

Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Consultation Statement

Regulation 12 Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2012
(as amended)

Persons consulted when preparing the supplementary planning document

The Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD was subject to public consultation for a period of 7 weeks between 8 December 2023 and 26 January 2024. Copies of the draft SPD and supporting documents (namely a Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Statement and Statement of Matters and Availability (see Appendix 1)) were made available to view at the following locations during opening hours:

- Rushmoor Borough Council Offices
- Aldershot Library
- Farnborough Library

The SPD and supporting information was also made available to view online at <https://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsultations> (see Appendix 2.)

Representations were invited via email or via post.

Consultation emails

The Council notified all those registered on the Rushmoor Local Plan consultation database. The database covers a wide range of stakeholders including local residents, businesses, statutory bodies such as Natural England and the Environment Agency. In total, there are approximately 190 contacts on the database and all were contacted via email (see Appendix 3).

Documents available on the Council's website

Copies of the draft SPD, the Strategic Environmental Assessment Screening Statement and Statement of Matters and Availability were made available to view/download on the Council's website at <https://www.rushmoor.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsultations>

Summary of the main issues raised

Six responses to the consultation were received in total, including from Historic England and Hampshire County Council.

The main issues raised by respondents include:

- Zone A should cover a wider area around Aldershot and Farnborough town centres
- The one space per dwelling requirement in Zone A should be removed

- The approach to visitor parking in Zone A should apply to Zone B too
- The minimum of 100 units for car clubs is onerous
- The 10% cap for offsetting car parking spaces with car clubs is too low/should be removed
- 1 car club car offsetting 9 car parking spaces is too low
- Car parking standards are too high (Census data shows lower average ownership)
- Car clubs should also be encouraged in existing residential areas
- Request that methodology for defining Zone A is shared
- Request that research into impact of maximum parking standards is shared as per NPPF paragraph 112

The detailed comments received are set out in Appendix 4.

How those issues have been addressed in the supplementary planning document

The Officer responses relating to the detailed comments and how they have been addressed in the final version of the SPD can be found in Appendix 4. Where changes to the SPD have been made in response to comments received, these are flagged in bold within the officer response.

Appendix 1 Statement of SPD Matters and Availability



Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Statement of SPD Matters and Availability

Regulation 12 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended)

Title: Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

Area Covered: Rushmoor Borough

Subject Matter: The purpose of the Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD is to build upon Local Plan Policy IN2 – Transport. It sets out guidance on appropriate parking provision in terms of amount, design and layout for both residential and non-residential development to meet the requirements of the policy. The parking standards apply to all development, including changes of use, residential sub-divisions, and extensions.

Representation Period: 8th December 2023 – 26th January 2024 (5pm)

Copies of the draft documents and the supporting information are available to view at:

- **Rushmoor Borough Council Offices** between 9am and 2pm Monday to Friday
- **Aldershot Library**, 109 High Street, Aldershot, Hampshire, GU11 1DQ at the following times:
 - Monday 9.30am – 1.30pm
 - Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday 9.30am - 5pm
- **Farnborough Library**, Pinehurst, Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 7JZ at the following times:
 - Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday 9.30am – 5pm
 - Tuesday 9.30am – 1.30pm
- **Online** at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsultations


Representations to be sent:

By **email** to planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk

Or **in writing** to: Planning Policy, Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, Hampshire, GU14 7JU

Adoption Notification: If you wish to be notified of the adoption of this SPD, please request this as part of your submissions.

Appendix 2 Planning Policy webpages

Search Rushmoor Borough CouncilOpen Menu

Car and cycle parking SPD

[Home](#) > [Planning and building control](#) > [Planning policies](#) > [Supplementary planning documents and advice notes](#) > [Car and cycle parking](#)

Supplementary planning documents and advice notes

- Affordable housing SPD
- Aldershot town centre prospectus SPD
- Locally Listed Heritage Assets SPD
- Car and cycle parking SPD**
- Development affecting public houses SPD
- Farnborough civic quarter masterplan SPD
- Farnborough town centre SPD
- Home improvements and extensions SPD
- Shop front design guide SPD
- Transport contributions SPD
- Financial contributions for open space
- Draft biodiversity SPD

A Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) that sets out the approach to car and cycle parking in Aldershot and Farnborough.

Consultation on the draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD (2023)

We are currently consulting on a [draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2023\)](#) which will replace the current [Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2017\)](#).

The purpose of the Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD is to build upon [Rushmoor Local Plan](#) Policy IN2 - Transport. It sets out guidance on appropriate parking provision in terms of amount, design and layout to meet the requirements of the policy.

Draft SPD and supporting documents

You can read the draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD (2023) and supporting documents below. The documents are also available to view at the Council Offices and at Aldershot Library and Farnborough Library during opening hours.

- [Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2023\)](#)
- [SEA/HEA Screening Statement](#)
- [Statement of Matters and Availability](#)

Have your say

You can send us your comments and feedback by emailing planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk or by post to the following address:

Planning Policy
Rushmoor Borough Council
Council Offices
Farnborough Road
Farnborough
GU14 7JU

This consultation closes on **Friday 26 January 2024**.

Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD (2017)

The [Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2017\)](#) sets out our approach to car and cycle parking in new development.

Documents relating to the adoption of the car and cycle parking SPD

- [Car and cycle parking standards \(2017\) - Consultation statement](#)
- [Car and cycle parking standards \(2017\) - Adoption Statement](#)

Car and cycle parking standards for schools

Hampshire County Council is the planning authority for most education establishments. It has adopted a set of guidelines called the [On-site school parking guidelines \(April 2013\)](#). These guidelines provide a more up-to-date parking standard for schools and replace this element in our Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD (2017).

Contact us

Planning policy

01252 398 787 | planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk

Planning policy consultations

Home > Planning and building control > Planning policies > Get involved in developing our planning policies > Planning policy consultations

Get involved in developing our planning policies

Statement of Community Involvement

Planning policy consultations

Keep up to date with the latest news on planning policy

Find out about what we are consulting on and how to give us your views.

Current consultations

We are consulting on a [draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2023\)](#) which will replace the [Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2017\)](#).

For more information and to have your say, please visit our [Car and Cycle Parking SPD page](#).

This consultation closes on Friday 26 January 2024.

Notifications about future consultations

If you would like to be notified of future consultations, please sign up to our [planning policy mailing list](#).

Contact us

Planning policy

01252 398 787 planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk



Supplementary planning documents and advice notes

Home > Planning and building control > Planning policies > Supplementary planning documents and advice notes

Planning policies

The Rushmoor Local Plan

Supplementary planning documents and advice notes

- Affordable housing SPD
- Aldershot town centre prospectus SPD
- Locally Listed Heritage Assets SPD
- Car and cycle parking SPD
- Development affecting public houses SPD
- Farnborough civic quarter masterplan SPD
- Farnborough town centre SPD
- Home improvements and extensions SPD
- Shop front design guide SPD
- Transport contributions SPD
- Financial contributions for open space
- Draft biodiversity SPD
- Get involved in developing our planning policies
- Planning obligations and the Community Infrastructure Levy
- Green Infrastructure Strategy
- Local cycling and walking infrastructure plan
- National, regional and county planning policy documents
- Neighbourhood planning
- Former local plans and policies

Details of our supplementary planning documents and advice notes.

Following the adoption of the [Rushmoor Local Plan](#), we are reviewing our adopted supplementary planning documents (SPDs) and published guidance notes. Please see our [former local plans and policies](#) page for more information.

Current consultations

We are consulting on a [draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2023\)](#) which will replace the [Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD \(2017\)](#).

For more information and to have your say, please visit our [Car and Cycle Parking SPD page](#).

This consultation closes on Friday 26 January 2024.

Adopted supplementary planning documents (SPDs)

There are ten adopted supplementary planning documents and one supplementary note.

- [Affordable housing](#)
- [Aldershot town centre prospectus](#)
- [Locally listed heritage assets](#)
- [Car and cycle parking standards](#)
- [Development affecting public houses](#)
- [Farnborough civic quarter masterplan](#)
- [Farnborough town centre](#)
- [Home improvements and extensions](#)
- [Shop front design guide](#)
- [Transport contributions](#)

Draft Biodiversity SPD

We consulted on a [draft Biodiversity SPD](#) between 29 August and 10 October 2023.

We will now review all the responses received before deciding whether the document should be adopted or if any changes are needed.

Interim Policy Statements

- [First Homes Interim Policy Statement](#)

Advice note

- [Financial contributions for open space - Interim advice note](#)

In addition, you will find advice on highways development planning on the [highways development](#) page on Hampshire County Council's website in the document called 'notification to local planning authorities document'.

Contact us

Planning policy

01252 398 787 planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk

Appendix 3 Email to Consultees

From: Rushmoor Council Planning Policy
Sent: 08 December 2023 09:46
To: Rushmoor Council Planning Policy
Subject: Rushmoor Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Consultation

Dear Sir/Madam,

The Council is currently consulting on the following document for a period of six weeks:

- Draft Car and Cycle Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

You can view the SPD and supporting documents online at www.rushmoor.gov.uk/planningpolicyconsultations.

The closing date for comments is 5pm on Friday 26th January 2024. Comments can be submitted:

- by email to planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk or
- in writing to: Planning Policy, Rushmoor Borough Council, Council Offices, Farnborough Road, Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 7JU.

Hard copies of the draft SPD and the supporting information are available to view at:

- Rushmoor Borough Council Offices between 9am and 2pm Monday to Friday
- Aldershot Library, 109 High Street, Aldershot, Hampshire, GU11 1DQ at the following times:
 - Monday 9.30am – 1.30pm
 - Tuesday, Wednesday, Friday and Saturday 9.30am - 5pm
- Farnborough Library, Pinehurst, Farnborough, Hampshire GU14 7JZ at the following times:
 - Monday, Wednesday, Thursday, Friday, Saturday 9.30am – 5pm
 - Tuesday 9.30am – 1.30pm


If you wish to be notified of the adoption of the Car and Cycle Parking Standards SPD, please request this as part of your submissions.

Yours faithfully,

Planning Policy and Conservation Team

Planning Policy and Conservation Team | Rushmoor Borough Council | Council Offices | Farnborough Road | Farnborough | Hampshire | GU14 7JU

DDi: 01252 398787 | e:planningpolicy@rushmoor.gov.uk | w:www.rushmoor.gov.uk

 Please consider the environment - do you really need to print this email?

Appendix 4 Detailed Consultation Responses and Officer Comments

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
David Mowbray (Resident)	General	There is no consideration given to charging vehicles on-street where there are no front gardens or garages.	Hampshire County Council is the local highways authority for Rushmoor and further information on on-street charging for electric vehicles is available on their website: Electric vehicle charging guidance for residents Hampshire County Council (hants.gov.uk)
Historic England	SEA Screening	Concur with the assessment that the SPD is unlikely to result in significant environmental effects and therefore endorse the conclusion that it is not necessary to undertake SEA of this SPD.	Comments noted.
Savills obo Wates Developments	General	General support for improved residential parking arrangements in the borough.	Comments noted.
	Aldershot SPZ (Zone A)	Object to the proposed red line around the Sustainable Parking Zone in Aldershot as it does not go far enough or take account of sites that could come forward for development close to the town centre in highly accessible locations. Consider that land promoted for residential development adjacent to Aldershot Town Football Club (ATFC) stadium has the same sustainability credentials as the Town Centre due to proximity of public transport & LCWIP route 170.	The extent of the Sustainable Parking Zones (SPZs) was determined through a process which looked at a number of criteria which define highly accessible locations. This included distance to public transport and day-to-day facilities. The process also considered the suitability of the area for high-density development, as data shows that this type of development has the lowest car ownership in Rushmoor. The starting point for the assessment was the town centres as the 2017 SPD already provided for a different consideration to parking within these locations. Parcels of land adjoining the town centre were then considered for their suitability for inclusion within the SPD. The Council will monitor the implementation of the SPZs and consider their expansion in the future if appropriate.
	Zone B	High parking requirement would severely impact on sites such as ATFC site, make them have limited viability and impact on provision of tree planting, landscaping and greenspaces due to less efficient use of land and less sustainable layout.	The parking requirement in Zone B remains as set out in the SPD adopted in 2017. The Local Plan policies as a whole have been tested for viability, although we recognise that this does not mean that there will not be sites which come forward where viability will need to be tested on an individual basis. We consider that the parking requirement does not preclude the provision of adequate tree planting, landscaping and provision of greenspaces.

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
	Zone A	Requirement for minimum of one space per dwelling is onerous and there should be a section on 'car free development' subject to certain criteria being met. Alternatively, the list of 'exceptional circumstances' in para 5.12 should be expanded.	The 2021 Census data shows that average car ownership for flats in Rushmoor is 0.84 cars per unit. We wish to avoid setting standards for parts of parking spaces and therefore this has been rounded to the nearest whole number of one space per dwelling.
	Visitor parking	Supports approach in Zone A but considers this should be expanded to include any residential development within close proximity of an existing car park.	The approach to visitor parking in Zone A will only work where there is no option for visitors other than to use existing car parks because parking is restricted both on the development and between the development and the existing car park. Otherwise visitors will likely park on-street if it is closer to the development than the existing car park. Parking restrictions within Zone A ensure this approach is possible but parking restrictions vary across Zone B therefore it would not be appropriate to apply the approach to Zone B.
	Car clubs	Support offsetting car parking requirement through use of car clubs but consider that the minimum of 100 units is onerous and suggests that 10% cap should be removed.	The minimum of 100 units reflects that there are not currently any established car clubs in Rushmoor and therefore any development making use of the principle would need to establish the car club and provide at least one car. This is unlikely to be feasible for smaller developments. Once car clubs are established and proven viable in Rushmoor, the SPD will be reviewed, and consideration given to smaller developments offsetting car parking requirements by contributing to these car clubs. Data shows that although it is growing, national uptake of car club membership is still very low, particularly outside of London. The 10% cap is to ensure that car clubs are not used to justify indiscriminately reduced parking which will not meet the needs of future residents of development. The Council will monitor the evidence on the uptake of car club membership and review the SPD if necessary.
Hampshire & Isle of Wight Constabulary	Para 8.4	Ask that the requirement for all cycle stores to have a Sold Secure Silver Standard cycle anchor point is included.	ADD REQUIREMENT FOR SOLD SECURE SILVER STANDARD (OR EQUIVALENT) CYCLE ANCHOR POINT
	Para 8.8	Facilities for secure staff cycle parking should be separate to those provided for use by the general public and ask that this requirement is included.	The SPD does not differentiate between the level of parking required for staff and members of the public for commercial

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
			uses but sets one overall level, therefore it would not be appropriate to require that these are separated.
Surrey County Council	Car clubs	10% parking space requirement cap for offsetting by car club cars means the parking ratio would still be no less than 0.9 spaces per dwelling. Greater flexibility for reduced parking should be considered to encourage use of car clubs.	Data shows that although it is growing, national uptake of car club membership is still very low, particularly outside of London. The 10% cap is to ensure that car clubs are not used to justify indiscriminately reduced parking which will not meet the needs of future residents of development. The Council will monitor the evidence on the uptake of car club membership and review the SPD if necessary.
Hampshire County Council	Background, context & principles	Little or no reference made to several key documents: LTN 1/20, Manual for Streets, Building for Healthy Life and Streets for Healthy Life. Also minimal reference to benefits and impact on health and wellbeing.	ADD ADDITIONAL REFERENCES/TEXT TO CHAPTER 2
	National & local policy context	Update to reflect latest version of LTP4. Recommend that air quality should also be a key consideration when setting parking standards.	UPDATE TO REFLECT LATEST VERSION OF LTP4
	Para 3.7	Query the statement that the parking standard is sufficient to provide the right number of parking spaces as Table 2 shows average car ownership levels are lower than requirement.	The 2021 Census shows that average car ownership per household in Rushmoor has not changed significantly since the 2011, therefore the existing parking standards are still considered appropriate for Zone B (outside of the SPZs). The Council intends to undertake an in-depth review of these parking standards as part of work on either a new local plan or design code for Rushmoor.
	Para 3.8	Request that the methodology for defining the zones is shared. Consider that there is an opportunity to extend and review the SPZs using routes in minutes and walking distanced ped shed analysis to include other areas of high connectivity e.g. train stations.	PROVIDE METHODOLOGY AS APPENDIX TO SPD
	Para 3.9	Request research into impact of maximum parking standards on the local highway network from additional informal parking as per NPPF para 112.	The principle of maximum parking standards for commercial uses has been long established in Rushmoor through the Car and Cycle Parking SPD and this update to the SPD does not seek to change that approach.
	Para 3.10	It would be more appropriate to consider a lower parking standard in the most accessible areas. There is a possible text	The use of maximum parking standards allows for provision below the standard to be sought and provided where it would be appropriate and not result in problem parking or

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
		error in the last sentence and incorrect term for non-residential development.	highway safety issues. An example of this would be in the most accessible locations. ADD REFERENCE TO ACCESSIBLE LOCATIONS & CORRECT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR
	Para 4.8	Any development will need to consider wider impact on highway network, therefore existing demand for parking in the area must be considered.	The impact of para 4.8 is not that the existing demand for parking in the area should not be considered when considering the level of parking appropriate for the development, but that new development should not have to ameliorate an existing situation.
	Table 4	Suggest parking bays in front of garage should be 6m long.	No evidence has been provided to support the change to the size of parking bays in front of garages.
	Para 4.11	Suggest change of words from 'may need to' to 'must'. Where car parking space is constrained on one side 0.3 must be added to width and if constrained on both sides then 0.6m. Shrubbery and grass are other reasons to widen adjacent parking spaces.	AMEND 'MAY' TO 'WILL' AND ADD REFERENCE TO SHRUBBERY AND GRASS TO PARAGRAPH 4.11
	Para 4.14	Urge caution with excessive use of tandem parking. Principle 4 reads as though tandem parking is acceptable anywhere within the development however para 4.14 only refers to provision on-plot.	Para 4.14 provides the explanatory text to Principle 4 and the two should be read together. We consider it is therefore clear in which situations tandem parking spaces are appropriate.
	Principle 5	Request addition of "subject to consultation with the Highway Authority".	ADD SUGGESTED ADDITION TO PRINCIPLE 5
	Para 4.16	Discussions around loss and re-provision of parking will be considered on a site-by-site basis and should be discussed with HCC.	The above amendment will clarify this position.
	Part 5.1	Are there any instances where the presumption to provide the parking standard in full would not be met and what evidence would be required to consider a deviation from standard?	These are set out in Para 5.12.
	Principle 7	Consider that this will need to specify that this only applies to development in Zone B.	Principle 7 will also apply to Zone A.
	Para 5.4	Suggest change of wording from 'may' to 'will'. HCC would be interested to understand the rationale for potentially excluding some communal parking areas.	UPDATE WORDING TO CLARIFY THAT ALLOCATED PARKING SPACES MAY NOT BE APPROPRIATE WHERE THE NUMBER

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
			OF SPACES IS LESS THAN THE NUMBER OF UNITS (E.G. SOME OLDER PERSONS HOUSING TYPES)
	Para 5.5	Not clear on in what circumstance this would apply if even in Zone A there is a requirement for 1 space per dwelling.	Examples would be where car club cars are used to offset part of the parking requirement for the site in line with Principle 13 or where off-site parking is used in line with Principle 12.
	Table 5	Is the requirement for 2+ beds correct, or should this be lower than the requirement for 1 beds?	The requirement for 2+ beds is lower than the requirement for 1 beds – 1 beds must provide 1/3 of a visitor space per property and 2+ beds must provide 1/5 of a visitor space per property.
	Para 5.6	On what basis would the TA determine the visitor parking amount and what kind of evidence will be required?	Given the constrained nature of Rushmoor, applications for over 50 residential units outside of the Sustainable Parking Zones are likely to be rare. We therefore propose that these matters can be discussed with an applicant on a case-by-case basis through the pre-application process. However, matters such as the sustainability of the site, access to public transport and on-street parking restrictions within the site and the surrounding areas are likely to be relevant.
	Para 5.8	Suggest addition of “or similar indicator”.	ADD SUGGESTED ADDITION TO PARA 5.8
	Principle 10	Inconsistent with commentary later in the document (Para 8.4).	Paragraph 8.4 is referring to cycle parking spaces being provided in older garages which are already being used for car parking.
	Para 5.9	This should read as displaced.	CORRECT TYPOGRAPHICAL ERROR
	Para 5.10	Reference should be made to Appendix B where the zones are mapped.	ADD REFERENCE TO APPENDIX B TO PARA 5.10
	Para 5.11	HCC are interested in the rationale for requiring at least one parking space per dwelling in Zone A.	The 2021 Census data shows that average car ownership for flats in Rushmoor is 0.84 cars per unit. We wish to avoid setting standards for parts of parking spaces and therefore this has been rounded to the nearest whole number of one space per dwelling.
	Principle 11	Suggest removing this principle as it is contrary to the principle of identifying the SPZ.	For the reason set out above, we consider it appropriate to retain the baseline of one space per dwelling within Zone A.
	Para 5.12	Suggest this is worded more positively to reflect the comments on Principle 11.	As set out above in response to comments on Para 5.11 and Principle 11, we consider that retaining the requirement for one space per dwelling is appropriate and therefore the

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
			wording on Para 5.12 regarding 'exceptional circumstances' is considered appropriate.
	Principle 12	Suggest this is applied to all sites within Zone A.	Whilst there is capacity within existing public car parks to absorb small amounts of parking from new residential development, there is not capacity to absorb the amount of parking resulting from large-scale development and this would be detrimental to overall parking levels.
	Para 5.14	Suggest making reference to Principle 3.	The SPD should be read as a whole and it is not considered necessary to reference Principle 3 in this paragraph.
	Principle 13	Suggest that car clubs could also be encouraged in existing residential areas to reduce overall impact of parking numbers. Query the application of this principle only to development in Zone A.	There are currently no established car clubs in Rushmoor and we consider that the most feasible location for these to be established initially is within the town centres and wider SPZs. Paragraph 5.21 sets out that car club schemes should ideally be made available to the general public as well as those living with the development. It is likely that once car clubs are established within the town centres/SPZs, operators will want to expand into existing residential areas in order to grow their membership. The Council will monitor the success of car clubs in Rushmoor and in the future consider extending Principle 13 to Zone B if appropriate.
	Para 5.19	Query the provision of 1 car club vehicle only replacing only 9 parking spaces and the maximum 10% of total parking spaces.	Whilst the latest data shows that across the country as a whole, each car club car replaces 23.5 private vehicles, this is likely to be skewed by data from large cities such as London. The 2022 CoMoUK Annual Car Club Reports show that 667,440 out of 752,560 (88.6%) car club members in the UK were in London. The Council therefore expects this number to be significantly lower in Rushmoor in comparison. The precedent of 1 car club vehicle offsetting 9 car parking spaces is established in the Farnborough Civic Quarter development which has a resolution to permit outline planning permission. The Council will monitor the uptake of car club membership and number of private cars they replace as car clubs are established in the borough and review the SPD if necessary.

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
			Data shows that although it is growing, national uptake of car club membership is still very low, particularly outside of London. The 10% cap is to ensure that car clubs are not used to justify indiscriminately reduced parking which will not meet the needs of future residents of development. The Council will monitor the evidence on the uptake of car club membership and review the SPD if necessary.
	Para 5.20	Suggest the following addition to the text: "this should be outlined within the Travel Plan for the site."	ADD SUGGESTED ADDITIONAL TEXT TO PARA 5.20
	Para 5.22	Suggest amending the suggested wording of the planning condition so that it is not limited to "for occupiers to use" which would bring the wording in line with para 5.21.	The condition only ensures that car clubs cars are available for residents of the development to use before the units are occupied but does not restrict car club cars to use only by residents in accordance with paragraph 5.21.
	Para 6.3	Did the Council mean "reasonably mitigated" or should it read "reasonably accommodated"?	The paragraph wording is correct in saying "reasonably mitigated".
	Principle 16	HCC would like to be sure on whether this is a requirement to provide the drop-off spaces within the development or nearby on the highway. From a public health perspective, car parking for non-residential uses should be designed so it does not compromise pedestrian and cycle routes.	The intention of this policy is to require drop-off spaces within the development. Any car parking should be designed so that it does not compromise pedestrian and cycle routes in line with the sustainable transport hierarchy.
	Principle 19	Threshold is lower than HCC threshold so any travel plans submitted for fewer than 100 units will not be reviewed by HCC.	Comment noted.
	Para 1.2 (7.2)	Suggest SPD needs to specify that the Travel Plan will be secured via S106 agreement.	ADD SUGGESTED TEXT TO PARA 7.2
	Para 8.2	Standards for quantum of cycle parking spaces in LTN 1/20 are a minimum and the SPD should reflect this. SPD doesn't currently reflect the priority matrix in Manual for Streets.	UPDATE PARA 8.2 TO CLARIFY THAT THE REFERENCE TO LTN 1/20 IS FOR THE DESIGN OF CYCLE PARKING NOT THE QUANTUM WHICH IS SET OUT IN APPENDIX A
	Para 8.4	Do not recommend the inclusion of garden sheds as suitable location to store bikes – the SPD should refer to suitable locations in LTN 1/20.	REPLACE "GARDEN SHED" WITH "SECURE OUTBUILDING"
	Para 8.6	Recommend adding a requirement for cycle parking to be located within 10m of dropped kerb per Healthy Streets Design Check. In some instances two-tier cycle stands may be suitable (LTN1/20 pg 136).	ADD REFERENCE TO DROPPED KERBS AND TWO TIER CYCLE STANDS TO PARA 8.6

Respondent	Section	Comment	Officer response
	Para 8.7	Recommend that 'safe and well lit' should also be added as a criteria.	ADD SUGGESTED TEXT TO PARA 8.4
	Para 9.2	Would be beneficial to include requirement for parking and charging of mobility vehicles within the residential parking standards section of the SPD as well.	Chapter 9 covers requirements for both residential and non-residential development and applicants will need to consider the requirements of the SPD as a whole. We wish to avoid duplication of information in different sections of the document.
	Chapter 10	Suggest changing heading to "Electric Vehicle". The SPD should reference opportunities to charge electric vehicle for smaller infill or change of use where there isn't sufficient capacity to provide on-plot infrastructure which could include a financial contribution towards EV charging infrastructure on the highway.	AMEND HEADING TO "ELECTRIC VEHICLE"
	Para 11.5	The meaning of "negative interface with the public realm" may be open to interpretation. Parking design could be used to enhance the street scene as well as other design aspects such as landscaping and planting. Excessive use of frontage parking is discouraged where there are identified walking and cycling routes and suggest additional wording.	Elements of design guidance may always be open to interpretation, however we consider that this paragraph could be re-worded more positively to encourage good parking design. AMEND WORDING OF PARA 11.5 TO BE POSITIVE AND ENCOURAGE GOOD DESIGN