

Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document: Regulation 12 (a) Statement of Consultation

This statement has been prepared in accordance with Regulation 12(a) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 for the adoption of Bracknell Forest Council's Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). This statement is required to set out:

1. Who was consulted in the preparation of the SPD;
2. A summary of the main issues raised during the consultation; and
3. How the issues raised have been addressed in the SPD.

1. Purpose of the Parking Standards SPD

The Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out a strategy for dealing with existing parking issues and sets parking standards for new development. The SPD provides guidance as a material consideration to planning applications in the Borough. The Parking Standards SPD sets out:

- A strategy for dealing with existing parking issues;
- Parking standards tables for new development;
- Technical design annexes for parking spaces, disabled parking, motorcycle and cycle parking and electric vehicle charging.

2. Consultation

In the preparation of the Parking Standards SPD, officers throughout the Council, including those with a responsibility for planning, transport and business development, were consulted in the preparation of the Draft and final SPD.

Following this, the draft Parking Standards SPD and its evidence was published for consultation for a 6 week period from Monday 19th October at 9 am until 5pm on Monday 30th November 2015.

Bracknell Forest Council has comprehensively consulted with a range of key and statutory organisations to help assess the scope of the Parking Standards SPD. The consultation included:

- Planning and highway consultants.
- Developers.
- Statutory bodies and organisations.
- Local interested groups and members of the general public.

Details of who has been consulted on the SPD and how they were consulted can be viewed in the Consultation Pro-forma at Appendix 2.

Details of the responses made to the consultation and how they have been taken account of in the adopted SPD are detailed in Appendix 1 of this statement.

3. Consultation Responses

A total of 30 representations on the draft SPD were made. The 30 representations comprised 19 from local residents, 4 from town and parish councils, 2 from national governing bodies, 2 from local resident groups, 1 from a developer, 1 from a Housing association and 1 from another professional organisation. The main issues raised were:

- Concerns raised on existing localised parking problems.
- General support for the SPD for its intention to provide sufficient parking, resolve existing parking problems.
- Concerns over pavement parking in the Borough.
- That parking on grass verges should not be allowed.
- The majority of respondents agreed with the preferred option for larger garages with separate storage.
- That existing garage sizes should count towards part of the overall parking provision.
- The majority of respondents agreed that there could be more flexibility if justified to allow lower parking provision for affordable housing.
- The majority of respondents agreed that the preferred option to consider school drop-off and pick-up provision on a case by case basis should be taken forward but with some suggested text improvements.
- The majority of respondents agreed that the preferred option to including passive provision for electric vehicle charging should be taken forward. However there were concerns over implementation and that London has now adopted a lower
- Concern that the thrust of the SPD is more flexible in its parking approach in line with the Government's intentions.

In terms of the responses to Chapter 3 the statistics are as follows:

Chapter 3 - Domestic Garage - Do you agree with the preferred option for the domestic garage?

	Number	Percentage	Officer comment
Yes	11	68.75%	This indicates that just over two thirds of those that responded to this question agreed with the Council's proposed approach to standards for domestic garages.
No	5	31.25%	

Chapter 3 - Affordable Housing - Do you agree with the preferred option for the revised parking standards for affordable housing?

	Number	Percentage	Officer comment
Yes	12	85.7%	This indicates support for more flexibility in consider standards but subject to evidence.
No	2	14.3%	

Chapter 3 - School drop-off/pick-up - Do you agree with the preferred option for school drop-off and pick-up standards?

	Number	Percentage	Officer comment
Yes	10	71.4%	This indicates support for considering school drop-off and pick-up parking provision on a case by case basis subject to evidence.
No	4	28.6%	

Chapter 3 - Future Technology & Climate Change - Do you agree with the preferred option for adapting the parking provision for future technology and climate change?

	Number	Percentage	Officer comment
Yes	11	78.6%	This indicates support for the provision of an element of parking to provide passive electric vehicle charging.
No	3	21.4%	

The following table provides a detailed summary of responses and officer recommendations which explain how the issues raised have been addressed in the final SPD.

Appendix 1 Consultation responses

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
Chapter 1 Introduction; Context - Do you have any comments or proposed changes to make to Chapter 1?			
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
	Summary: Encourage alternative modes and make routes safer	Noted with thanks – Not directly related to parking.	No changes required to the SPD
09	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
	Summary: In broad agreement with Chapter 1	Noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
10	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway (Dr John Ward Smith (Chairman) on behalf of The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents' Association (TRAWCRA))		
	Summary: In broad agreement with Chapter 1	Noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	Summary: Welcome consideration of existing parking problems and new development	Noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	<p>Summary: There are parking problems in central Bracknell where:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Garages are not used for cars but for storage, renting out or spare rooms. 2. Private car spaces are used by the owners rather than tenants. 3. There is little kerb-side parking space for residents in areas such as cul-de-sacs. 4. Residents are using garage blocks to park cars blocking garage doors. 5. Parents from schools park in private residential areas. 6. There is no indication that all parking in residential areas is private for residents and visitors only. 7. Children play in garage blocks areas which is a disaster waiting to 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted with thanks. It is acknowledged that there are parking issues in some parts of the Borough and the Council has operated and will continue to run a variety of schemes which provide more parking or resolve local parking issues as set out in Chapter 2 of the SPD. However, it is recognised that more is required to be done which the implementation of the Parking Standards SPD will strive to achieve. 2. Planning and the Police cannot get involved in legal issues of ownership and related parking disputes. These are normally civil matters over which we have no jurisdiction over. 3. Noted with thanks, as stated in 1. Above the Council strives to identify and prioritise local schemes to help resolve local parking issues. 4. Planning and the Police cannot get involved in legal issues of ownership and related parking disputes. These are normally civil matters over which we have no jurisdiction over. However, many garage blocks are owned by Bracknell Forest Homes who may be able to help. 5. There are incidents where school drop off and pick up are causing 	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
	<p>happen.</p> <p>8. Driver park on blind corners on both sides of road entrances.</p> <p>9. Garages are too short and narrow.</p>	<p>inconvenience to local residents. The Council via this SPD is seeking for new school development to provide sufficient drop off and pick provision and where there are existing parking issues, the Council works with the schools in an attempt to resolve them.</p> <p>6. If the parking is provided within the public highway without imposed restrictions anyone is free to park there for example in park bays or on the street. The Council is piloting a scheme for residential parking permits and if successful it can be rolled out to other areas where appropriate.</p> <p>7. Noted with thanks. As stated in 4. Above the garage blocks are generally out of the Council's ownership. Furthermore the comment does not focus on the location of the garage block and therefore it is difficult to provide a fuller response and deal with the matter if at all possible.</p> <p>8. This should not occur and it may obstruct the public highway. Please provide further details of where this is occurring so the Council can consider appropriate action to deal with the issue.</p> <p>9. This is agreed and the Council is seeking bigger, useable garages from new residential development as part of the SPD.</p>	
29	Warfield Parish Council		
	Summary: Adequate parking is preferred even if more land is required.	The policy approach is to ensure that adequate parking is provided while balancing this with the need to make efficient use of available land and encourage travel by non-car modes.	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
Chapter 2 Strategy for Existing Parking Issues - Do you have any comments or proposed changes to make to Chapter 2?			
01	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
	Summary: Request for The Ridgeway to be included in the Residents Parking Scheme.	<p>In summary, this is a matter relates to the implementation of the Council's parking Strategy rather than its development in the Parking Standards SPD. Therefore the Local Highways Authority (LHA) Transport Engineering Team will consider the matter and contact the residents in The Ridgeway separately over this matter.</p> <p>In more detail, the Council is currently trialling the first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the</p>	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
		<p>addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trial has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered.</p> <p>In 2014 the council implemented additional waiting restrictions in the Hazel Hill area in consultation with the local residents association. Indeed, the residents association believed at this time that the exiting restriction were sufficient to deter any town centre related long term parking.</p> <p>However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p>	
02	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield Ward, Crockford Place	Support is noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
	Summary: Paragraph 2.13 - Support for the strategy. There is a need to define what qualifies for the Residents Parking Scheme.	<p>The residents parking trial is not yet complete and so the Council cannot comment on the final scheme that could be considered for rolling out. However, the residents parking scheme as being trialled, is aimed to protect local communities from parking pressures relating to the Bracknell town centre redevelopment. Any future resident parking areas would be expected to be experiencing parking pressures relating to external facilities causing competition for kerb side road space, such as commercial premises that are preventing the residents from being able to realistically park within their own community where they need to do so. However, if the community in question has its own off street parking, and there is no competition for road side parking, residents parking would not be considered a suitable solution to prevent on street parking by others that is considered safe.</p>	

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
03	Local Resident, Priestwood and Garth,	Ashridge Green	
Summary	<p>1. Prevent use of outbuildings as living/sleeping accommodation creating an additional household.</p> <p>2. Renting parking spaces is a problem which may mean little can be done with private residents but Bracknell Forest Homes could do something about it in their properties.</p> <p>3. Parking on pavements should be banned.</p> <p>4. Existing garage blocks in Bracknell Forest Homes ownership would be replaced with open parking areas. They should not be redeveloped for residential purposes.</p>	<p>1. Planning policy for homes in multiple occupancy and use of outbuildings for residential purposes etc is outside the scope of the Parking Standards SPD. In some situations the development is permitted development or is approved under a certificate of lawfulness. In both situations, the Council has no control over where it happens. In a situation that the building needs planning permission to use as accommodation, then the Parking Standards SPD will apply. In this circumstance, aside from other planning considerations, the application would need to demonstrate it meets the parking provision required to be acceptable.</p> <p>2. The Council cannot use its planning powers to enforce a ban on existing situations where parking spaces are rented out. In situations with development seeking planning permission, to seek to enforce any planning conditions to restrict this practice would far outweigh any harm caused. In some respects the hiring of available parking spaces in this manner may help make the most efficient use of available off-street parking spaces, for example, during working hours when the owner is away and the space is free.</p> <p>3. In London there is effectively a blanket ban on pavement parking. Pavement parking is not permitted unless there are signs specifically making it legal. Outside of London it is the opposite situation. English Local Authorities outside of London are able to introduce local pavement / verge parking bans through a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on a particular length of road or over a wider area. However, to date Bracknell has not introduced any pavement parking restrictions</p> <p>The Council recognise that pavement parking can cause serious problems for pedestrians, especially for vulnerable road users such as the visually impaired or those with mobility scooters, wheelchairs or push chairs. Indiscriminate pavement parking may also damage the footway, with the burden of repair costs normally falling on local authority budgets. However there needs to be a balance between preventing pavement parking where it causes an obstruction and maintaining residential parking in areas where this is at a premium. Whilst pavement parking can be a widespread problem, in some streets pavement parking may in practice be inevitable to maintain free passage of traffic whilst meeting the needs of local residents</p>	No changes required to the SPD

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
		<p>and businesses, due to widths of roads. It is for this reason that when the Department for Transport in 2014 introduced new powers for Local Authorities to tackle pavement parking issues, they intentionally fell short of proposing a blanket ban on pavement parking such as in London.</p> <p>The police have powers to enforce obstructive parking if they witness the offence. Therefore residents can report instances of pavement parking to the police who can, should they believe it required, either ticket the vehicle or in extreme circumstances remove the vehicle.</p> <p>BFC is active in providing additional off-street parking in residential estates, often working with Bracknell Forest Homes. The Council will respond pro-actively on any proposals to reconfigure or redevelop garage courts taking account of parking requirements in the area. However, the garages and associated forecourts are generally not council owned and so any proposals or ideas relating to them must be agreed with by the owner. This will inevitably make any potential scheme difficult as many of the garages have been sold to private individuals.</p> <p>4. BFC is active in providing additional off-street parking in residential estates, often working with Bracknell Forest Homes. The Council will respond pro-actively on any proposals to reconfigure or redevelop garage courts taking account of parking requirements in the area. Each application would be considered on its own merits taking into account to local parking situation which may not be a problem. In this circumstance new residential development may be acceptable provided existing parking problems are not exacerbated or new problems result.</p>	
04	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central , Swaledale		
Summary	<p>1. The strategy does not take into consideration Houses of Multiple Occupation which needs to be a consideration.</p> <p>2. Garages are not always let with rental properties but used as storage.</p>	<p>1. Planning policy for homes in multiple occupancy (HMO's) is normally outside the scope of the Parking Standards SPD. For information, conversion of dwellings to HMO's of up to 6 bedrooms are permitted development and not subject of planning permission. Above this number, planning permission is required and the Parking Standards will be a consideration in determining the application. Otherwise, should an area be dominated by HMO's and cause parking issues then the measures in Chapter 2 are available to help resolve the situation. However, it should be noted that many of the</p>	No changes required to the SPD

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
		<p>main source of the problem with HMO's is outside of the Council's control.</p> <p>2. Noted with thanks.</p>	
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
Summary	<p>1. Paragraphs 2.6 and 2.9, residential parking scheme should be funded by residents and enforced by lockable bollards.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 2.10, parking on grass verges should not be allowed.</p> <p>3. Paragraph 2.16, on- street parking restriction around schools should be enforced including the area around Benetfield Road has got worse since Council Officers visited the area.</p> <p>4. Dropped kerbs can add to parking but should not encroach on service strips.</p>	<p>1. The Council is not in a position to construct parking spaces on the highway and allocate them individual properties. The public highway is for use by all vehicles.</p> <p>2. Parking on grass verges is not permitted where there are parking restrictions on the carriageway that restrict parking, such as single or yellow double lines. The difficulty is that for this is only true for highway verges. Furthermore, kerb side parking, adjacent to the verge may not be unsafe and so introducing restrictions to prevent verge parking will have the unwanted effect of also preventing the required on street parking. Where verge parking is an issue it is fair to assume parking pressures are at a premium and the removal of both verge and on street parking would be unrealistic. Therefore preventing verge parking by the use of waiting restrictions is not a real option.</p> <p>Therefore, the Council has a programme of introducing additional residential parking spaces into verges to remove the issue of damaging verges whilst improving parking provision. Obviously this is not possible in every location and in these cases where the verges are being damaged, the Council do maintain these verges.</p> <p>Text should be added to the SPD to clarify the Council's position.</p> <p>3. The matter has been passed to the Environment Operational Support Team for consideration outside o Parking Standards SPD process.</p> <p>4. Agreed, the Council, where appropriate will allow dropped kerbs to allow a car to traverse a service strip (i.e. land in the public highway) to facilitate parking in the private property boundary. However we will not allow for parking on the service strip are which impedes the public highways (e.g. footpath).</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 2.10 to read as:</p> <p><u>The provision of new parking spaces should take account of any impacts on the wider environment such as highways safety or local character. New parking bays should be suitably surfaced. In certain cases it may be appropriate to surface new parking areas with a modular concrete system that can take the weight of domestic vehicles while allowing grass to grow through. It may in some cases be appropriate to provide new shrub or tree planting to soften the impact of new parking. The off-street parking strategy is:</u> <i>The views of local residents are invited on existing problems associated with parking on grass verges and the creation of off-street parking, with a view to relaxing the rules preventing the creation of car parking spaces instead? Subject to the response on this issue, the preferred strategy is to continue with how it currently manages the situation which is:</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
09	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
Summary	<p>1. on-street parking is not a major problem for most residents in this area.</p> <p>2. The waiting restriction on The Ridgeway, Woodridge Close and Hazel Hill has worked well.</p> <p>3. The restriction on Woodridge Close has been extended which has solved the problem.</p> <p>4. During term time at Ranelagh School, parents dropping off children sometimes cause minor inconvenience to some residents.</p> <p>5. There is a far greater problem for 45 minutes at school pick up time where residents can get past but larger vehicles find it more difficult to get through. The problem could get worse in the area through daytime shoppers, evening social activities and new flats built in the area.</p> <p>Therefore the restriction should be extended to 7 days per week and include an overnight ban on parking or introduce a new parking permit regime but there are concerns over costs.</p>	<p>1. There are many areas that have no parking issues. However, there are also many areas with acute parking problems which the council works to resolve through measures such as imposing restrictions and creating new parking spaces.</p> <p>2. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>3. Noted with thanks, text relating to commercial vehicle parking is provided in paragraphs 2.21-2.23 of the SPD.</p> <p>4. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>5. In 2014 the Council implemented additional waiting restrictions in the Hazel Hill area in consultation with the local residents association. Indeed, the residents association believed at this time that the exiting restriction were sufficient to deter any town centre related long term parking.</p> <p>However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the Parkin Standards SPD, the specific issue of parking in this issue has been passed to the Transport Engineering Team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p> <p>The flats above the station have parking within the multi-storey car park next to the railway for residents and visitors and other schemes which require planning permission will be required to meet the Parking Standards SPD provisions.</p> <p>The Council is currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trail has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating Standards SPD provisions.</p>	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
		<p>The Council are currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trial has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered.</p> <p>Noted with thanks, text relating to commercial vehicle parking is provided in paragraphs 2.21-2.23 of the SPD.</p>	
10	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway (The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents' Association (TRAWCRA))		
	<p>Summary: Parking is currently not a problem for the TRAWCRA area as waiting restrictions on The Ridgeway and Hazell Hill prevent commuters from parking there. However this restriction is poorly enforced by parking attendants.</p>	<p>The issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the LHA Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p>	No changes required to the SPD
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	Summary – Agree with Chapter 2.	Support noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
22	Crowthorne Parish Council (
	Summary – Agree with strategy to protect existing residents from increased parking pressures.	Support noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
21	Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
	Summary – Agree with preferred options stated.	Support noted with thanks	No changes required to the SPD
28	Local Resident, No location given (Ms Patricia Holland)		
	<p>Summary:</p> <p>1. The affordable housing provision does not take account of change in tenants status.</p> <p>2. Some private residents have 3</p>	<p>1. Evidence from the recent survey of residents of newly completed housing developments indicates that occupants of affordable housing have generally lower levels of vehicle ownership than those in market housing. Planning can only seek from developers sufficient parking and other infrastructure to meet the needs, and</p>	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
	<p>vehicles showing growth in car ownership which measures such as disabled provision and on-street parking restrictions.</p> <p>3. There should be more CCTV cameras as cars are being damaged by short stay drivers in narrow streets</p>	<p>mitigate the impact of, the proposed development.</p> <p>2. The Council is currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trial has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered.</p> <p>The Council provide disabled parking on a need by need basis within residential areas based on application criteria; however, as parking is always at a premium we do not provide it as a matter of course.</p> <p>The Council has a responsibility to identify areas where parking is causing a safety issue. Where such areas are identified the council will consider using waiting restrictions, such as single yellow lines to prevent long term on mass parking obstructing through traffic.</p> <p>3. The question of cctv cameras and speed reducing traffic calming features in estate roads falls outside the remit of the wider consultation therefore they will be passed to the Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p>	
29	Warfield Parish Council		
	<p>Summary: Amend paragraph 2.10 to include 'access to and exit from properties'.</p>	<p>This proposed change is agreed for clarification.</p>	<p>Amend the text in paragraph 2.10 to read as: <i>"The Council will continue to support residential off-street parking schemes on a priority basis provided they do not have unacceptable adverse impacts upon character, amenity, sustainable drainage, trees, open space or highways safety including access to and from properties."</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
Chapter 3 Domestic Garages - If No - please give reasons plus any supporting evidence below including what changes you would like to see?			
02	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield Ward, Crockford Place		
	Summary: Paragraph 3.2 (3) what provision is there to ensure current unusable small garages into living areas	This response is not related to the new used garage standards in paragraph 3.2. However to answer comments made, applications for such proposals, as with all planning applications, will be considered on their merits and in accordance with relevant planning policies. There are many examples where applications to convert garages to habitable rooms have been successful. Others have not for sound planning reasons.	No changes required to the SPD.
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
	Summary: 1. Paragraph 3.2 (3) – An inspector agreed a condition to restrict a garage to parking a car only in an appeal decision which should be a consideration in all planning applications. 2. Parking at schools should be discouraged in favour of walking/cycling. As stated the situation at Benetfield Road is an accident waiting to happen and it is hoped that the Blue Mountain application will state the safety proposals.	1. Support noted with thanks. Parking requirements are considered with extensions and existing garages are considered as long as they have restrictive conditions on the original consent. 2. The Council continues to work with schools to encourage more walking/cycling. New school developments are required to implement a School Travel Plan and so these measures can be enforced, for other schools there is no mechanism to enforce such measures.	No changes required to the SPD.
18	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Church Road East		
	Summary: Bigger garages are the best option but only with a condition restricting the use for parking. In Canada the situation has been resolved through under-dwelling or underground parking spaces. The extra costs would be acceptable compared to on-street parking problems otherwise.	Support for the preferred option is noted with thanks. It should be noted that underground parking in most situations is very expensive to provide and that there is no evidence that developers could absorb such costs. Therefore, it would not be reasonable to impose this as a requirement on development. However, if a proposal comes forward with such a parking solution the Council, with other considerations, could favour such an approach.	Confirm that the preferred option for garages is to become the guidance relating to garages.
27	Boyer Planning Ltd (on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd)		
	Summary:	1. Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
	<p>1. Cars have increased in size over the years.</p> <p>2. The current minimum size of garage is due to be increased in height and width.</p> <p>3. The amendments are generally welcomed by volume housebuilders.</p> <p>4. Garages will only be counted as parking if the additional storage is also provided.</p> <p>5. There is no evidence that more storage will lead to people using the garage for parking.</p> <p>6. Support for the principle of the preferred option but it is not clear how it would be effective and does not reflect circumstances elsewhere in the country where this has worked. The Council should take a more flexible approach than minimum size standards and monitor the effect of extra internal storage on garage use and on-street parking.</p> <p>7. Paragraph 3.2 – restrictive conditions are unlikely to be unenforceable.</p>	<p>2. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>3. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>4. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>5. This option was selected as a pragmatic response to the evidence of the low level of garages being used to store vehicles. It would also address another concern highlighted by the evidence from the survey of residents of new developments concerning the lack of storage space. It is not a perfect solution but it is considered to be much better than the existing situation where garages are clearly underused for parking provision.</p> <p>6. There will still be flexibility for developers to provide open off-street parking spaces or car-ports. The Council could have a hybrid approach whereby smaller garages are permitted but in accordance with the evidence on usage they would only count as 0.2 of a parking space which would be unlikely to be attractive to developers seeking to meet the required standards. Allowing sub standard garages to be counted as a fraction of a space is not practical. When considered across a development it may give a whole number but individually is worthless. Car ports or open parking spaces instead is a more practical and effective option.</p> <p>The Council will monitor the impact of the changes over time.</p> <p>7. It is acknowledged that restrictive conditions will not be easy to enforce on a comprehensive basis, however they are part of a suite of measures to encourage parking in the garage. They also could be used to tackle any specific problem areas in the future and also provide a planning reason to resist potential applications to convert garages to habitable rooms.</p>	
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	<p>Summary: Paragraph 3.2, it needs to be clear how the storage area will be determined.</p>	<p>Support is noted with thanks. The draft dimensions for the proposed storage areas are set out in 3.2 (3) of the draft SPD. This needs to be emphasised in the final SPD. Clarification on how the storage area will be acceptable is also necessary.</p>	<p>The dimensions of the proposed storage area will be set out in the Final SPD. Additional text to Paragraph 3.2 (2) is also required which states: <i>The garage element should be a minimum of 6m (length) by 3.5m (width) by 2.4m (height) and the storage element should be a minimum of 1.5m width(length) by</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
			<u>3.5m (width) by 2.4m (height). It should be clearly defined in the proposed development to ensure that it is constructed and cannot easily be removed by occupiers. The garage door should be at least 2.4m high by 2.4m wide excluding the frame</u>
22	Crowthorne Parish Council (Mrs Adele Swadling)		
	Summary: Support for the preferred option. Evidence in recent years shows that garage sizes are inadequate. The provision of extra storage should be included in the standard.	Support noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
21	Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG) (Mrs Carole Doran)		
	Summary: 1. A planning condition is likely to be unenforceable because the police are likely to be uninterested and the planning department is unlikely to have resources to inspect garages and it is difficult to enforce a change. 2. Counting garages as 0.2 of a parking space is reasonable. 3. Counting a double width garage as a single space may be acceptable. 4. It is risky to base official parking standards on the assumption that attitudes can change.	1. If the requirement is part of a planning condition this would be enforceable. Enforcement would be undertaken by the Planning Authority rather than the police. However it is agreed that each and every case will unlikely be inspected. The provision would be more akin to speed limits where it relies on the majority to respect the provision although difficult for full respect of the condition. 2. While counting each garage space as 0.2 of a parking space would fit with the available evidence it could add significant cost to development where garages are included and would not provide additional storage which was another issue identified in the survey work. 3. The Council agrees with this comment as a good idea and text should be added to the SPD to reflect double garages counting as 1 space or even two if the extra storage space is provided commensurate with the garage. 4. The current position regarding garages sizes and use is not effective and providing larger garages will provide the opportunity to improve the garage use statistic to a more acceptable level.	Add a new paragraph 3.4 which reads as: <u>Where double garages are constructed to the relevant dimensions and incorporate the specified additional storage they will count as two parking spaces. However, if a double garage is constructed to current dimensions (6 metre length by 6 metres width internal dimensions) then it will count as one space only.</u>
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	Summary: 1. Paragraph 3.2.1 and 3.2.2 – Do the measurements take account of a	1. The dimensions would allow for the parking of most 4x4 vehicles as stated in paragraph 3.3 of the Draft SPD. 2. Support is noted with thanks. The idea of a pitched roof for	Amend paragraph 3.3 to contain an additional sentence which reads as: <u>The garage, where appropriate in</u>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer response	Recommendation
	4X4 vehicle? 2. Paragraph 3.2.2 – Support for planning condition restriction on using the garage for parking. Pitched roofs might also help with storage.	additional storage is a good idea which should be reflected in the final version of the SPD.	<u>design terms, could also have a pitched roof in which contains additional storage.</u>
25	Abley Letchford Partnership Ltd		
Summary	<p>1. Preferred option is generally supported.</p> <p>2. Amend the first bullet point to read as <i>Garages will be included as part of the parking standards if they are large enough to incorporate a separately accessed storage room. To meet this requirement the minimum dimensions required are 7.5m (length) by 3.5m (width) by 2.4m (height) with separate access provided for the storage area wherever possible. The garage dimensions should not be obstructed by structural pillars.</i></p> <p>3. The 1st and 3rd bullet points both refer to restrictive planning condition therefore delete the 3rd bullet point.</p> <p>4. Smaller garages make an important contribution to parking so they should count towards 0.25 (one quarter) of a parking space, rounded to the nearest whole space across a development.</p>	<p>1. Noted with thanks.</p> <p>2. The proposed wording would give greater flexibility in circumstances where it is not practicable to provide a separate access to the storage area and the SPD should be amended accordingly.</p> <p>3. This is agreed but the text in the 1st bullet point should be deleted rather than the 3rd bullet point.</p> <p>4. This point is generally agreed. The proposed change would provide greater flexibility and could be provided as an option along with the provision of storage space. However the proposed 0.25 space per garage does not comply with the Council's up to date evidence that only 20% of garages are used for parking. This indicates that each such garage should only count as 0.2 of a parking space. Text should be added to the SPD to clarify this.</p>	<p>Amend the second sentence of paragraph 3.2 (1) to read as: <u>Garages will be included as part of the parking standards if they are large enough to incorporate a separately accessed storage room. To meet this requirement the minimum dimensions required are 7.5m (length) by 3.5m (width) by 2.4m (height) with separate access for the storage area wherever possible.</u></p> <p>Delete the last sentence in paragraph 3.2 (1) which reads as: The use of Planning Conditions will be considered to ensure that the garage use is restricted for parking purposes.</p> <p>Add a bullet point 4 to paragraph 3.2 which read as: <u>4. In instances where garages are provided that do not meet the 7.5m x 3.5m x 2.4m dimensions, but are at least 6m x 3m x 2m in size, these should count as 0.2 (one fifth) of a parking space, rounded down to the nearest whole space across a development</u></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
Chapter 3 – Affordable Housing - If you answered No, please give reasons plus any supporting evidence below including what changes you would			

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
like to see?			
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
Summary:	<p>1. Paragraph 4.3 it is essential that adequate parking is available to shops including disabled spaces.</p> <p>2. Paragraph 4.4 - Table 6 –cycles – if the garage cannot accommodate cycles then a separate storage facility should be provided.</p>	<p>This does not appear to relate to affordable housing. However in response to the points made:</p> <p>1. It is agreed that town centre shops should have sufficient parking including disabled parking nearby and additional text to paragraph 4.3 should clarify this.</p> <p>2. The preferred option in paragraph 3.3 includes separate storage provision. However, additional text should be used to clarify this.</p>	<p>1. Amend paragraph 4.2 to read as: <u>The tables below set out the</u> This document details proposed parking standards for all vehicle and planning use types. Integrated tables showing all standards including car, cycle, motorcycle, servicing and disabled parking. <u>Parking requirements arrangements for town centre uses are presented in Table 5 below. The parking provision for uses in Table 5, including disabled car spaces and cycle provision, should be convenient and easily accessible to the uses they serve</u></p> <p>2. Add an additional sentence within paragraph 3.3 which reads as: <i>This approach would help reduce parking problems by parking garages that are large enough to park an average sized car and provide usable additional internal storage space</i> <u>which could be used for general storage and cycles.....</u></p>
10	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway (The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents' Association (TRAWCRA))		
Summary:	<p>The strategy does not take account of bed-sits where properties are converted which results in 4 or 5 adults and they all have cars causing parking issues.</p>	<p>Such properties would not necessarily fall within the planning definition of affordable housing and are privately rented properties in many cases. The parking standard tables (chapter 4 of the draft SPD) can only be applied to new development where a planning application is made.</p> <p>It should also be noted that bed-sits are known in planning terms as homes in multiple occupancy (HMO's). HMO's are normally outside the scope of the Parking Standards SPD. For information, conversion of dwellings to HMO's of up to 6 bedrooms are</p>	<p>No changes required to the SPD.</p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		permitted development and not subject of planning permission. Above this number, planning permission is required and the Parking Standards will be a consideration in determining the application. Otherwise, should an area be dominated by HMO's and cause parking issues then the measures in Chapter 2 are available to help resolve the situation. However, it should be noted that many of the main source of the problem with HMO's is outside of the Council's control.	
18	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Church Road East		
	Summary: Question how a car can be afforded if a need for social support.	The policy proposal reflects recent evidence of car ownership levels of occupants of affordable housing in the Borough.	No changes required to the SPD.
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	Summary: The reduction in affordable housing parking would need to take account of the forthcoming starter home initiative, right to buy and the need for shift workers to own cars.	This is agreed and additional text should be added to the SPD to clarify that the impact of starter homes should be considered.	Amend the last two sentences of paragraph 3.5 to read as: <i>..... The types of acceptable evidence could be surveys of comparable sites and the location of the site in relation to public transport and local facilities and the consideration of issues such as shared ownership, forthcoming starter homes initiatives and right to buy. The preferred option requirements are is:....</i>
22	Crowthorne Parish Council		
	Summary: the provision for affordable housing should be the same as for other dwellings but also allows for more flexibility to reduce this.	This is disagreed as there is clear evidence that the recently built affordable housing schemes have lower car provision than the parking supplied. Flexibility subject to robust evidence could support lower parking provision.	No changes required to the SPD
26	Iceni Projects Limited (on behalf of Thames Valley Housing Association)		
	Summary 1. Support for the preferred option. 2. It is unclear whether BFC are also seeking to apply the standards as a minimum and further clarification is sought.	1. Support is noted with thanks. 2. Support is noted and it is agreed that clarity is required on whether standards are applied as maxima or minima or a guideline to be applied flexibly, particularly in relation to town centre parking. The standards set out clearly that town centre requirements are lower than other areas of the borough and the new standards	Amend paragraph 4.3 to read as: <i>Bracknell Town Centre will be significantly redeveloped over the coming years. While there will be additional car parking in the new scheme, one of the key ambitions of the</i>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>provide more flexibility for such housing schemes outside of the town centre should appropriate evidence be provided to support a reduction in parking. This provides sufficient flexibility in my view to the needs for such developments.</p> <p>However the approach should make it clear that the Parking Standards are a starting point rather than a minimum and should there be evidence otherwise then different provision can be agreed.</p>	<p><i>Council is to ensure that we have a town centre fit for the 21st century. To reflect that the Town Centre is the most sustainable location in the Borough, the Council adopted more rigorous standards for this part of the Borough in the 2007 Parking Standards SPD. These may standards now require more flexibility review to reflect changes in the role of town centres and the nature of shopping since the previous standards were adopted. The Council is consulting on the existing standards and will seek evidence during the consultation period as to whether changes are required. With future Town Centre sites such as the Southern Gateway and The Point potentially coming forward in due course it is necessary to get the views on whether the Town Centre parking standards need changing. The Town Centre parking standards as set out in Table 5 will be applied current proposal is to apply them as a starting point for consideration rather than as minimum standards. The application consideration of these standards should be on the basis that they are proposed to be minimum not maximum standards and that they may be subject to more evidence-based flexibility including for to affordable housing or local parking conditions (see paragraph 3.5 - Revised parking standards for affordable housing). Disabled parking provision is still applied as a minimum standard.</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
21	Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
	Summary: 1. Agree the starting point for affordable housing should be that they meet the prescribed parking standards. 2. The caveat for flexibility is too vague because developers always provide evidence but its robustness is often suspect. Even less well off families own car frequently on a one per adult basis	1. Noted with thanks. 2. The approach should be accompanied by clear guidance on the nature and quality of the evidence required to justify a departure from normal standards. Evidence to support a lower level of parking will need to be relevant to the site proposed and will also need to reflect the issues raised. In that regard evidence of similar sites with a mixture of tenure would provide a robust basis for parking requirements. Text in paragraph 3.5 makes this clear.	No changes required to the SPD.
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	Summary: Affordable housing should be the same as private housing.	This is disagreed because there is clear evidence is provided to support flexibility in lowering standards for affordable housing where appropriate and provided there is clear evidence to support the lower provision.	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
Chapter 3 - School drop-off/pick-up - If No, - please give reasons plus any supporting evidence below including what changes you would like to see?			
01	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
	Summary: During school times drivers ignore restrictions and execute dangerous turning manoeuvres. The Ridgeway needs to be included in the Resident's Parking Scheme.	The Council are currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trial has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered. In 2014 the council implemented additional waiting restrictions in the Hazel Hill area in consultation with the local residents association. Indeed, the residents association believed at this time that the existing restriction were sufficient to deter any town centre related long term parking.	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>The current waiting restrictions prohibit parking for a single hour to prevent all day parking from town centre visitors. If the single hour were to be increased to 9:00 to 16:00 it is likely that residents would find this too restrictive as it would also prevent them and their visitors from legally parking in the estate throughout this time. The restrictions are not intended to remove all non-residential parking from the estate, but to minimise the effect of long term parking.</p> <p>However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p>	
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggitt Grove	Support is noted with thanks. The Parking Standards is one strand of the Council's transport strategy. The Council also promotes walking and cycling in its Local transport Plan policies and other measures such as a school travel plan.	No changes required to the SPD.
10	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway (The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents' Association (TRAWCRA))	<p>The Council are currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trial has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered.</p> <p>In 2014 the council implemented additional waiting restrictions in the Hazel Hill area in consultation with the local residents association. Indeed, the residents association believed at this time that the existing restriction were sufficient to deter any town centre related long term parking.</p>	No changes required to the SPD

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>The current waiting restrictions prohibit parking for a single hour to prevent all day parking from town centre visitors. If the single hour were to be increased to 9:00 to 16:00 it is likely that residents would find this too restrictive as it would also prevent them and their visitors from legally parking in the estate throughout this time. The restrictions are not intended to remove all non-residential parking from the estate, but to minimise the effect of long term parking.</p> <p>However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p>	
18	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Church Road East		
	<p>Summary: Every method to get parents to walk/cycle children to school because catchments are not too distant and inconsiderate drop-off should be heavily penalised.</p>	<p>This comment is not directly related to the Parking Standards SPD.</p> <p>However, to answer the comments, the Council continues to work with schools to encourage more walking/cycling. New school developments are required to implement a School Travel Plan and so these measures can be enforced, for other schools there is no mechanism to enforce such measures.</p> <p>Inconsiderate parking is not subject to penalty from the council, obstructive parking is a police matter. Illegal parking is enforced by the council but the spend of proceeds from penalties is defined by law and cannot be given to individual schools.</p> <p>However, the council do use various methods to encourage, incentivise and reward children to choose a more sustainable method of travel. However, it is not a legal possibility to force parents or their children to find a sustainable method of travel.</p>	No change required to the SPD.
23	Winkfield Parish Council		
	<p>1. Drop-off/pick-up points should be integrated /essential to any design.</p>	<p>1. Drop off and pick up arrangements are fully considered when determining planning applications for new school development. However, it is agreed that provision should be integral to the design</p>	<p>Add a new sentence to paragraph 3.7 to read as: Adequate provision for drop-off and</p>

Summary:

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	2. Staggered start and finish times should be considered by all schools to help relive congestion.	of schools. Text should be included in the final SPD to make this clearer. 2. The question of staggered times will be passed to the Local Education Authority for consideration.	<u>pick-up will be required to be fully designed and provided for new school developments.</u>
27	Boyer Planning Ltd (on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd)		
	Summary: Parking requirements are proposed to be within Transport Assessments. The flexible approach is supported and this needs to be taken into account in the assessment of such Transport Assessments	Support is noted with thanks. The Council will take into account information in TA's when considering parking requirements for schools.	No changes required to the SPD.
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	Summary: Robust guidance is required if a case-by-case basis is followed.	This comment is agreed with. In developing the Draft SPD it became apparent that each school has differing levels of drop-off and pick up due to varying reasons such as exiting infrastructure and location. This meant it was not possible to set a level of parking provision which could be applied top all schools, hence the need for a case-by case basis supported by robust evidence.	No changes required to the SPD.
22	Crowthorne Parish Council		
	Summary: Evidence must take account of the impact pf local residents. Parking permits or restrictions must stop 6 th form students from parking in residential areas too.	<p>The Council always consider the local community, including residents, when considering implementing parking measures near schools, as it is accepted that for the majority of the week, the parking demands are significantly different to those at the start and end of the school day. For this reason site specific solutions are sort.</p> <p>The Council is currently trialling its first Residents Parking Scheme. This trial is due to end in November 2016. The Council are not considering making any alterations, including the addition of any additional areas to the scheme until the trail has been completed, and the lessons learnt. Assuming the trial concludes that the residents parking scheme has been successful, the rolling out of the residents parking scheme into further areas under pressure from increased parking relating to the town centre can be considered.</p> <p>The revisions are aimed at the drop off/pick up implications for schools. Parking standards for staff and sixth form are already set</p>	<p>Amend the preferred option (now the confirmed parking requirement) in paragraph 3.7 to read as:</p> <p><i>The parking requirements for new or expanded schools <u>regarding drop-off and pick up in addition to the standards for teachers, visitors and other users is set out in Table 8, Section 8. They will be applied</u> <i>will be considered on a case by case basis and informed by robust evidence including the capacity of the school, <u>its operational needs and impact on local residents.</u> The evidence required will form part of a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement including information on the existing parking</i></i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		out in current standard and should be followed. Observations made for new schools have shown that parking for staff under current standards are sufficient.	<i>situation, car ownership levels and other relevant information relating to the impact of the proposal and need.</i>
21	Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
	<p>Summary: The wording needs changing to reflect drop-off and pick-up and post 17 students where applicable should be considered too. Recommend the following text:</p> <p>The parking requirements for new or expanded schools will be considered on a case by case basis and informed by robust evidence including the capacity of the school. These requirements apply for staff, visitors and post 17 students (where applicable) as well as for school drop-off and pick-up. The evidence required will form part of a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement including information on the existing parking situation, car ownership levels and other relevant information relating to the impact of the proposal and need.</p>	<p>The revisions are aimed at the drop off/pick up implications for schools. Parking standards for staff and sixth form are already set out in current standard and should be followed. Observations made for new schools have shown that parking for staff under current standards are sufficient.</p> <p>However, text should be amended to reflect drop-off and pick-up.</p>	<p>Amend the preferred option (now the confirmed parking requirement) in paragraph 3.7 to read as:</p> <p><i>The parking requirements for new or expanded schools regarding drop-off and pick up in addition to the standards for teachers, visitors and other users is set out in Table 8, Section 8. They will be applied will be considered on a case by case basis and informed by robust evidence including the capacity of the school, its operational needs and impact on local residents. The evidence required will form part of a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement including information on the existing parking situation, car ownership levels and other relevant information relating to the impact of the proposal and need.</i></p>
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	<p>Summary: It appears that drop off areas at school have never been considered. The proposals in the Bellway site (Amen Corner north) are totally inadequate.</p>	<p>Drop off and pick up arrangements are fully considered when determining planning applications for new school development. However, it is acknowledged that there was no guidance to help enable this which the new SPD seeks to address.</p> <p>Standards for drop off/pick up now being considered as past problems are recognised. Such issues however vary from school to school and thus one solution or a specific standard would not be appropriate. In relation to new development, provision for drop off/pick up is being made in relation to that expected. The majority of school places are for those who live on site, well within walking</p>	<p>Add a new sentence to paragraph 3.7 to read as:</p> <p><u>Adequate provision for drop-off and pick-up will be required to be fully designed and provided for new school developments.</u></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		<p>distance which will have be a consideration when trying to balance travel choice.</p> <p>Text to clarify that drop-off-/pick-up provision must be provided in new applications should be added to the SPD to make it clearer.</p>	
29	Warfield Parish Council		
	<p>Summary: Paragraph 3.7 – the preferred option is too vague. Specific parking spaces should be provided outside schools.</p>	<p>Unfortunately, there is not the evidence base to be more specific in what pick up/drop off provision there should be for all schools, hence the need for a case-by-case basis. However what is clear is that there will be the need for provision at all schools, the question is how much? Additional text should be included to clarify this. Visitor parking is considered when determining planning applications for new school development and is included in the proposed standard.</p> <p>Parking is now being sought, such parking will be designed on a case by case basis. Parking on street outside school is open to abuse and could lead to lack of capacity when needed.</p>	<p>Add two sentences to paragraph 3.7 which reads as:</p> <p><i>..... Different circumstances will apply to each school in the Borough which makes a specific standard difficult to establish.</i></p> <p><u>However it would be useful to set out general standards for schools including visitor provision which is in Table 8, Section 8. Adequate provision for drop-off and pick-up will be required for new school developments. The preferred option requirement for new school or extensions to existing schools therefore is as follows:.....</u></p>
insert	Local resident , Beaumont Gardens, Harmanswater		
Summary	<p>1. Parking is an issue for residents of Beaumont Gardens where 3 times a day parents at the nearby Harmans Water school use parking spaces, the road or grass verges to park on causing major inconvenience to residents.</p> <p>2. There is not enough parking also because nearby Wellington Drive residents also use Beaumont gardens for parking. There is space to include new parking bays for around 6 vehicles on the left side of</p>	<p>1. and 2. Both main concerns are no matters for the parking standards SPD consultation, However the localised parking issues in Beaumont Gardens relating to school drop off and use by nearby residents needs to be looked at in more detail. The matter has been passed to the the Transport Engineering team who will contact you directly regarding the situation and new parking bays.</p>	<p>No changes required to the SPD</p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	Beaumont gardens to help resolve the situation.		

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
Chapter 3 - Future Technology & Climate Change - If No, - please give reasons plus any supporting evidence below including what changes you would like to see?			
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove Summary: This is not suitable for smaller towns than London.	Noted with thanks – but no evidence provided to support this view. This is an attempt to future proof parking spaces should demand for electric vehicle charging take off.	No changes required to the SPD.
18	Local Resident Summary: Even if electric vehicles take-up does materialise, they are still cars. The drive should be to ensure other modes of transport than the car are used.	It is agreed that other modes of transport should be encouraged. The Council's transport policies in its Local Transport Plan encourage the provision of facilities for non-car modes of transport including pedestrian and cycle routes and public transport. The parking standards are only one strand of the Council's overall policy approach on transport. There are clear environmental benefits to the increased use of electric vehicles and the provision of suitable charging facilities is a way of encouraging and supporting their take up.	No changes required to the SPD.
23	Winkfield Parish Council Summary: support in principle.	Support noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
27	Boyer Planning Ltd (on behalf of Luff Developments Ltd) Summary: The London Plan paragraph 6.13 requires 1 in 5 spaces (both active and passive) to provide charging points. There is no justification for higher amount.	The evidence base for 40% was provision is that 40% of spaces The Land for Industry and Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012). However, London Plan Policy as amended in 2015 is for 20% of spaces to be active or passive for ELVC. Therefore, to encourage up-take the Council agrees for it to align with London but should be designed to be able to be adapted to charging points (passive) installed rather than a requirement for charging points to be provides immediately (active). In this respect it is a lower-cost future-proofing measure rather than a higher requirement than that applied in London.	Amend text in paragraph 3.9 to read as: The preferred option is standards are: <i>1. For residential schemes: on sites larger than 10 dwellings, require 40% 20% (1 in 5) of all spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points.</i>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
			<p>2. For employment schemes: on sites with over 500 sq. m net internal area, require 30% 20% (1 in 5) of new spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points.</p> <p>3. For retail schemes: on sites over 1000 sq. m net internal area, require 20% (1 in 5) of new spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points.</p>
26	Iceni Projects Limited (on behalf of Thames Valley Housing Association)		
Summary	<p>1. The preferred option for 40% parking spaces are adaptable for electric vehicle charging points should be revised to reflect a more realistic standard.</p> <p>2. Clarification is sought on the practicalities of providing ECVP's where no communal parking is provided as the current evidence provides no sound justification.</p>	<p>1. The evidence base for 40% was provision is that 40% of spaces The Land for Industry and Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012). However, London Plan Policy as amended in 2015 is for 20% of spaces to be active or passive for ELVC. Therefore, to encourage up-take the Council agrees for it to align with London but should be designed to be able to be adapted to charging points (passive) installed rather than a requirement for charging points to be provides immediately (active). In this respect it is a lower-cost future-proofing measure rather than a higher requirement than that applied in London.</p> <p>It is not clear how useful evidence of current levels of electric car ownership would be as this is likely to increase over coming decades.</p> <p>However it is agreed that the target should be amended to align with London Plan 2015 policy.</p> <p>2. It is agreed that clarification should be provided on implementation and text should be included in the SPD to make it clear.</p>	<p>Amend text in paragraph 3.9 to read as: The preferred option is <u>standards are:</u></p> <p>1. For residential schemes: on sites larger than 10 dwellings, require 40% 20% (1 in 5) of all spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points.</p> <p>2. For employment schemes: on sites with over 500 sq. m net internal area, require 30% 20% (1 in 5) of new spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide charging points.</p> <p>3. For retail schemes: on sites over 1000 sq. m net internal area, require 20% (1 in 5) of new spaces to be designed and constructed to be readily adaptable to provide</p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
			<i>charging points.</i> Additional paragraphs numbers 3.11 – 3.16 have also been added to clarify implementation
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	Summary: support for the preferred option but future proofing might be an issue.	Support noted with thanks. It is recognised that it is not an easy solution to implement. However it is an attempt to future proof parking provision and market demand would enable the electric charging to be provided at these spaces. Clarification text should be added to paragraph 3.10.	Add a new sentence to paragraph 3.10 which reads as: <u>The passive provision should include accessible ducting and sufficient space to incorporate charging infrastructure and allow the convenient establishment of an electricity supply.</u>
22	Crowthorne Parish Council		
	Summary: support for the preferred option.	Support noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	Summary: Quoting the preferred option standards	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
Chapter 4 - Parking Standards Tables - Do you have any further comments to make on the Draft Parking Standards Tables?			
06	Highways England		
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD
13	Local Resident, College Town, Burghead Close		
	Summary: No comments other than grammatical corrections required.	Noted with thanks. Further checking of tables should be carried out before publication.	No technical changes required to the SPD. The Draft SPD has been reviewed and to ensure it is grammatically correct.
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
	Summary: 1. Paragraph 4.3 – Town centre parking should be generally available if shoppers want to visit more than one shop. 2. Paragraph 4.4 – Table 6 uses –	1. This is agreed as new parking provision associated with the new development will allow people to visit more than one shop. The existing parking provision (3 multi-storey car parks already operate on this basis and will continue to do so. 2. This is agreed in that parking provision should be available, convenient and easy to use. The production of larger garages will	Add to Annexe C – Paragraph C3 an additional point which reads as: - <u>Stands for adult bicycles should not too low or small so that the wheels of the bicycle can be damaged or buckled.</u>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	the spaces should be for all types of houses should mean usable spaces. 3. Paragraph 4.6 – Cycle parking should be available for non-residential cases and ‘Sheffield’ type hoops should be used.	make them more likely to be used for parking. 3. The Council disagrees that cycle parking should be required for all non-residential uses because of factors the physical ability to achieve this. The current thresholds in Table 4.6 are considered appropriate and a recommended to be continued with. However the comment about smaller stands which buckle wheels is considered appropriate and clarification on this is recommended to be added in Annexe C	
12	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Fletcher Gardens		
	Summary: 1. Need to address parking problems for people who are disabled but who cannot get a Blue Badge. 2. The volume of cars is a problem and therefore alternatives to the car are needed. 3. Are the new developments going to include more parking spaces with sufficient contingency?	1. The Council have disabled parking spaces throughout the town centre areas, within their off street car parks and also provide them within residential areas where residents meet specific criteria. These bays are reserved for road users with a valid blue badge. Of course the Council also provide parking for all other road users within the town centre. In residential areas, non blue badge holders all have the same duty to find a safe, non obstructive road side space to park if they have not got an available off road facility, This document does not set the criteria for assessing need for Blue Badges. However the Council has been running a programme for identifying parking need within the Borough over the past years and has, and will continue to, provide more parking solution where appropriate. Please contact the Transport Engineering Team to discuss the issues in your particular area? 2. The Parking Standards SPD is one strand to the Council policy and strategy for transport. The Council agrees with the well-informed comment that alternatives to the car are needed and follows this through in its planning polices and the Local Transport Plan, which include specific Council policies to promote choice in mode of transport, public transport and pedestrian and cycleways. 3. The new developments will provide sufficient parking for residents and visitors. This new Parking Standards SPD will be important to ensure the right type of usable provision is provided.	No changes required to the SPD.
17	Local Resident, Priestwood and Garth, Grange Road		
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
14	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Larkwood Drive		

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
15	Local Resident, Winkfield and Cranbourne, Grove Lane		
	Summary: Please explain without having to download anything what is wanted.	Noted with thanks. Unfortunately the document is technical in nature and will be mostly used in a technical context by planning and transport professionals. However, the Council strives to make documents as accessible to the general public as possible including the technical language used in them. We will contribute to do so in preparing the final version of the document.	No technical changes required to the SPD. The Draft SPD will be reviewed in producing the final version to ensure it, in terms of its text, is understandable by the general public and professionals.
16	Local Resident, Warfield Harvest Ride, Derbyshire Green		
	Summary: There is a parking issue and Derbyshire Green which needs to be considered.	The specific issues of parking in and around Derbyshire Green fall outside the remit of the production of the Parking Standards SPD. However, these issues have been passed to the LHA Transport Engineering Team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.	No changes required to the SPD.
11	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Pinewood Avenue		
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks. The consultation provides an opportunity to comment but there is no requirement to do so.	No changes required to the SPD.
09	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
	Summary: 1. Cars are here to stay and parking provision for them is required along with motorbikes and cycles. 2. Cars are much bigger on average than in the past. 3. There is concern over future problems in The Ridgeway, Woodridge Close and Hazel Hill areas due to shoppers, overnight parking and nearby newly constructed flats.	1. Noted with thanks. 2. Noted with thanks. 3. The current waiting restrictions prohibit parking for a single hour to prevent all day parking from town centre visitors. If the single hour were to be increased to 9:00 to 16:00 it is likely that residents would find this too restrictive as it would also prevent them and their visitors from legally parking in the estate throughout this time. The restrictions are not intended to remove all non-residential parking from the estate, but to minimise the effect of long term parking. Since the amendments to the waiting restrictions in Hazel Hill there have been very few representations by residents regarding parking in this area. However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the Transport Engineering	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.	
10	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway (The Ridgeway and Woodridge Close Residents' Association (TRAWCRA))		
	<p>Summary:</p> <p>1. There is concern over future problems in The Ridgeway, Woodridge Close and Hazel Hill areas due to shoppers, overnight parking and nearby newly constructed flats.</p> <p>2. Free parking in town centre car parks may help the problem.</p>	<p>1. The current waiting restrictions prohibit parking for a single hour to prevent all day parking from town centre visitors. If the single hour were to be increased to 9:00 to 16:00 it is likely that residents would find this too restrictive as it would also prevent them and their visitors from legally parking in the estate throughout this time. The restrictions are not intended to remove all non-residential parking from the estate, but to minimise the effect of long term parking.</p> <p>Since the amendments to the waiting restrictions in Hazel Hill there have been very few representations by residents regarding parking in this area.</p> <p>However, the issue of parking in and around the Hazel Hill and The Ridgeway area has been brought to our attention many times throughout this consultation. As this is a specific parking issue that falls outside the remit of the wider consultation, the specific issue of parking in this area has been passed to the Transport Engineering team who will investigate and comment independently of this consultation.</p> <p>2. The Council relies on the income from town centre car parking and is not, in the current financial climate able to consider making parking for the town centre free.</p>	No changes required to the SPD.
18	Local Resident, Crowthorne, Church Road East		
	Summary: Much more effort is required to encourage less intrusive methods of transport.	It is agreed that other modes of transport should be encouraged. The Council's transport policies in its Local Transport Plan encourage the provision of facilities for non-car modes of transport including pedestrian and cycle routes and public transport. The parking standards are only one strand of the Council's overall policy approach on transport.	No changes required to the SPD.
26	Iceni Projects Limited (on behalf of Thames Valley Housing Association)		
	Summary: The Town Centre standards should not be a minimum in line with the NPPF and to ensure the key objective of 1000 new homes	<p>Support is noted</p> <p>It is agreed that the imposition of a minimum standard in the town centre area should be reviewed as it could have adverse</p>	<p>Amend paragraph 4.3 to read as:</p> <p><i>Bracknell Town Centre will be significantly redeveloped over the</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	is deliverable.	consequences on the delivery of homes within the most sustainable location in the Borough, run counter to policies to promote the use of non-car modes of transport and encourage more vehicles into this area. The text should therefore be revised.	<p><i>coming years. While there will be additional car parking in the new scheme, one of the key ambitions of the Council is to ensure that we have a town centre fit for the 21st century. To reflect that the Town Centre is the most sustainable location in the Borough, the Council adopted more rigorous standards for this part of the Borough in the 2007 Parking Standards SPD. These may standards now require more flexibility review to reflect changes in the role of town centres and the nature of shopping since the previous standards were adopted. The Council is consulting on the existing standards and will seek evidence during the consultation period as to whether changes are required. With future Town Centre sites such as the Southern Gateway and The Point potentially coming forward in due course it is necessary to get the views on whether the Town Centre parking standards need changing. The Town Centre parking standards as set out in Table 5 will be applied current proposal is to apply them as a starting point for consideration rather than as minimum standards. The application consideration of these standards should be on the basis that they are proposed to be minimum not maximum standards and that they may be subject to more evidence-based flexibility including for to affordable housing or local parking conditions (see paragraph 3.5 - Revised parking standards for affordable</i></p>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
			<i>housing</i>). <u>Disabled parking provision is still applied as a minimum standard.</u>
32	Local Resident, Ascot, Ranelagh Crescent		
	Summary: Grass verges should never be used for parking. If no other option is available then verges should be replaced with permanent surfaces ideally mini laybys.	<p>Parking on grass verges is not permitted where there are parking restrictions on the carriageway that restrict parking, such as single or yellow double lines. The difficulty is that for this is only true for highway verges. Furthermore, kerb side parking, adjacent to the verge may not be unsafe and so introducing restrictions to prevent verge parking will have the unwanted effect of also preventing the required on street parking. Where verge parking is an issue it is fair to assume parking pressures are at a premium and the removal of both verge and on street parking would be unrealistic. Therefore preventing verge parking by the use of waiting restrictions is not a real option</p> <p>Therefore, the council have a programme of introducing additional residential parking spaces into verges to remove the issue of damaging verges whilst improving parking provision. Obviously this is not possible in every location and in these cases where the verges are being damaged, the Council do maintain these verges.</p>	No changes required to the SPD
20	Bracknell Town Council (
	Summary: Support for tables 3.14, 3.15,4.3, 4.4 and paragraph 3.16	Support noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
31	Local Resident, Central Sandhurst, Robin Lane		

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	<p>Summary:</p> <p>1. There is difficulty in accessing documentation.</p> <p>2. What is the basis for the minimum parking space dimensions?</p>	<p>1. Many apologies for the difficulty in accessing the documentation. The Council will take on-board these comments and will strive to improve in future consultations.</p> <p>2. The dimensions are as existing and the Council would need an evidence base to suggest a change. It is recognised that the dimensions of many cars has increased in recent years but industry guidance parking space sizes have not. In reality a 2.4m x 4.8m standard parking bay is satisfactory for most vehicles. Commercial vehicles are different. I would say that more commentary on the spaces around parking bays is one way of allow more flexibility. For example circulation space in front of the parking space especially if parked in front of a building. Previous design guidance indicated that some separation should be provided and this could be reinforced in further guidance proposed by the Council.</p>	No changes required to the SPD.
24	Local Resident, Great Hollands South,	Sarum	
	<p>Summary: general support for the strategy. There is a lack of consideration by many car drivers when parking their cars (cluttering streets, on verges, on pavements) which spoils the outlook and area. There needs to be an effective strategy for all of Bracknell.</p>	<p>Support is noted with thanks. Further, the strategy is intended to be borough-wide and hopefully will help to improve existing parking problems as well as dealing with new development. Many residents share the frustrations with inconsiderate parking and whilst it is no immediate consolation, measures to improve the problem areas are being considered and provided in many areas of the borough already.</p>	No changes required to the SPD.
22	Crowthorne Parish Council		
	<p>Summary: The increased pressure for retirement / care / nursing homes need to have provision for the intended type of resident (fully mobile, part mobile or non mobile), the tenure and location.</p>	<p>The standards do reflect the proposed type of users. Should the type of occupant be such then a consideration of the use class is required and this could impact on the parking requirement (C3 vs C2).</p>	No changes required to the SPD.
21	Crowthorne Village Action Group (CVAG)		
	<p>Summary: Has Table 8, section 8 been tested with secondary heads and governors? Please consult with them also?</p>	<p>The provisions in Table 8, section 8 along with the rest of the SPD have been considered by the Local Education Authority. In practice these standards have worked in the past when implemented and with travel planning and the provision in Chapter 3 to ensure that</p>	No changes required to the SPD.

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
		drop-off and pick-up is provided on a case-by-case basis, the Council is confident the measures will be effective in planning additional school capacity.	
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	Summary: Bracknell rail station parking is totally unsuitable and insufficient.	Unfortunately, the Council has little control over the level of parking associated with the railway station, however it is noted that there are alternatives to the main station car park within a short walking distance of the Station such as High Street car park which with new pedestrian improvements being put in gives a quick and direct route to the station. The Council however could in principle support extra provision at the station should it come forward.	No changes required to the SPD.
30	The Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead		
	Summary: support for document.	Support is noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
19	Historic England		
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
25	Abley Letchford Partnership Ltd		
	Summary: 1. Paragraph 4.5, Table 7 states parking dimensions which are considered to be unnecessarily prescriptive. 2. The prescriptive dimensions do not facilitate situations with on-plot tandem parking spaces. Therefore that the offset dimensions referred to above should be presented in Table 7 as minimum requirements and also caveated appropriately to allow flexibility.	1. Comment disagreed with. The dimensions need to be specified to provide adequate space for parked vehicles and circulation/access to protect other road users from parked vehicles blocking footways etc. It is not accepted that there is no specific information on tandem parking spaces. Whilst it is not ideal, garages and parking spaces in front are allowed and do give some indication of what would be required. 2. The standards are a starting point for consideration and if there is any evidence otherwise the Council will take it into account in determining such detail.	No change required to the SPD.
23	Winkfield Parish Council		
	Summary: 1. Tandem parking is not practical and should not be used. 2. The presumption should be against converting garages into accommodation. 3. Parking standards should be	1. Tandem parking spaces are not ideal but can be the only practical option on certain sites Government policy is that there should be a presumption in favour of sustainable development. Where there remains adequate parking on a site then such conversions may be acceptable. 2. Comment is supported with thanks. The thrust of the parking standards is to ensure adequate parking is provided and maintained	Amend paragraph 2.10 to read as: <u>The provision of new parking spaces should take account of any impacts on the wider environment such as highways safety or local character. New parking bays should be suitably surfaced. In certain cases it may be</u>

Ref	Response/Summary	Officer Response	Recommendation
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 bedroom – 1 space • 2 bedrooms – 2 spaces • 3 and 4 bedrooms – 3 spaces • 5 bedrooms – 4 spaces • Visitor Parking – at least 3:5 <p>4. New parking bays on former grass verges should be hard surfaces.</p> <p>5. Large retail developments should provide separately marked spaces for large and small cars.</p> <p>6. Plentiful parking should be provided for new small retail development for local footfall and future use.</p> <p>7. Applications to changes parking arrangements resulting in a lower number of spaces should be refused.</p> <p>8. Parking standards should be realistic for office staff and visitors.</p> <p>9. Residential parking schemes are supported in appropriate areas.</p> <p>10. Transport hubs should be introduced wherever possible on existing sites including bus, cycle and drop off provision.</p> <p>11. A robust management system should be put in place to review up-to-date data and adjust forward planning as appropriate.</p>	<p>at an appropriate level. In circumstances where it is clear that the loss of a garage will impact on the parking provision for that property, the Council will resist its approval.</p> <p>3. Comments on standards are noted but no evidence is provided to support these views. Excessive parking requirements will result in inefficient use of land/lower densities of development meaning more land will be required to provide for housing needs. The proposed standards are based on BFC evidence including Census data and are therefore considered to reflect reasonable requirements and it is proposed to apply some flexibility for individual circumstances.</p> <p>4. Support is noted with thanks. Amend the SPD to clarify this</p> <p>5. In relation to parking space sizes there is no evidence to provide varying sizes for normal domestic add in text on vehicles and it is considered to be too difficult to enforce if at all.</p> <p>6. Noted with thanks. Parking should be in accordance with standards unless other evidence recommendations otherwise.</p> <p>7. Where parking provision is reduced but would still meet the relevant standard it would not be reasonable to refuse permission on this basis. Each application should be considered on its own merits and in some circumstances a loss in spaces might be unacceptable but otherwise for some other cases.</p> <p>8. Parking for B1 development is proposed to increase from current standards reflecting industry need.</p> <p>9. Support is noted with thanks.</p> <p>10. Noted although the authorities main hubs are served well by Bus which all travel too and from the town Centre Bus Station. This is located next to the Bracknell Train station and can be easily accessed following the recent improvements. Cycle parking is also provided at our main central hub and well as those community hubs throughout the borough. These can all be accessed by Bracknell's extensive Footway/Cycleway network and provides residents the choice and ability to travel by sustainable modes. The recent improvements made at both the Bus and Trains stations also provide an area for dropping off and picking up.</p> <p>11. Parking standards need to be reviewed over a reasonable time frame. It will not be possible to have very fluid standards that need to change in each circumstance. The standards need flexibility but they do need an evidence base to rest on.</p>	<p><u>appropriate to surface new parking areas with a modular concrete system that can take the weight of domestic vehicles while allowing grass to grow through. It may in some cases be appropriate to provide new shrub or tree planting to soften the impact of new parking. The off-street parking strategy is:</u> <i>The views of local residents are invited on existing problems associated with parking on grass verges and the creation of off-street parking, with a view to relaxing the rules preventing the creation of car parking spaces instead? Subject to the response on this issue, the preferred strategy is to continue with how it currently manages the situation which is:</i></p>

	Annexes - Do you have any further comments to make on the Annexes? Please include the Annexe and relevant paragraph numbers you are commenting on.	Officer Response	Recommendation
02	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield Ward, Crockford Place		
	Summary: How will it affect developments under construction and the fear is that there will be little development left in the future that will fall under the SPD.	<p>The new standards, once adopted, can only be applied to subsequent planning applications. There is no provision in law for their retrospective application to developments that already have planning consent.</p> <p>There will however, be many developments, both large and small, that the new Parking Standards will apply to</p>	No changes required to the SPD.
07	Local Resident, Binfield with Warfield, Wiggett Grove		
	<p>Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A1.1 and A1.2 – residential parking should be off road in a safe place to avoid congestion and danger. 2. A.1.3 on street parking impedes public transport and safety. 3. A1.10 – Figure A10 shows parking on a pavement which is unacceptable. 4. Figure A12 – shows what Benetfield Road looks like at school times where its winding curves and no passing places cause much concern. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Off-street parking will often be the first choice, but may not always be achievable. Subject to road widths and other highways safety considerations, on street parking can usefully supplement off-street parking, particularly for visitors. 2. If designed properly on-street parking is safe and allows vehicles to progress unimpeded. 3. It is agreed that parking on pavements is unacceptable in safety terms and that it also negatively contributes to the appearance of a street. 4. Noted but the photo shows a street where it is wide enough to safely park cars and to allow them to pass. Text should be added to emphasise this. The Transport Engineering team will contact you directly regarding the Benetfield Road situation. 	Add text to Figure A12 which reads as: <u>This parking provision shows safe parking whilst allowing sufficient width to allow vehicles including buses to pass through safely.</u>
09	Local Resident, Wildridings and Central, The Ridgeway		
	<p>Summary:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The document is very comprehensive. 2. The strategy does not take account of bed-sits where properties are converted which results in 4 or 5 adults and they all 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Noted with thanks. 2. Planning policy for bed-sits known as homes in multiple occupancy (HMO's) is normally outside the scope of the Parking Standards SPD. For information, conversion of dwellings to HMO's of up to 6 bedrooms are permitted 	No changes required to the SPD.

	<p>have cars causing parking issues.</p> <p>3. Free parking in Bracknell town centre would be a way to encourage shoppers and compete with other centres.</p>	<p>development and not subject of planning permission. Above this number, planning permission is required and the Parking Standards will be a consideration in determining the application. Otherwise, should an area be dominated by HMO's and cause parking issues then the measures in Chapter 2 are available to help resolve the situation. However, it should be noted that many of the main source of the problem with HMO's is outside of the Council's control.</p> <p>Where planning permission is required for the sub-division of a residential property parking will normally be sought on the basis of the approved standards for the sizes of the resulting units. In this respect the residential parking standards set out in the document would apply in the same way as they do to other forms of residential development.</p> <p>3. The Council relies on the income from town centre car parking and is not, in the current financial climate able to consider making parking for the town centre free.</p>	
20	Bracknell Town Council		
	<p>Summary: Support for the annexes. The role of the Police and Civil parking enforcement should be clarified.</p>	<p>Support is noted with thanks.</p> <p>It is agreed that the SPD could clarify the role of parking enforcement. Therefore a new paragraph in Chapter 2 should be added.</p>	<p>Add a new paragraph 2.24 in chapter 2 which reads as:</p> <p><u>Parking Enforcement</u> <u>The Road Traffic Act 1991 permits local authorities to apply to take over the enforcement of both on and off street car parking restrictions from the Police. Bracknell Forest applied for, and received, these powers in 2006. These powers enable the council to enforce parking on the highway (or in a Council car park) where in contravention of a parking restriction included within a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO). In simple</u></p>

			<u>terms, the Council can enforce if a vehicle is parked on a yellow line or in a controlled parking bay where the parking is in contravention. The Council do not, however, have powers to enforce against dangerous or obstructive parking. In these circumstances Thames Valley Police remain the enforcement authority and can take appropriate action. Parking disputes on private land are not a matter for the Council or the Police.</u>
22	Crowthorne Parish Council		
	Summary: No comments.	Noted with thanks.	No changes required to the SPD.
28	Local Resident, No location given		
	Summary: 1. Support for the Annexes. 2. Lorries and large vans should not park in small areas suitable for family sized vehicles.	1. Support noted with thanks. 2. Noted with thanks, text relating to commercial vehicle parking is provided in paragraphs 2.21-2.23 of the SPD.	No changes required to the SPD.
29	Warfield Parish Council (Mrs Sheila Collings on behalf of Warfield Parish Council)		
	Summary: 1. Annex A A1.5, more parking barns should be provided. 2. There are no guidelines for community halls as they have more impact than churches.	1. This is agreed and it is considered that the increased size requirement for garages could result in increased use of car barns and car ports. 2. This is agreed and new text should be added to clarify matters.	Add in the following text to Table 8 Section 8 for cars and cycle: <u>Community Centres Consider on a case by case basis</u>

Appendix 2 Consultation Pro-forma

Document:	Parking Standards SPD Consultation Draft	
Stage	Consultation Draft	
Date of Consultation	Monday 19 October – Monday 30 November 2015.	
Lead Officer	Simon Cridland ext. 1186	
Democratic Authorisation	Executive agenda Item 10b - 22 September 2015 http://democratic.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/documents/s88341/Parking%20Report%20Exec%20Sep%202015.pdf	
Publication Documentation		
Documentation Titles	Ref	Doc.
	PS2	Evidence Review Background Paper
	PS1	Draft Parking Standards SPD (Oct 15)
	PS3	Statement of Consultation
	PS4	SPD matters
	PS5	Document Availability Statement
	PS6	Responses form
	PS7	Advert
Method of Consultation		
Topic	What the Council did	
Venues the documents have been made available	<p>Easthampstead House Time Square Each venue received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 copy of PS2 • 1 copy of PS1 • 5 copies of PS6 <p>All nine libraries All 6 Town and Parish Council Offices Each venue received:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 1 copy of PS2 • 1 copy of PS1 • 5 copies of PS6 	
Publish online	<p>Objective: http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/parking_standards_draft_spd/draft_parking_standards_spd BFC web http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/parkingstandardsspd</p>	
Send to specific consultees	Main Consultation Letter (Appendix 1) was sent to all persons and groups represented on the list in Appendix 2. This letter sign-posted where on the website all the following can be found	
Send to general consultees	Main Consultation Letter (Appendix 1) was sent to all persons and groups represented on the list in Appendix 2	
Local advertisement notice	Appendix 3 provide evidence that the advert was published on 21 October 2015 in the Bracknell News paper which is available to all households in the Borough.	

Sub Appendix 1 –Main Consultation Letter

19 October 2015

Dear Sir or Madam

Parking Standards Supplementary Plan Document Consultation on DRAFT Parking Standards SPD

The Council has published a **DRAFT Parking Standards Supplementary Plan Document. The consultation runs from Monday 19 October until 5pm Monday 30 November 2015**

Bracknell Forest's Consultation DRAFT Parking Standards SPD focuses on four main areas:

1. Chapter 2 which sets out the preferred strategy for dealing with existing parking issues in the Borough;
2. Chapter 3 which sets out preferred options for dealing with key parking issues relating to new development namely, garages, school drop off and pick up, affordable housing and electric vehicle charging;
3. Chapter 4 which provides full parking standard tables for Bracknell Town centre, residential development and all other development uses;
4. Annexes which provides design guidelines for vehicle parking, disabled, bicycle and motorcycle parking and electric vehicle parking.

Comments on the DRAFT Parking Standards SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/parkingstandardsspd>
- by completing the response form
- or via e-mail or writing to the Council

Copies of the document are also available at Libraries and Parish Councils across the Borough.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2016. The adopted version will replace the existing Parking standards SPD (2007) and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

If you have any queries please get in touch with a member of the Development Plan Team, call 01344 352000 or email development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Yours sincerely



Max Baker (Head of Planning)

Sub Appendix 2 Organisations consulted by letter

Chief Planner/Principal Manager The Coal Authority	Winkfield Parish Council
Hurst Parish Council	HIGHWAYS ENGLAND
Bray Parish Council	Regional Planner English Heritage
Shottesbrooke Parish Council	British Gas
Sunningdale Parish Council	Thames Water Property Services
Sunninghill and Ascot Parish Council	Affinity Water
White Waltham Parish Council	Planning Coordinator Veolia Water Three Valleys
Spatial Planning Team Manager Surrey County Council	Thames Valley Berkshire Local Enterprise Partnership
Thames Valley Police	Blackwater and Hawley Town Council
Berkshire East Primary Care Trust	Yateley Town Council
Senior Planning Officer Wokingham Borough Council	Surrey Heath Borough Council
Finchampstead Parish Council	Windlesham Parish Council
Planning & Transportation Officer Wokingham Town Council	Chobham Parish Council
Waltham St Lawrence Parish Council	Binfield Parish Council
Strategic Planning Manager Hampshire County Council	Town clerk Bracknell Town Council
Hart District Council	Crowthorne Parish Council
Sandhurst Town Council	Wokingham Without PC
Warfield Parish Council	Government Team Natural England
Planning Liaison Officer Environment Agency	Old Windsor Parish Council
Scottish and Southern Energy	Head Office T Mobile (UK) Ltd
South East Water Engineering	Hutchison 3G UK Limited
Thames Valley Police	Planning & Development Telefónica O2 UK Limited
Crime Prevention Design Adviser Thames Valley Police	Council and Community Liaison Officer Orange
Fire and Rescue HQ	Vodafone Ltd
Department of Transport	National Grid Gas
Clerk to the Council Crowthorne Parish Council	London Network, Street Works Admin Team
Town Planning Network Rail	National Grid Gas
Senior Planning Officer Royal Borough of Windsor and Maidenhead	Virgin Media
BT Openreach	Vtesse Networks Limited
SGN	Cable and Wireless
Marine Management Organisation	South Central Ambulance Service NHS Trust

**BRACKNELL FOREST BOROUGH PLANNING GUIDANCE
PARKING STANDARDS SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT
– CONSULTATION DRAFT**

The Council is preparing a new planning guidance document to guide future development in the Borough called the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Draft.

The Consultation Draft Parking Standards SPD focuses on the following main areas:

- Chapter 1 which provides an introduction and context to the document;
- Chapter 2 which sets out the preferred strategy for dealing with existing parking issues in the Borough;
- Chapter 3 which details the preferred options for dealing with key parking issues relating to new development namely, garages, school drop-off and pick-up, affordable housing and electric vehicle charging;
- Chapter 4 - which provides full parking standard tables for Bracknell Town centre, residential development and all other development uses; and
- Annexes which provides design guidelines for vehicle parking, disabled, bicycle and motorcycle parking and electric vehicle parking.

The Council has also published a supporting evidence background paper for consultation alongside the SPD Consultation Draft.

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2016. The adopted version will replace the existing Parking Standards SPD (2007) and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

Period within which responses may be made

The public consultation runs from Monday 19 October until 5pm Monday 30 November 2015

How you should respond?

The Council has prepared a response form in which response should be made.

1. You can respond on-line using our planning consultation portal page: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/parkingstandardsspd>
2. Or you can send your representations in writing to:

Spatial Policy
Environment, Culture & Communities
Bracknell Forest Council
Time Square
Market Street,

Bracknell
Berkshire, RG12 1JD

3. Or you can e-mail them to: development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

Your representations must reach us by 5pm Monday 30 November 2015.

Please note that any representations may be accompanied by a request to be notified at a specified address of the adoption of the SPD.

What will happen to your comments?

All representations will be used to finalise the SPD. It is envisaged that the Council will adopt the SPD in early 2016.

Further information

To further discuss any elements of the Parking Standards (SPD) Consultation Draft, please contact Spatial Policy on 01344 352000 or via email at: development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk.

Alternative Formats

A summary of the Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation Draft can be made available in large print, in Braille or on audio cassette. Copies in other languages may also be obtained.

Please contact:

Spatial Policy
Bracknell Forest Council
Time Square
Market Street, Bracknell
Berkshire RG12 1JD
Email: development.plan@bracknell-forest.gov.uk

All the documentation is also available for inspection at the following places and times:

Bracknell Forest Council	
Time Square, Market Street, Bracknell, RG12 1JD. Monday to Friday 8:30 to 17:00	Easthampstead House Town Square, Bracknell, RG12 1AQ Monday to Friday - 8:30 to 17:00
Parish/Town Councils	
Binfield Parish Council, Parish Office, Benetfeld Road, Binfield, RG42 4EW Monday – Friday – 9.00-12.00.	Bracknell Town Council, Brooke House, High Street, Bracknell, RG12 1LL Monday to Thursday – 9:00 to 17:00 Friday – 9:00-16:00
Crowthorne Parish Council Parish Office Morgan Centre	Sandhurst Town Council Council Offices Sandhurst Memorial Park

Wellington Road Crowthorne RG45 7LD	Yorktown Road Sandhurst GU47 9BJ
Monday to Friday – 9am – 1pm	Monday to Friday – 9am – 5pm
Warfield Parish Council, 17 County Lane, Warfield, RG42 3JP	Winkfield Parish Council Council Offices Fernbank Road Ascot SL5 8JW
Monday to Friday – 9:30 to 12:30pm	Monday to Friday – 9am – 1pm

Libraries	
<p>Bracknell (Central) Library Town Square, Bracknell, RG12 1BH</p> <p>Monday 9:30 to 17:00 Tuesday 9:30 to 19:00 Wednesday Closed Thursday 9:30 to 19:00 Friday 9:30 to 19:00 Saturday 9:30 to 16:00 Sunday Closed</p>	<p>Ascot Heath Library Fernbank Road Ascot Berkshire SL5 8LA</p> <p>Monday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 19:00 Tuesday 14:00 - 17:00 Wednesday Closed Thursday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 19:00 Friday 14:00 - 17:00 Saturday 9:30 - 12:30 Sunday Closed</p>
<p>Binfield Library, Benetfeld Road, Binfield, RG42 4JZ</p> <p>Monday 14:00 to 19:00 Tuesday 14:00 to 17:00 Wednesday Closed Thursday 9:30 to 17:00 Friday 14:00 to 17:00 Saturday 9:30 to 16:00 Sunday Closed</p>	<p>Birch Hill Library Leppington Birch Hill Bracknell Berkshire RG12 7WW</p> <p>Monday 14:00 - 17:00 Tuesday 10:00 - 12:30 and 14:00 - 17:00 Wednesday Closed Thursday 10:00 - 12:30 and 14:00 - 17:00 Friday 14:00 - 19:00 Saturday 9:30 - 12:30 Sunday Close</p>
<p>Crowthorne Library 162 High Street Crowthorne Berkshire RG45 7AT</p> <p>Monday 9:30 - 17:00 Tuesday 9:30 - 17:00 Wednesday 9:30 - 17:00 Thursday 9:30 - 19:00 Friday 9:30 - 17:00 Saturday 9:30 - 16:00 Sunday Closed</p>	<p>Great Hollands Library Neighbourhood Centre The Square Great Hollands Bracknell Berkshire RG12 8UX</p> <p>Monday Closed Tuesday Closed Wednesday 09:30 - 12:30 and 14:00 - 19:00 Thursday Closed Friday 9:30 - 12:30 and 14:00 - 17:00 Saturday 9:30 - 12:30 Sunday Closed</p>

Libraries	
<p>Harmans Water Library Neighbourhood Centre The Square Harmans Water Bracknell Berkshire RG12 9LP</p> <p>Monday 9:30 - 12:30 and 14:00 - 19:00 Tuesday 10:00 - 12:30 Wednesday Closed Thursday 14:00 - 17:00 Friday Closed Saturday 9:30 - 12:30 Sunday Closed</p>	<p>Sandhurst Library The Broadway Sandhurst Berkshire GU47 9BL</p> <p>Monday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 17:00 Tuesday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 19:00 Wednesday Closed Thursday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 17:00 Friday 9:30 - 13:00 and 14:00 - 17:00 Saturday 9:30 - 16:00 Sunday Closed</p>
<p>Whitegrove Library, 5 County Lane, Warfield, RG42 3JP</p> <p>Monday 9:30 to 17:00 Tuesday 9:30 to 17:00 Wednesday 9:30 to 18:00 Thursday 9:30 to 17:00 Friday 9:30 to 17:00 Saturday 9:30 to 16:00 Sunday Closed</p>	

Sub Appendix 4 Email to all contacts on the Council's consultation portal

This email was sent to the Council's database of local residents, formal bodies and planning and transport professionals (numbering 2,388 email contacts). This included all contacts in the Council's business directory.

-----Original Message-----

From: consult@objective.co.uk [mailto:consult@objective.co.uk]

Sent: 19 October 2015 09:01

To:

Subject: Bracknell Forest Council: New event available

Dear Sir/Madam

Draft Consultation Parking Standards SPD will be available for you to view and comment between the following dates:

Start date: 19/10/15 09:00

End date: 30/11/15 17:00

Please select the following link to view this event:

http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/portal/planning/parking_standards_draft_spd/draft_parking_standards_spd

If the link appears to be broken, please try copying the entire link into the address bar on your web browser.

This e-mail has been automatically generated by the Consultation software.

The information contained in this e-mail or in any attachments is confidential and is intended solely for the named addressee only. Access to this e-mail by anyone else is unauthorized. If you are not the intended recipient, please notify the administrator and do not read, use or disseminate the information. Opinions expressed in this e-mail are those of the sender and not necessarily the company. Although an active anti-virus policy is operated, the company accepts no liability for any damage caused by any virus transmitted by this e-mail, including any attachments.

To unsubscribe please click on the link below or paste it into your browser:

<http://consult.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/common/unsubscribe.jsp?guid=378AC0CC-8D6A-9440-E4BF-EB2EB9B81376>

Sub Appendix 5 - Email to Libraries and Parish

-----Original Message-----

From: Development Plan

Sent: 12 October 2015 10:10

To: Development Plan

Subject: Consultation - Draft Parking Standards SPD

*** This message has been classified as UNRESTRICTED ***

Dear Libraries

This email is to inform you that we will be starting a consultation on Monday 19th October at 9am until 5pm on Monday 30th November 2015 on the Consultation Draft Parking Standards Supplementary Parking Document.

The Consultation Draft Parking Standards SPD focuses on the following main areas:

- Chapter 1 which provides an introduction and context to the document;
- Chapter 2 which sets out the preferred strategy for dealing with existing parking issues in the Borough;
- Chapter 3 which details the preferred options for dealing with key parking issues relating to new development namely, garages, school drop-off and pick-up, affordable housing and electric vehicle charging;
- Chapter 4 - which provides full parking standard tables for Bracknell Town centre, residential development and all other development uses; and
- Annexes which provides design guidelines for vehicle parking, disabled, bicycle and motorcycle parking and electric vehicle parking.

Comments on the Consultation Draft Parking Standards SPD can be made:

- on-line using our planning consultation portal page: <http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/parkingstandardsspd> or,
- via the response form, e-mail or writing to the Council.

Copies of the document will be available at Libraries and Parish Councils across the Borough

Subject to the responses on the public consultation, a final version of the SPD is anticipated to be adopted as planning guidance in early 2016. The adopted version will replace the existing Parking standards SPD (2007) and will be a material consideration in the determination of planning applications.

A copy of the document will be dropped off to you shortly, and will need to be made available to the public.

Further information will follow, however should you have any queries, please contact me.

Many thanks. Kind regards,

Simon Cridland

Team Manager for Design, Transport and Environment