</th> <th data-bbox="1323 328 1686 453">Text to move</th> <th data-bbox="1686 328 1809 453">Where to move text to</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1144 453 1323 794">standard car parking spaces</td> <td data-bbox="1323 453 1686 794"> <p>Consulting Surgeries (including clinics and veterinary surgeries) 3 spaces per consulting room (including nurses' treatment rooms) for patients and visitors and 1 space per consulting staff (at busiest time). 1 space per 3 other staff</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1686 453 1809 794">Create new Table 6 section for E(e) and move text here</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1144 794 1323 1070"></td> <td data-bbox="1323 794 1686 1070"> <p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff: 1 space per staff member Parents/Visitors: 1 space per 4 children.</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1686 794 1809 1070">Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1144 1070 1323 1350">Cycle Parking</td> <td data-bbox="1323 1070 1686 1350"> <p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff/Visitors: 1 per 10 children (at least 2 – whichever the greater)</p> </td> <td data-bbox="1686 1070 1809 1350">Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>			Row of Table 6 F1	Text to move	Where to move text to	standard car parking spaces	<p>Consulting Surgeries (including clinics and veterinary surgeries) 3 spaces per consulting room (including nurses' treatment rooms) for patients and visitors and 1 space per consulting staff (at busiest time). 1 space per 3 other staff</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(e) and move text here		<p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff: 1 space per staff member Parents/Visitors: 1 space per 4 children.</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here	Cycle Parking	<p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff/Visitors: 1 per 10 children (at least 2 – whichever the greater)</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here
Row of Table 6 F1	Text to move	Where to move text to														
standard car parking spaces	<p>Consulting Surgeries (including clinics and veterinary surgeries) 3 spaces per consulting room (including nurses' treatment rooms) for patients and visitors and 1 space per consulting staff (at busiest time). 1 space per 3 other staff</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(e) and move text here														
	<p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff: 1 space per staff member Parents/Visitors: 1 space per 4 children.</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here														
Cycle Parking	<p>Nursery/Playgroup/Creche Staff/Visitors: 1 per 10 children (at least 2 – whichever the greater)</p>	Create new Table 6 section for E(f) and move text here														

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action	
		<p>Consulting Surgeries (including clinics) Staff/Visitors: 2 per consulting room. (at least 2 – whichever the greater)</p>	<p>Create new Table 6 section for E(e) and move text here</p>
		<p>Other rows to the new table sections for E(e) and E(f) will be required for: Motorcycle Lorry Parking Disabled Parking Travel Plan Additional Information</p>	
<p>Representor 2: Bracknell Forest Cambium Partnership LLP (a joint-venture between Countryside Partnerships (part of Vistry Group) and Bracknell Forest Council).</p>			
<p>General</p>	<p>We support the Council’s ambition to modernise its approach to parking and welcome the flexibility proposed for sustainable locations. We encourage clear and proportionate evidence requirements that apply across all tenure types, along with a more balanced EV charging approach that reflects the needs and interests of the residents. This will help ensure the SPD can be used effectively to support the delivery of sustainable developments.</p>	<p>Noted, the Council will expect a robust evidence base to justify more flexible parking arrangements which are reasonable and clear.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD required.</p>	
<p>Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations.</p>	<p>1. Flexibility within the Town Centre and Flexibility Zone We welcome the SPD’s intention to allow flexibility in parking requirements within Bracknell Town Centre as well as the newly-defined Flexibility Zone (up to 800m from the rail/bus station). Car parking provision remains an important factor for purchasers buying outside of London. In locations such as Bracknell, buyers would generally expect parking as part of a new development. That being said, for town centre sites, with close transport links</p>	<p>Noted with thanks.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>	

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>and local amenities, there is some flexibility. Certain purchaser profiles, typically investors, younger first-time buyers / early-career professionals and students, may be open to reduced or alternative parking solutions. There are also those buyers who would like access to a car but use it infrequently. These buyers are more amenable to off-site parking solutions or the use of car clubs. The recognition within the SPD that alternative measures—such as car clubs and public transport incentives — can offset an element of parking provision is therefore considered a positive and pragmatic step forward. We believe this shift aligns well with the Bracknell Forest Local Plan (2024) as well as evolving behaviour of residents. For developers, this will also provide flexibility in responding to site challenges, helping unlock sites where physical constraints make full compliance challenging.</p>	
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations.	<p>1. Flexibility within the Town Centre and Flexibility Zone: It would be beneficial to have clearer guidance on acceptable levels of evidence to support reduced parking provision. Providing worked examples of acceptable survey scopes and levels of mitigation packages would give developers greater certainty in understanding what the Local Planning Authority considers ‘robust’ evidence. We would also suggest that evidence requirements are scaled based on the size of the scheme, to ensure that smaller developments are not subject to the same level of technical analysis and costly mitigation packages as major schemes.</p>	<p>The onus is on the developers to provide information and a potential package of measures alongside the evidence base in the form of Lambeth-methodology compliant parking surveys. In terms of scale of development, the Council will consider matters on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations.	<p>3. Flexibility for Affordable Housing We support the Council’s acknowledgement that affordable housing typically generates lower levels of car ownership and therefore may justify reduced levels of parking provision, subject to evidence. It’s noted however that this flexibility is limited to schemes that deliver only 100% affordable housing. It’s considered affordable housing is typically secured as a proportion of mixed-tenure development. This would therefore limit the ability to qualify for this flexibility. Additionally, car ownership levels would not change</p>	<p>The Council has examined this issue in the past and found the typical parking demands for affordable housing as part of a wider development, is broadly the same as the neighbouring market dwellings. Affordable housing provision also contains shared ownership dwellings which generally do not differ from market dwellings in terms of their car ownership levels. In addition, we have found that some higher density developments where affordable housing has been secured on-site have had to come back to renegotiate due to not being able to find a registered partner. This means that the dwellings become market dwellings which would have higher parking needs.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>depending on whether an affordable home sits within a mixed-tenure scheme or not.</p> <p>We'd therefore recommend the SPD responds to the evidence of car parking needs as opposed to the level of affordable housing on a development. It would also be good to understand how a developer is able to provide such evidence for affordable housing and whether this requires evidence from Registered Providers.</p>	<p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Annexes A, B and C	<p>2. EV Chargers</p> <p>We support the alignment with Building Regulations Part S (EV charging) and the requirement for active and passive EV provision where appropriate. This ensures future residents are equipped for the shift toward lower-carbon travel.</p> <p>Whilst supportive of EV uptake, the requirement to install active charging points for every dwelling is considered disproportionate to actual EV ownership levels (particularly for individuals). For developers, the capital cost of installing active chargers, upgrading electrical capacity, and providing supporting infrastructure can be substantial, whilst for residents the EV charging infrastructure will likely still incur ongoing back office and operational costs, despite whether they own an electric vehicle or not. The costs would form part of the service charge and would apply regardless of individual usage. This is necessary to ensure the chargers remain functional, compliant and available for residents.</p> <p>It is recommended that a more proportionate, phased or demand-led approach, is considered, where activation of passive EV chargers can be triggered at a later date by future users. This would still mean that the underlying infrastructure is provided, but with the ability to respond to future user's needs as and when required</p>	<p>Part S of the Budling Regulations applies to all developments, including flats where they have associated parking;</p> <p>It is understand regarding the points made particularly around ongoing costs that may be incurred for residents in terms of service charges, associated with back-office etc. (particularly in more 'communal' parking settings i.e. flats), but not installing goes against Building Regulations Part S. Passive infrastructure isn't compliant with Part S – it is intended to supplement, not replace the min number of operational chargepoints required at completion. To argue that chargepoints should be installed based on demand contradicts the very purpose of BR Part S, which is about future proofing by providing provision from the outset, regardless of current EV ownership levels or individual demand.</p> <p>The only exceptions are when costs exceed £3600 per chargepoint, and this has to be evidenced through documentation e.g. formal quotes, DNO letters). This allows developers to comply but not at any expense to their viability margins.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 3: Sandhurst Town Council		
General	<p>The Committee does not support the principle of allowing "flexibility" in the consideration of Planning and Highways development policies or the adoption of zero development</p>	<p>It is disagreed that a degree of flexibility should be applied in a limited area in Bracknell Town Centre and its surrounds. A level of pragmatism and a response to the longer-term strategy of intensification is required to deliver</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>planning permission or the change of larger HMO parking spaces to 0.5 per occupant.</p>	<p>the balance of new development and cater for a number of issues such as parking requirements. For example, a less intensified town centre would without doubt mean greater pressure for strategic growth in countryside or green belt which is not what the local plan was adopted upon.</p> <p>Regarding the comment about HMO's, the 0.5 per bedroom for large HMOs is an improvement on the current setup where anything of 4 bedrooms plus requires 3 spaces. Research has been undertaken looking at HMO permissions and standards both in Bracknell Forest and neighbouring boroughs. This standard is well researched and appropriate.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
<p>Chapter 1 - Introduction</p>	<p>It is apparent that these new parking standards are designed to enable high numbers of dwellings to be built in locations that are not suitable for high density housing because of the high levels of car ownership experienced here in Bracknell Forest and Bracknell Town in particular. 2011 Census data show high levels of car ownership in Bracknell Forest at 86% of the houses with at least one car. In 2021 total car ownership was 88.5% as shown in the BFC AMR.</p> <p>There appears to be no consideration of the health impacts of poor parking provision. No examination of the success or otherwise of schemes to improve the current shortfall in adequate parking across the whole borough. Para 1.4 says the consultation document content is drawn on "local knowledge, expertise and experience of what works" within Bracknell Forest but this knowledge and experience of current parking issues does not seem to have featured in this plan to allow flexibility. Para 4.19 acknowledges the fact that older neighbourhoods and estates have degraded quality of life for its residents because of the increased number and size of vehicles but no schemes to improve local issues are presented. In some areas neighbours have engaged in physical violence to maintain "their parking space". Some residents will contact friends to take them to social events because they cannot move their car for fear of losing their parking</p>	<p>The issue raised about health impacts and poor parking could also be considered about health and too many cars, so the point made is no a valid argument in the context of the SPD.</p> <p>It is disputed that nothing is done to help resolve existing parking issues in the estates. In fact the Council has funded over 800 new parking spaces with the estates over the last 10 years. This programme will continue further but not as part pf the Parking Standards SPD.</p> <p>The Council adopted the Local Plan in 2024 after many years of consultation and examination. Its strategy to concentrate development in the Town Centre was considered to be the most sustainable and hence why the plan was found to be sound. The option to develop sites beyond the urban area was found to not be a sound approach so the countryside around Bracknell and Sandhurst was protected from large scale allocations.</p> <p>The parking Standards SPD does not cover issue such as car park ability to hold heavy electric cars. That is a matter for the Council and its overall emerging parking strategy.</p> <p>It is disagreed that residential development in the flexible zone or town centre will contribute towards enhancing the Lexicon. Thousands more</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>space. To remedy this all that is suggested in 4.20 is that developers should fund waiting restrictions on roads nearby or adjacent to their development.</p> <p>To encourage development in Bracknell Town Centre where the CIL contribution level is zero is a massive failure of responsibility to protect current residents from the highway safety issues that the use of CIL could mitigate.</p> <p>There is no mention of how the effect of large heavy electric cars on the structural integrity of Bracknell's current public multi-storey car parks will be managed and paid for as the current flexibility plan will lead to an increase in the use of these car parks. The High Street car park is due to be rebuilt in early 2026 as new dwellings and the current 980 parking spaces is to be replaced with just 320, the number of dwellings this will serve is given as approx. 142 in the master plan.</p> <p>How can further parking to enhance the Lexicon as a retail destination of choice be provided when the stated intent is to have "flexible" parking (non-compliant or less than is needed) for residential development in a "flexibility zone" within 800m walk of the Bracknell Railway Station and Bus Station. This is unlikely to contribute to footfall in the town centre and residents do not want to see actions taken that could reduce the town centre to the wind-swept ghost town it used to be.</p> <p>Where in the technical and factual updates is the increase in car ownership in Bracknell Forest and Bracknell Town presented and taken into account?</p> <p>The use of a parking rate of just 0.5 for each Large HMO would mean a house with 7 occupants all with their own car would only need 4 spaces. This is not supported by the STC Planning Committee.</p>	<p>people living there will use the Lexicon and other town centre facilities especially for their day to day needs. The future parking needs for the Lexicon and Town Centre (for visitors) is a matter for the Council's emerging parking strategy.</p> <p>Regarding the comment about HMO's, the 0.5 per bedroom for large HMOs is an improvement on the current setup where anything of 4 bedrooms plus requires 3 spaces. Research has been undertaken looking at HMO permissions and standards both in Bracknell Forest and neighbouring boroughs. This standard is well researched and appropriate.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations?	Where is the definition of the term Flexibility in the context of parking standards presented? Dictionary defines it as: "the ability to change or be changed easily according to the situation," in other words the ability to not follow the rules laid down to protect residents, enhance a local environment or support aspiration in	The draft SPD is clear that flexibility is to be used to ensure that an equivalence of the standards are met which will be required to be demonstrated through robust evidence and the securing of to be agreed measures.

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>the form of car ownership that have been examined and approved by due process and independent confirmation.</p> <p>5.18 sub para 1-2 clearly states that the LPA “may approve the application with a level of parking below that required by the full standard.”</p> <p>Para 1.8 states “This does not mean that a relaxation of standards will be accepted in every case, nor will any case where a relaxation of standards will be accepted set a precedent for lower parking provision on other sites.” This statement confirms it is the council’s intention to relax the standards on an ad hoc basis. Whenever a planning related decision is made, particularly at appeal, the decision, if approved, sets a precedent.</p> <p>4.4 Why retain previous land use class parking standards?</p> <p>Para 5.3 whilst listed under Bracknell Town Centre Standards introduces the element of having ‘zero car’ development. The only statistic presented is that 10% of the current dwellings do not have parking. Para 5.4 states that the more flexible approach will only be used in Bracknell Town Centre on use classes other than Class E. But what will the effect on Class E uses in the town centre be?</p> <p>The purpose of this revised Supplementary Parking Document appears to ensure a lot more houses can be built without adequate parking thereby maintaining or exacerbating the poor and unhealthy parking regime we currently have.</p> <p>Nowhere in this consultation draft is there a clear explanation of the benefits that flexibility will deliver for residents in any area of the borough.</p> <p>Sandhurst Town Council’s Planning Committee had hoped the revision of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document would be seeking to improve parking situations across the borough. Clearly the introduction of a “flexible” approach to any planning related policy or guidance regime cannot do anything other than reduce the effectiveness of the substantive policies or guidance. We therefore seek to have the introduction of flexibility and the 0.5 rate for large HMO’s removed from this and any future Parking or Planning policy document.</p>	<p>We do not agree that the flexible zone should be removed.</p> <p>Regarding the comment about HMO’s, the 0.5 per bedroom for large HMOs is an improvement on the current setup where anything of 4 bedrooms plus requires 3 spaces. Research has been undertaken looking at HMO permissions and standards both in Bracknell Forest and neighbouring boroughs. This standard is well researched and appropriate.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
Representor 4: Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
Chapter 1 - Introduction	<p>Though it does not say so specifically, this SPD is a complete overhaul of the previous versions, obviously devised with great care and sympathy for the various “parkers” and also road users potentially affected by parking and parked vehicles. It takes into account the demography of the Bracknell Forest area and draws distinctions between different types of land use, Bracknell Town, “Flexible Zone” and other.</p> <p>CVAG is pleased with this approach.</p> <p>The SPD goes to pains to “allow some flexibility in the application of parking requirements”. On the other side of that coin we trust that it is not an invitation to developers to be so flexible that they do what they want and ignore the Standards.</p>	<p>Comments noted with thanks.</p> <p>This is agreed, the flexible solution needs to be appropriately and robustly evidenced and any equivalent parking measures such as car clubs must be put in place and supported over time. Planning conditions and /or S106 Agreement obligations will be required to ensure the solution is secured and delivered.</p>
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles	<p>4.9 – SANGs</p> <p>SANGs are supposed to relate to specific developments, but it is not always so. For example, the Bucklers Forest SANG in Crowthorne has proved very popular to residents and to casual visitors. For 42 Hectares, the SPD suggests a minimum 1.5 spaces per hectare = 63 spaces. The existing car park (unmarked) would not support that many and, for example, Crowthorne Parish Council asked the Carnival Committee NOT to do a (walking) treasure hunt on that site because of insufficient parking space for likely participants from all round Crowthorne.</p> <p>Therefore, there should be a condition that if a SANG is likely to be popular more than 1.5 spaces per hectare should be provided.</p>	<p>SANGs are provided for specific developments and have capacity for developments within the defined catchment areas. It should be noted that SANGs provided as part of a large housing site where a number of dwellings fall within 400m of the SANG do not need parking provision and a further calculation on residual capacity to serve other developments beyond this distance is required. This amount of capacity will determine how much parking there is. So, in the case of Bucklers Park (for example), the car park is large enough for the residual SANG capacity it may provide. Other SANGs such as Warfield Park does not have a car park so any residual capacity can only be used for developments with 400m of the SANG. The point is well made though and there may some situations where further consideration may be required by the Highways Authority but that will be on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	4.20 – Waiting restrictions – agreed, but beyond the SPD, the Council should implement resident only parking, with daily permits for residents’ visitors.	As inferred in the comment, this is not a matter for the Parking Standards SPD but a wider matter for the Council in its role as Local Highways Authority (LHA). The LHA duties include consideration and implementation of resident permit schemes for parking and follows due process when a request is made by members of the public. No changes required to the SPD.
Chapter 6 Monitoring and Compliance	Technical comment. In the SPD, the word “Chapter” is missing from the title of this chapter.	Agreed – action replace ‘6. Compliance and Monitoring’ to read as <u>Chapter 6 – Monitoring and Compliance</u>
Appendix 1 Map, 2 Tables and 3 The Lambeth Methodology	<p>This comment refers to table 7 in Appendix 2 The current text reads “Standard end-in parking space: • Minimum 4.8m long x 2.4m wide with additional width of 0.3m to each side of space where there is an adjacent wall or fence. Size increased to reflect national guidance if more recent.”</p> <p>In response of the increase in car sizes since 2016 and the trend towards SUVs the Institute of Structural engineers now recommends that a standard bay should be 2.6m x 5m, with 2.4 x 4.8m as a minimum</p> <p>It is suggested that this document should recognise that evolution and the wording should read:</p> <p>“The standard parking space should be 2.6x 5m, with a minimum of 2.4 x 4.8 m only where special extenuating circumstances can be demonstrated.”</p>	<p>Not all vehicles are large and the increase in vehicle size over time, has commonly been to the width of vehicles and not the length. For example, none of the top 10 selling cars in the UK in 2025 were over 4.8 m in length. Increasing space sizes is likely to result in fewer spaces being provided over an area as a whole or loss of landscaping on a scheme in order to provide parking standards compliance. As a compromise position, the width requirement will be increased to 2.5m but the length requirement will remain as 4.8m in the standards. Additional width of 0.3m to each side of space where there is an adjacent wall or fence to remain.</p> <p>Partly agreed, amend all relating references in the SPD Table 7 the width from “2.4 metres” to <u>2.5 metres</u></p>
Annexes A, B and C	<p>Annexe A - Design Approach for Parking</p> <p>This is generally good. We like that the fact that the Design Approach also considers environmental matters such as the effect of parking on the street scene and on other residents.</p> <p>However:</p>	Existing car parking is not considered unless the spaces are either on adopted highway (in which case a Lambeth methodology parking survey will be required) or in a BFDC-owned car park and the applicant has negotiated with the parking service to lease a space long-term and the availability of the space is confirmed through a Lambeth methodology parking survey.

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>We cannot see any mention of use of existing car parks. We feel that it should not be permitted to adopt existing designated car parking spaces for new developments.</p> <p>Examples in Crowthorne</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. At the western end of Crowthorne there was insufficient parking so the developers were allowed to take spaces in the Wellington Business Park. Some erstwhile offices there had been converted to flats and as a result their spaces were lost. <p>As a development in the Crowthorne High Street, new residents were advised to park in Lidl's car park. They were not told that the LIDL carpark is restricted to two hours during business hours, which are from early morning until very late evening. This effectively cancelled this capability.</p> <p>Annexes B to E – No comment. Too technical for us to make remarks.</p>	<p>Existing private car parking outside an application's boundary cannot be allocated for new development. Any proposed alternative use for existing parking within a site will need to confirm that the parking is available and not allocated to retained uses.</p> <p>Developers should not request residents to use car parks outside of their control and the owners of private car parks such as these will need to use their own enforcement powers to fine and remove vehicles which are not parked in accordance with the car park's operating arrangements; this is not in the Council's control.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 5: Borough Councillor		
General	<p>Parking is a major issue in Crowthorne (where I'm a Councillor) and Jennetts Park, where I live, and I'd like to understand the current status versus planned changes. Specifically, are the rules and suggestions in Table 6 (p.16) applicable to these areas?</p> <p>Where should I submit comments? I don't see real improvements for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Private parking – Insufficient spaces for housing size, forcing on-street parking. 2. Garage sizes/storage – Garages too small or doors too narrow; lack of storage due to no basements or underground parking. 3. Trader parking – No secure spaces for vans or delivery vehicles; theft risk. 4. Public transport – Infrequent, costly, not a viable alternative. 5. Reduced parking for subsidized housing – Seems unfair; 	<p>Taking each comment in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of spaces per dwellings is considered appropriate for new development. 2. The garages will only comply with parking standards if they are larger with a wider door space. Otherwise, garages cannot count even if provided at its standard size meaning an extra space is required. 3. The Council cannot easily plan for trader vans in new estates. For example, which new dwellings will have vans and which will not and how do you control the buy and selling of property on that basis? Communal parking courts may be able to take van parking. Good design will help with surveillance. 4. This document does not deal with public transport which is a matter for other strategies including the Local Transport Plan Local Transport Plan Bracknell Forest Council.

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>residents often need two spaces.</p> <p>6. Visitor/disabled parking – None provided; streets congested.</p> <p>7. Parking space size – Current standards don't reflect current average SUV dimensions (see Table 7).</p> <p>8. School drop off/collect spaces – Schools should provide safe drop off areas and parents should adhere to it or fines are issued, looking at Crowthorne it is a major pain point around the new private SEND school and also Edgbarrow School, although the latter has been working well with everyone to alleviate the matter as much as possible.</p> <p>For example, in Jennetts Park, most 4-bed homes have only one garage (often unusable for cars) and one off-street space, with no real on-street provision. Buckler's Park faces similar issues. These new/er estates could be easily adapted to better reflect real-life needs versus older Crowthorne village roads with the same issues.</p> <p>Finally, why aren't improved rules enforced in areas where space exists to alleviate problems?</p>	<p>5. Affordable housing does generate on average lower parking needs which is reflected in the standards allowing flexibility.</p> <p>6. Disagreed as we require visitor and disabled parking as reflected in the standards.</p> <p>7. Agreed, amend all relating references in the SPD Table 7 the width from "2.4 metres" to 2.5 metres;</p> <p>8. The Council works to ensure that new schools provide the necessary drop-off and pick -up provision in their designs as required in the standards for use class F1 in the SPD. Enforcement issues are a matter for a separate function of the highways department. The enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk to promote your street for a need to resolve existing parking issues.</p> <p>Other than for 7 above, no changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 6: Borough Councillor		
<p>Appendix 1 Map, 2 Tables and 3 The Lambeth Methodology</p>	<p>Table 7</p> <p>I am extremely concerned that the width of the car park space is too small for larger family cars, and it makes it so difficult to get out of the car in many parking spaces as the car door is so close to adjoining car door.</p> <p>Could you change the width to wider dimensions to accommodate larger family cars?</p>	<p>Agreed, amend all relating references in the SPD Table 7 the width from "2.4 metres" to 2.5 metres</p>
Representor 7: Local Resident		
<p>General</p>	<p>Following the parking standards consultations for Bracknell I wanted to share with you my ongoing concerns of the lorry's parking outside Tesco's. See below trail. I have been asking why no planning has been made for a lay-by to open the road back up</p>	<p>This matter is not related to the SPD but has been passed to the relevant highways team to respond outside of this process.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>and make it safe. As the demand on this store is growing so are the lorry's. Sometimes three at a time down county lane. But Tesco's do not have anywhere for the lorry's to park apart from on the road outside. It seems no one wants to do anything about this and it's not a problem. But I live next to this road and voicing for the neighbourhood that it is important to address now before everything is built up. If necessary I can share with you photos and videos to support my concerns. With cars driving fast down the hill traffic lines and warning signs hidden due to the lorry's parked it's not if there will be an accident it's when. I appreciate your views and feedback.</p>	<p>This matter is not specifically relating to the Parking Standards SPD as it involves an existing issue. This comment has been passed to the relevant Highways Team to respond separately from this process.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
<p>Representor 8: Local Resident</p>		
<p>Chapter 2 About the Parking Standards?</p>	<p>As part of a strategy to encourage greener transport choices safe secure cycle storage needs to be provided at stations. Car numbers for flat owners also should be controlled by way of residential parking controls and permits.</p>	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to focus solely on parking matters relating to new development. The Council however has a suite of planning and highways documents which seek to promote choice in mode of transport including sustainable modes other than the car.</p> <p>Regarding parking permits, this is not a matter for the Parking Standards SPD but a wider matter for the Council in its role as Local Highways Authority (LHA). The LHA duties include consideration and implementation of resident permit schemes for parking and follows due process when a request is made by members of the public.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
<p>Representor 9: Local Resident</p>		
<p>Annexes A, B and C</p>	<p>More disabled parking on lower car park floors</p>	<p>This comment is not necessarily relevant to the Parking Standards SPD insofar as it relates to existing car parks. However, the SPD does ensure that disabled parking is provided to standard and in an appropriate and convenient location for user needs.</p> <p>The Council monitors its car parks and usage including for disabled people and if there is a consistent need for more in a more convenient location, it will react accordingly and where necessary reconfigure existing provision to accommodate.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		No changes required to the SPD.
Representor 10: Local Resident		
Chapter 1 - Introduction	The key changes listed in the introduction section should be much clearer and more quantitative - what is the expected average number of car parking spaces as a result of this change? It should be described what the expected benefit of these changes are.	<p>Agreed, amend paragraph 1.3 to read as:</p> <p><i>This document supersedes the Parking Standards SPD (2016), and makes the following key changes:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>reflects changes to the Use Classes Order;</i> • <i>provides parking standards for HMOs;</i> • <i>supports flexibility for the amount of parking for residential development and other development within the boundary of the defined Bracknell Town Centre boundary;</i> • <i>supports flexibility for the amount of parking for residential development in a new flexibility zone within 800m walk of Bracknell Railway Station and Bus Station;</i> • <i>for residential development, the standard of on-site parking in Bracknell Town Centre and the flexibility zone is of 0.9 spaces per dwelling which can be lower provided there is a robust evidence base to justify a lower amount and a suite of measure to compensate and achieve an equivalence of the standard.</i> • <i>supports flexibility for the amount of parking for affordable housing schemes irrespective of location, setting out the type of evidence base needed to support this;</i> • <i>contains guidance in relation to electrical vehicle parking/charging provision;</i> • <i>reflects changes in working practices such as home working.</i>
Chapter 2 About the Parking Standards	General points: - The links in the pdf document don't work, which is annoying. - very difficult to know what are the specific changes in these tables, it would be useful to provide highlights and comments with the changes. Specific comments: - 1 electrical car charging point on new & renovated properties - seems suitable as we are likely to see a large increase over the next 10-15 years. - Flexibility zone - any change that potentially promotes	<p>The links should work in the SPD but we apologise if they do not work for everyone. We will seek to address this matter in the final version.</p> <p>Review final version to ensure all links work.</p> <p>Regarding comments made about EV charging points and car clubs, noted with thanks.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	the reduction of cars in the town centre is a good thing and the idea for a shared car club" could be a good idea	
Chapter 3 Context	however it depends entirely on the implementation and I would need to see more details of this. Because train services are slow and very costly access to cars is still an important social mobility factor	The Council has a suite of planning and highways documents which seek to promote choice in mode of transport including sustainable modes other than the car. No changes required to the SPD.
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles?	even in town centres. - cycle storage - 1 per bedroom sounds very high especially when in easy walking distance of the town centre. Bracknell has exceptional cycle and walking paths though so this may be suitable with promotion of cycle paths from the centre towards the forest etc. - residential standards (table 4) - Many areas of Bracknell suffer from severe lack of parking	The standard for cycle storage is considered to be reasonable to help drive more choice in transport mode. It is recognised there are areas in Bracknell which have low amount of parking compared to the number of vehicles on the street. However, this issue is not a matter for the Parking Standards SPD which is concerned with new development only. The Council has in fact put in more than 800 parking spaces within street in the borough in the last 10 years and will continue to do so in the coming years. The enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk to promote your street for a need to resolve existing parking issues. No changes required to the SPD
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations?	even in the newer developments cars are a huge source of social mobility so I would recommend increasing the parking provision on all elements by 0.5 spaces on new developments to assist with the problems of previous developments	This is generally agreed and the Council through its suite of policies and guidance on transport promotes a choice of mode of transport including the car. However, to increase parking across the board by 0.5 spaces on new development will have a detrimental effect on other considerations in the streetscene such as planting, amenity, trees and so on. The Council needs to balance the design of developments to ensure there is not an overly hard landscape. This is why we are promote other measures in addition to parking spaces. No changes required to the SPD
Appendix 1 Map, 2 Tables and 3 The Lambeth Methodology	particularly in areas with poor parking needs. C- standards for SANG - it is not really clear what is meant by SANG, does this mean grass verges in residential areas, small residential parks like Tarman's Copse or larger parks like Swinley Forest. Either	SANG is the acronym for Suitable Alternative Naturae Greenspaces where are large open spaces which are provided to mitigate the impact on residential development upon an environment designation called the Thames Basin Heath Special Protection which is considered under a

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	way, increasing the parking spaces for this seems like a good idea.	planning policy and guidance framework. For clarification, additional text will be added to Paragraph 4.8 which reads as <u>Suitable Alternative Natural Greenspaces (SANGs) are large open space areas which are provided as mitigation for residential development upon an environmental designation called the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area (TBHSPA). Further information about the TBHSPA can be found in the Thames Basin Heaths Special Protection Area Supplementary Planning Document 2025. SANG's draw in a lot of recreational visitors and there is a consequential need for car parks to accommodate them.</u>
Representor 11: Elmbridge Borough Council		
General	The Council does not have any comments to make with regards to the Consultation.	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Representor 12: Natural England		
General	We therefore do not wish to comment.	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Representor 13: Surrey County Council		
General	Please note that we have no comments to raise.	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Representor 14: Local Resident		
General	<p>I live in Wildridings.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is not enough parking, for the amount of properties 2. Being an old estate, garage blocks are too small for cars these days so most owners don't use them for vehicles- these should be looked into and knocked down and parking bays put in their place 3. The council causes alot of the lack of parking on residential roads by allowing so many HMO's which most have 4-5 rooms and if everyone drives that's 2-3 cars more than normal households. There are 3-5 of them just in our block alone. 4. Too many grass verges can be changed to parking 5. I have recently made a complaint about princess square car park needing resurfacing as tyres won't grip, making it very dangerous 6. Parking is also too expensive in town centre 7. All estates should have allocated parking per house for 2 	<p>Responding to each point in turn:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The parking standards for new dwellings are considered to be appropriate. 2. This is a good idea although it is difficult to implement because many garages are privately owned and the Council does not own any of them or the land they sit on. Abri does and it is their responsibility. 3. HMO's under 6 rooms do not require planning permission because the have permitted development rights as granted at a national level so the Council has little to no control to prevent them. It is frustrating for the Council as well as for some residents. 4. The Council operates a programme of creating new parking spaces in estates, in fact it has provided over 800 new spaces in the last 10 years. 5. Princess Square is not owned by the Council. It is privately owned the its up keep is the responsibility of the owners.

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>vehicles, if this was the case then when there are HMO's or people with work vehicles they are not using extra spaces. When complained before about parking, council advises down to abri and not them and Abri won't do anything, they said because not all abri owned houses they can't enforce. And then to top it all some Abri staff live around here and their work vans are left parked in resident bays for weeks on end as well as them having their own vehicles. I am sure this is the same in other roads not just ours.</p>	<p>6. Parking costs is not part of the Parking Standards SPD which is concerned with parking requirements of new development only. The Council deals with parking charges as a separate function.</p> <p>7. Many parking areas and garages/courts are owned privately or by Abri and the Council cannot force them to create more parking if they choose not to.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 15: Local Resident		
Chapter 1 - Introduction	None. All looks good	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Chapter 2 About the Parking Standards	None. All looks good	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Representor 16: Local Resident		
General	<p>I'm setting out some feedback on the parking standards consultation. I had intended to use the online tool, but this was very difficult to navigate. I would also add that the consultation document itself is very difficult to understand and seems excessively technical to expect typical residents to be able to provide meaningful comments, for example it is difficult to visual parking provisions based on spaces per specified area. My general comments are:</p> <p>1. Although the Council claims to promote active travel, the proposed standards are still for parking spaces for cars vastly in excess of cycle parking. There is also no reference to the use of public transport as alternative to car use.</p> <p>2. Provision of on-street parking should include a prohibition of drivers being able to park on, and therefore obstruct, pavements. The Council should be clear that pavements are for pedestrians not car drivers. If roads are viewed as unsuitable for parking without obstructing pavements, then double yellow lines should be</p>	<p>Many apologies for the online tool being difficult to navigate. We will look at this in further consultations. Unfortunately, the document is a technical product as its primary user will be professional and highways professionals. Taking each further point in turn:</p> <p>1. The car is still the most popular mode of transportation and will likely remain as so even in a full transition to electric vehicles. Therefore, the SPD needs to cater for this issue. That said, the Council supports increased bicycle use. This document does not deal with public transport which is a matter for other strategies including the Local Transport Plan Local Transport Plan Bracknell Forest Council.</p> <p>2. This is not a matter for this SPD. It is a function for enforcement which is another part of the Council's function. It is agreed though that cars should be restricted from parking on pavements etc. However, whilst enforcement is undertaken it is not necessarily illegal to do so, so in many cases unenforceable.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>added to prevent parked vehicle blocking pavements or preventing access for larger vehicles. The convenience of drivers should not be put ahead of pedestrians.</p> <p>3. On street parking should also be required to keep any cycle lanes clear, though admittedly there are very few such lanes in Bracknell.</p> <p>4. The Council should support genuine secure cycle storage at retail areas, in particular in Bracknell town centre. This means more than just the standard A stands that are often tucked out of sight, making them vulnerable to thefts. The lack of any secure cycle parking in the town centre is currently a disincentive to cycle. For example, the Council could convert some of the empty retail units into cycle storage areas, ideally manned by staff, which could be rented for a nominal charge or annual membership.</p>	<p>3. Agreed, although as part of the new town legacy, most of the cycle network is off the road in separate cycleways. New provision and links are actively pursued with new development but it is not a function of this SPD.</p> <p>4. The Parking Standards SPD requires secure and covered cycle parking for new developments. The Council supports secure cycle parking and tries to strike a balance between quality provision and proportionality when considering cycle parking in new developments. The Council worked with the owners of The Lexicon to investigate options for transforming an empty shop unit in Bracknell town centre into a secure cycle storage area but ultimately the business case was not viable. Instead, the council has provided 8 secure locker-style cycle parking options in the town centre, for a nominal charge, as a trial. However, further additional text in the SPD can help clarify more. Insert text to Annex C to read as:</p> <p><u>Cycle parking for retail uses (and other commercial uses if not already clear) is well located to building entrances and overlooked to enhance security.</u></p>
Representor 17: National Highways		
General	No comments	Noted with thanks, no changes required to the SPD
Representor 18: Local Resident		
General	<p>There isn't enough disabled parking in town for those that can't walk far. To access the dentist by the banks you can't use the open air parking without risking a fine (dentist may run late), but if you use the car park the disabled spaces aren't near the walkway leading to the steps.</p> <p>The Avenue car park is ok for M&S, but walking to the restaurants is too far. The area across from the cinema would be ideal for disabled drop off, but this isn't allowed.</p>	<p>This comment is not necessarily relevant to the Parking Standards SPD insofar as it relates to existing car parks. However, the SPD does ensure that disabled parking is provided to standard and in an appropriate and convenient location for user needs.</p> <p>The Council monitors its car parks and usage including for disabled people and if there is a consistent need for more in a more convenient location, it will react accordingly and where necessary reconfigure existing provision to accommodate.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	All disabled spaces should be monitored, spaces in Easthampstead, Wildridings, great Hollands and Hanworth are often used by non disabled, leaving us no option than to go home without using the shops.	No changes required to the SPD.
Representor 19: Local Resident		
Chapter 3 Context?	<p>The SPD promotes the concept of “walking neighbourhoods” and reduced parking provision in highly accessible areas. While this aligns with sustainable transport objectives, the document assumes that residents and visitors can comfortably walk meaningful distances between parking and destinations. This assumption does not reflect the reality for many disabled people (Such as my Sister-in-law.) Under the Personal Independence Payment (PIP) mobility assessment, an inability to walk more than 20 metres unaided qualifies a person for enhanced mobility support. For such individuals, policies that reduce parking provision or rely on distant public car parks effectively create barriers to access and defeats PIP principles. The SPD does not set any minimum distance standards for accessible parking in these areas, nor does it guarantee that Blue Badge holders, wheelchair users, mobility scooter users, or those with walking aids will have parking within a reasonable proximity to homes, services, or community facilities. As currently drafted, the walking neighbourhood concept risks indirectly discriminating against disabled residents and visitors by assuming a level of mobility that many do not have. This is particularly concerning given the Council’s duties under the Equality Act 2010 and national planning policy requirements for inclusive design. The SPD should be amended to: Guarantee accessible parking within defined maximum distances (e.g. 20–50 metres) in walking neighbourhoods; Require accessible drop-off and pick-up points in car-lite or car-free schemes; Explicitly recognise the mobility needs of people who cannot walk typical distances assumed by the policy.</p>	<p>The SPD relates to parking and any equivalent alternative measures. It does also make provision for disabled parking in terms of how many are required and their location and design. However, it is agreed that that other accessibility needs are catered for which is normally in other policies and guidance such as ensure safe and level paths/cycleways for mobility scooters.</p> <p>Normally the location of disabled spaces is a matter for detailed design including where wheelchair accessible affordable housing is secured but the point is well made relating to including minimum distances for the location of disabled bays for blue badge holders. Further it is recommended that it is made clear that disabled parking standards are required and cannot be replaced with alternative means.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph 1.9 which reads as:</p> <p><u>1.9 Standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD. Furthermore, the location of all disabled spaces should be located close as possible to the dwelling or facility they serve.</u></p> <p>Add a new Paragraph 5.6 (and renumber all consequential paragraphs) which reads as:</p> <p><u>5.6 In Bracknell Town Centre the standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD.</u></p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		<p>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 5.8 to be numbered as 5.10 (after consequential renumbering as above) to read as:</p> <p><u>5.10 In the ‘Flexibility Zone’ the standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD.</u></p> <p>In all tables where relevant under disabled parking add in the following text:</p> <p><u>The location of all disabled spaces should be located close to the dwelling or facility they serve.</u></p>
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles?	This SPD will govern development through the period when new ICE vehicle sales have ceased. However, the EV charging standards assume a minority uptake. This risks creating developments that are obsolete on the day they are built, requiring costly retrofit to meet inevitable demand. The SPD should be revised to assume EVs are the default vehicle, not the exception, for the lifetime of this policy.	<p>The proportion of EV chargers is governed by Building regulations which this SPD reflects. Unfortunately, the SPD cannot go above the regulatory requirements. If the Building regulations change to require more then we will default to any new requirements.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations?	Comment on Chapter 5 – Flexibility in relation to the Part S EV Charging Cost Cap: The SPD states that it will respect the £3,600 per space connection cost cap set out in Building Regulations Part S when applying EV charging standards. This cost cap was introduced based on 2021 prices and is not index linked. Connection costs for electricity infrastructure are rising significantly and are likely to continue to rise throughout the lifetime of this SPD to at least 2037 i.e. The Local Plan runs to then. As a result, the cost cap will increasingly be triggered in future planning applications, not because developments are unusually constrained, but simply due to inflation and rising grid connection costs. This risks creating a systematic loophole whereby EV charging standards in Table 2 are routinely reduced	<p>Part S of the Building Regulations applies to all developments, including flats where they have associated parking.</p> <p>The only exceptions are when costs exceed £3600 per chargepoint, and this has to be evidenced through documentation e.g. formal quotes, DNO letters). This allows developers to comply but not at any expense to their viability margins.</p> <p>The Council has no power to raise the costs cap provision in Part S of the Building Regulations.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>across most developments, undermining the intent of the SPD and the Council's net zero objectives. Without additional safeguards, the cost cap could become the default justification for reduced EV provision rather than a genuine exception. The SPD should therefore be amended to: Require developers to demonstrate detailed apportionment of connection costs specifically attributable to EV infrastructure; Require evidence that alternative design solutions (load management, phased installation, on-site generation, battery storage) have been explored before accepting reduced provision; Clarify that passive provision (ducting and cabling) should still be required even where active provision is reduced by the cost cap; Consider whether higher passive provision standards should apply where the cost cap is invoked, to future-proof developments. This will ensure the cost cap operates as intended — as a genuine safeguard — rather than becoming an unintended route to routinely under-providing EV infrastructure.</p>	
Chapter 6 Monitoring and Compliance?	<p>Table 7 proposes standard parking bay dimensions that are unchanged from the previous SPD. This does not reflect the reality of modern vehicle sizes, particularly electric vehicles, which are generally wider and often longer than vehicles in use when the 2016 SPD was adopted. The proposed minimum width is insufficient when considering: Typical EV widths now exceeding 1.85m excluding mirrors; Additional clearance required when a vehicle is plugged in, where charge connectors and cables project beyond the vehicle body; The practical need for occupants to open doors safely without encroaching into adjacent bays. The SPD recognises this issue for EV-designated charging bays by making them wider, yet the same logic is not applied to standard residential bays, despite the fact that during the lifetime of this SPD (to at least 2037) most vehicles using these bays will be electric. A more appropriate minimum standard would be at least 2.5m wide and 4.8m long for all residential parking bays to future-proof developments and avoid creating layouts that are obsolete shortly after construction. In addition, as noted in my comments</p>	<p>Agreed, amend all relating references in the SPD Table 7 the width from "2.4 metres" to <u>2.5 metres</u></p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>on Chapter 4, the EV charging provision percentages set out in Table 2 assume EV uptake is a minority case. This SPD will operate during the period when the sale of new petrol and diesel vehicles has ceased. The EV standards should therefore assume EVs are the default vehicle, not the exception, and the percentages of active and passive provision should be increased accordingly.</p>	
<p>Appendix 1 Map, 2 Tables and 3 The Lambeth Methodology</p>	<p>Annex B sets out standards for disabled parking provision but does not address how these standards operate in the context of walking neighbourhoods or reduced parking areas described elsewhere in the SPD. There is also no reference to mobility scooters, storage, or charging provision, despite these being essential mobility aids for many residents, particularly older people and those with long-term disabilities. The SPD provides detailed technical standards for bicycles and electric vehicles, yet provides no equivalent practical guidance for mobility scooters or for ensuring parking proximity for those with limited mobility. Without specific provisions for: Mobility scooter storage and charging in residential and mixed-use developments; Maximum walking distances from accessible parking to destinations; Step-free, scooter-friendly routes from parking to buildings; the SPD risks failing to deliver genuinely inclusive design in practice. Annex B should therefore be expanded to include: Specific reference to mobility scooter provision; Proximity standards for accessible parking spaces; Guidance ensuring that disabled access is not undermined by the walking neighbourhood approach.</p>	<p>This is covered by Part M of the Building Regulations and Inclusive Mobility (DfT, 2021). For clarification Add text to Table 6 section C2 'Disabled Parking': <u>All C2 Uses</u> <u>Provision for mobility scooter parking should be made</u></p> <p>And,</p> <p>Add to bullet point 4 to the list below paragraph 5.15: <u>Provision for mobility scooter parking should be made</u></p> <p>And,</p> <p>In Table 4 column for Specialist Housing for older people (fourth column) row for disabled parking add after "<i>At least 10% and should flexibly be able to accommodate more if necessary</i>" <u>Provision for mobility scooter parking should be made</u></p>
<p>Representor 20: Local Resident</p>		
<p>Chapter 2 About the Parking Standards?</p>	<p>2.14: Perhaps consider more robust wording.... a disabled space can be provided for a disabled person "near" their home... That is great. You then can remove the space if alerted to it no longer being used... I would suggest that the council should be proactive and perhaps send a letter every other year to ask if its still needed, as other residents get frustrated with not knowing how to report this. I also think clarity is needed on when the bay is disengaged for disabled use... I had someone locally who</p>	<p>The SPD relates to parking and any equivalent alternative measures. It does also make provision for disabled parking in terms of how many are required and their location and design. However, it is agreed that that other accessibility needs are catered for which is normally in other polices and guidance such as ensure safe and level paths/cycleways for mobility scooters.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>reported the bay as unneeded as the person it was intended for died. The council went out to assess it and change its use to normal parking... but he was stopped as another resident said they had a disabled friend visit and use the spot. So this spot remains for disabled use... but that conflicts with the current or updated policy as in a normal situation, the resident cant ask for a bay to be put in at a friends house... only near their own home... so is it right that the bay intended for a resident who died, can continue as it is when it is now used for the unintended person? I am sympathetic to disabilities.. but I had this issue in a residential street with a resident so clarity and thought here would be idea. I'm not sure policies should allow for "dumb luck" as that's when things seem unfair.</p>	<p>Normally the location of disabled spaces is a matter for detailed design including where wheelchair accessible affordable housing is secured but the point is well made relating to including minimum distances for the location of disabled bays for blue badge holders. Further it is recommended that it is made clear that disabled parking standards are required and cannot be replaced with alternative means.</p> <p>Add a new paragraph 1.9 which reads as:</p> <p><u>1.9 Standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD. Furthermore, the location of all disabled spaces should be located close as possible to the dwelling or facility they serve.</u></p> <p>Add a new Paragraph 5.6 (and renumber all consequential paragraphs) which reads as:</p> <p><u>5.6 In Bracknell Town Centre the standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD.</u></p> <p>Add a new paragraph after paragraph 5.8 to be numbered as 5.10 (after consequential renumbering as above) to read as:</p> <p><u>5.10 In the 'Flexibility Zone' the standards for disabled parking in terms of the amounts and their design and layout specifications are not part of the flexible arrangements and must be provided on-site in accordance with the respective requirements in the SPD.</u></p> <p>In all tables where relevant under disabled parking add in the following text:</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		<p><u>The location of all disabled spaces should be located close to the dwelling or facility they serve.</u></p> <p>Regarding existing parking matters, any requests for additional parking bays can be made to the Local Highways Authority on highways@bracknell-forest.gov.uk</p>
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles?	<p>4.3 Table 5. This is confusing but as this part says residential I am treating the comment as such, regardless of there being a further table below... I Think that less than 1 space per flat is ridiculous. That doesn't allow for even 1 person per flat to park and whilst i commend the environmental dreams... no one has 0.9 of a car.. you only have a whole one... so that is no use to anyone in any argument either and I am painfully aware that parking wars are exactly that... this also doesn't allow for visitors, and they do need those too. Specifically on high visitor times like weekends... People cant afford to live anywhere but flats, but they need to live too and car ownership is part of that until we have a better bus network that is faster, and ideally a park and ride... which I think is needed for the educational establishments with those few spaces... 4.4 table 6. I don't think allows sufficient parking either. 2 people can live in a 1 bed. Both having cars is not unreasonable. Both have separate jobs... then additional bedrooms. Children live at home for longer and many will be in flats for life... so teen and young adults will remain at home. They need to drive. Even with our environmental aspirations. Same for visitor spots. Not enough. Mentally we need visitors and its free to have a coffee at home and its £10 to go out for one. I am particularly triggered by the allocation for retirement visitor parking. Those people are isolated without visitors and visitors include careers... those will tend to arrive at the same time of day and all in their cars. I am aware that I struggle to visit an elderly lady in Binfield due to lack of residential parking so this must be considered.</p>	<p>The 0.9 standard for Bracknell Town Centre is the same as in the 2016 SPD, effectively 90% of dwellings have 1 space and 10% have no space. Bracknell Town Centre is well served by bus and train services and Bracknell has a comprehensive network of cycleways; having some dwellings without parking is common in a town centre situation and recently completed developments, for example on Market Street, indicate that there is sufficient parking based on these standards.</p> <p>The standard of 1 space for 1-bedroom dwellings located outside of Bracknell Town Centre is also unchanged and the retirement housing standards are unchanged. Increasing the standards would require more space and would result in less space for other things on a development, such as landscaping, public open space footways and cycleways.</p> <p>No change required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 21: Local Resident		

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
Chapter 3 Context?	3.5 1. For residential schemes: on sites larger than 10 dwellings, require 20% (1 in 5) of all spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points. With the phase out of ICE vehicles, 100% of homes with cars will soon need EV charging.	<p>The proportion of EV chargers is governed by Building regulations which this SPD reflects. Unfortunately, the SPD cannot go above the regulatory requirements. If the Building regulations change to require more then we will default to any new requirements.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 22: Local Resident		
Chapter 1 - Introduction	I welcome the draft Parking Standards SPD and note that it rightly recognises parking pressures in older residential areas (paras. 4.19, 4.20), where historic layouts no longer meet current parking needs. However, the document focuses largely on mitigating the impact of new development and does not go far enough in addressing existing residential streets that already experience chronic parking shortages. In my own street (Pankhurst Drive), there is green space that could potentially be reconfigured for parking, and opportunities for residents to convert front gardens into driveways, which would help reduce on-street and verge parking. I would encourage the Council to provide clearer guidance and greater flexibility to support practical solutions for existing neighbourhoods, rather than relying primarily on waiting restrictions and enforcement.	<p>The SPD is a formal planning document which is concerned with the parking impacts of new development rather than existing problems in the older areas.</p> <p>The Council does look to deal with existing parking matters in a number of ways such as parking restrictions and putting in new communal parking bays across our existing estate areas. The Council has put in over 800 new parking bays across the Borough in the last 10 years but it recognizes there is more to do. Issues of local context and available budgets may affect as faster delivery as the Council or residents would like but there is an ongoing effort to resolve parking matters where possible.</p> <p>The enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk to promote your street for a need to resolve existing parking issues.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 23: Local Resident		
Chapter 1 - Introduction?	Addition to 1.3 supports solutions in towns where on road parking limits available width for access by emergency service vehicles contains systems to increase safety for all road users and pedestrians where double yellow lines are being ignored by those unwilling to use car parking areas in smaller towns like Crowthorne.	<p>Matters relating to emergency (and refuse) vehicles are a primary consideration when assessing new road layouts and where not properly catered for will result in an objection on highways safety ground.</p> <p>The enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk if there is a particular problem with access for emergency vehicles so investigation into the matter can be urgently undertaken.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		No changes required to the SPD.
Chapter 2 About the Parking Standards?	2.8 table 7 Depth from dwelling for the to highway boundary to cater for parking space 5.0-5.2meters. This is unnecessarily deep when a standard car parking space is 4.8meters. Many cars are much smaller and do not need a space this long. The consultation information states this has been reduced to between 5 and 5.2 meters, this is an improvement on the previous required depth of 5.5m, but needs to be reduced further for town centre locations like Crowthorne where residential roads used for parking are seeing persistent issues with double parking, blocked footways and blocked/reduced access for emergency service vehicles. In Coventry, this depth measurement is 4m which allows more residents the opportunity to have a dropped kerb to park off the road. They also allow parallel parking in front of a property. There are a number of roads in Crowthorne where this smaller depth may help ease problems, Cambridge Road and Forest Road, in particular. If necessary, double yellow lines on one side of the road would prevent double parking and ensure emergency access was maintained.	<p>On average, cars are getting larger and the minimum length needs to account for all vehicle types, it is not possible to contain what vehicles current or future residents choose to buy. Vehicles partly oversailing footways cause issues for pedestrians, including children and those which pushchairs or wheelchairs. Reducing the required length would result in more partial oversailing of footways.</p> <p>The reduction from 5.5m to between 5.0m and 5.2m, depending on the circumstances, has actually been in place since an Executive Member report in 2018. This update to the Parking Standards SPD consolidates this 2018 Executive Member report into the main SPD text.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Chapter 3 Context	BFC can set its own standards for dropped kerbs to allow residents additional parking off road. In some cases, increasing dropped kerb length allows easier access to off road driveway spaces where cars parked around and / or opposite the driveway make access more difficult.	<p>This is not a matter for the Parking Standards SPD. The point is valid and generally agreed with, however, planning permission is not required to put in a dropped kerb and the new SPD is intended to just deal with parking matters for new development which requires planning permission. Instead, there are standards and requirements for making an application for a dropped kerb to the relevant Council Highways Team and details can be found by following this link: About dropped kerbs Bracknell Forest Council and emailing highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk</p> <p>No changes to the SPD required.</p>
Chapter 4 Underpinning Principles	4.19 A lack of adequate parking has resulted in local tensions and unsatisfactory parking on verges and open spaces, also reduced access for emergency services vehicles, blocked footways limiting access by disabled users and parents with buggies and prams.	The standards in the draft SPD are based on evidence and local expertise. Many of the issues with parking is a result of a different demographic and less car ownership at the time the developments were built. The Council is working to improve localized parking situation and for example, over 800

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
		<p>new parking spaces have been created in the existing estate areas over the last 10 years. That is not necessarily a matter for this SPD but other council strategies. The SPD is concerned with new parking provision including, where appropriate, other measures to achieve the equivalence of the parking provision. Furthermore, there are many other considerations such as planting, walking and cycling which need to be factored into the street scene rather than over prescribing parking and thereby creating an overly hard landscape. Matters relating to emergency (and refuse) vehicles are a primary consideration when assessing new road layouts and where not properly catered for will result in an objection on highways safety ground.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Chapter 5 Flexibility and other considerations	This section does not cover other village/Town locations within the Borough. Whilst policies need to be included for Bracknell town centre itself, these need to be extended to places like Crowthorne as appropriate.	<p>This section is for the area with the most pressure for high density development as part of the Council's existing Local Plan with Bracknell Town Centre, so it is not relevant to all other areas of the Borough. It is considered, for example, that the existing parking standards for residential development are still sufficient for the wider area including Crowthorne. Furthermore, there is no empirical evidence to justify a more flexible approach to parking in Crowthorne.</p> <p>No changes to the SPD required.</p>
Appendix 1 Map, 2 Tables and 3 The Lambeth Methodology	Table 6 sets out parking needs for retail, food outlets etc. It doesn't address issues or plans to tackle those who refuse to use parking areas provided and instead park on double yellow lines too close to busy junctions. Cambridge Road, Crowthorne, is seeing a marked increase in illegal parking by people visiting Anne Marie's bakery despite a large car park being situated in very close proximity. The effect is reduced safety for car drivers having to drive round them too close to the junction with the High Street, risking a head on collision. They also risk hitting a pedestrian attempting to cross, both have reduced visibility especially when the parked vehicle(s) is a van. Some drivers including HGV's delivering to Co-op are sometimes having to wait on the High	<p>This is a parking enforcement issue and not related to the Parking Standards SPD, which is which is concerned with parking associated with new development rather than existing parking issues.</p> <p>For enquiries about parking enforcement matters the enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	Street to get into Cambridge Road causing unnecessary delays. The double yellow lines are worn and need repainting. Bollards or cameras with ANPR to issue fines would help restore safety here.	
Annexes A, B and C	Table 7 design standards for parking spaces. Depth from dwelling for the to highway boundary to cater for parking space 5.0 - 5.2meters. This is unnecessarily deep when a standard car parking space is 4.8meters. Many cars are much smaller and do not need a space this long. The consultation information states this has been reduced to between 5 and 5.2 meters, this is an improvement on the previous 5.5m measurement, but needs to be reduced further for town centre locations like Crowthorne where residential roads used for parking are seeing persistent issues with double parking, blocked footways and blocked/reduced access for emergency service vehicles. These old roads are narrow often with frontages that are closer to the highway. In Coventry, this depth measurement is 4m with allows more residents the opportunity to have a dropped kerb to park off the road. They also allow parallel parking in front of a property. There are a number of roads in Crowthorne where this smaller depth may help ease problems, Cambridge Road and Forest Road in particular. If necessary, double yellow lines on one side of the road would prevent double parking to ensure emergency access was maintained.	<p>On average, cars are getting larger and the minimum length needs to account for all vehicle types, it is not possible to contain what vehicles current or future residents choose to buy. Vehicles partly oversailing footways cause issues for pedestrians, including children and those which pushchairs or wheelchairs. Reducing the required length would result in more partial oversailing of footways.</p> <p>The reduction from 5.5m to between 5.0m and 5.2m, depending on the circumstances, has actually been in place since an Executive Member report in 2018. This update to the Parking Standards SPD consolidates this 2018 Executive Member report into the main SPD text.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>
Representor 24: Local Resident		
Chapter 4 - Underpinning Principles	E. On-Street Waiting Restrictions (p.12) 4.19 This really is a problem on older neighbourhoods and Estates in the areas of Bracknell Borough's remit. Those houses with on plot-parking do indeed give a poor street scene as they age and it seems the Borough will be considering improvements for future sites. However, such parking and lack of street space in the here and now has given rise to many home owners having their own parking spaces being 'taken over' by unruly/thoughtless Tenants leaving owners and other occupiers living in fear and intimidation by Tenants who will not respect the fact that each property has its own parking bay and is part of a property's plot; the bullies not	<p>This is not a matter for the SPD but it is recognized there are localized parking issue within the older areas and estates. The Council has tried to help with the issue by putting in over 800 new spaces in various streets over the last 10 years and there is still more to do.</p> <p>Matters such as signage and education will often be site-specific, with some locations involving land outside the Council's ownership, i.e. housing associations. The Council will continue to engage with residents and their elected representatives directly regarding specific problem areas.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	<p>only want their parking bay but another's. How is the Borough going to 'educate' the public with suitable signage in the future? There is inadequate formal signage in most areas. Making parking regulations clear on all sites (residential/commercial) would be helpful</p>	
<p>ANNEX A - Design Approach for Parking</p>	<p>(a) RESIDENTIAL PARKING P.41 A.1.2 Residents with Garage parking should be required to put vehicles in garage not park outside garage door - if vehicles are not put away it causes mayhem for others wishing to enter/exit their garages. Entrance/exit to/from these areas are often blocked by drivers of vehicles ignoring either the drop down kerb or even the fact that the entrance is to a garage area; vehicles are left causing severe obstruction to home occupiers wishing to use garages. A note: Garage areas are often used as public toilets causing distress to owners who have to 'clear up' offending material. Parking areas need good lighting and cameras (this is the world we live in today). 3) On-Street Parking (p.46) A.1.10 Parking on pavements or with two wheels on pavement and two on road is now becoming a major problem for pedestrians of all ages and abilities and are being forced on to roads already congested with traffic. School times are an absolute nightmare fraught with danger. Whilst I agree with on-street waiting restrictions are these be implemented across the Borough or are the older parts of the Borough to be ignored whilst the newer are enhanced? If the Borough intends to ignore the older areas of Bracknell then this is the fastest way of creating vast neglected areas which will decline even more rapidly into 'no go' areas. Thank you to those who have taken time to put together the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document Consultation Draft January 2026 using The Lambeth Methodology and with respect hope it has been recognised Bracknell is not</p>	<p>Most of the garage blocks in the borough are not adopted highway and are predominantly owned and managed by Abri (The Registered Provider for managing most of the social housing in the Borough) Private garages and their forecourts are not the responsibility of the Council unless they are adopted highway (which is rare).</p> <p>The enquirer should contact the owner/manager of the garage block with regard to parking enforcement/lighting/CCTV.</p> <p>The Parking Standards SPD applied to new development, for enquiries about existing areas the enquirer should contact the Highway Authority via highways.transport@bracknell-forest.gov.uk</p> <p>The Lambeth Methodology is a methodology for undertaking parking surveys, it is used across the country. Whilst it was developed initially in Lambeth, it has now been adopted by many Highway Authorities; Bracknell Forest has its own version with minor amendments to reflect Bracknell Forest.</p> <p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Relevant section in draft SPA SPD	Summary of comment	Council Response / Proposed Action
	London and I for one would not wish it to be. Bracknell has its own identity.	