

## APPENDIX B

# Draft Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) Evidence Review Background Paper

1.1 This background paper reviews the evidence base for revising the Parking Standards SPD providing officer comments where relevant. It focuses on seven elements:

- A. Policy and guidance requirements.
- B. Census 2011 data.
- C. Residents Survey of new developments.
- D. Officer Consideration.
- E. Other Local Authorities.
- F. Employment Density Review.
- G. Places of Worship

### A. Policy and guidance requirements

1.2 This policy and guidance review looks at the up-to-date framework and provides commentary against each.

#### **Government National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) (2012)**

1.3 Paragraph 39 states that *if setting local parking standards for residential and non-residential development, local planning authorities should take into account:*

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

**The new Parking Standards SPD will need to meet all the aims of the NPPF Paragraph 39.**

#### **DCLG, National Planning Practice Guidance (NPPG)**

1.4 In the section of the NPPG regarding, Travel Plans, transport assessment and statements in decision making, paragraph 8 (dated 06 March 2014), is clear that the Government is opposed to the setting of maximum parking standards and that parking provision should be appropriate to the needs of the development and not reduced below an unreasonable level.

**To ensure consistency with the NPPG, the Parking Standards SPD will not prescribe maximum standards.**

#### **Bracknell Forest Borough Local Plan (BFBLP)(2002)**

1.5 The following saved policies are relevant:

- *Policy M7 Access for people with disabilities* seeks wider parking bays by promoting the provision of disabled parking and negotiating parking facilities.

**BFBLP Policy M7 is still relevant and the Parking Standards must be consistent to ensure the satisfactory delivery of disabled parking. This will be achieved in Technical Annex B.**

- *Policy M9 Vehicle and cycle parking* states that development will not be permitted unless satisfactory parking provision is made.

**BFBLP Policy M9 is a clear statement that developments must comply with parking standards. The supporting text to the policy also states such standards will be reviewed from time to time in the context of national policy and Local Transport Plans.**

- Paragraph 6.60 recognises the need to remedy shortfalls in parking provision in certain areas through the Council continuing to promote and provide additional residential parking areas. In locations with attractive landscape areas that are being harmed by inappropriate parking, the Council may investigate parking regulation.

**Parking schemes to remedy shortfalls in provision in existing areas are supported in principle and such schemes should conform to the Parking Standards SPD.**

- Paragraph 6.61 supports improved parking in centres and railways stations.

**The existing Parking Standards SPD (2007) contains standards that relate to centres and railways stations in conformity with paragraph 6.61. The existing standards form part of the consultation on the Draft SPD**

- Paragraph 6.62 states that parking problems should be addressed by an integrated approach including traffic management, providing cycle parking and by promoting public transport.

**Once adopted, the Parking Standards SPD will form part of the Council's strategy to deliver an integrated transport system with other policies and guidance in accordance with BFBLP Policy M9 paragraph 6.61.**

- *Policy M10 Parking for Countryside Recreation* requires appropriate vehicle and cycle parking facilities for recreational facilities in the countryside.

**The Draft SPD will consult on standards to meet BFBLP Policy M10.**

#### ***Core Strategy Development Plan Document (DPD)(2008)***

**1.6** The following policies are relevant:

- *Policy CS1: Sustainable Development* is a criteria-based policy which includes that development will be permitted which is located so as to reduce the need to travel.

**One aim of Policy CS1 is to reduce the need to travel. The Council's objective in this respect is not to suppress car ownership but to promote choice. Policy CS1 does not support the over provision of parking provision which could encourage excessive car use over alternative, more sustainable, modes of transport. A pragmatic approach taking account of the high levels of average car ownership in the Borough but supporting and promoting non-car-modes will be sought through the Parking Standards SPD.**

- *Policy CS7: Design* sets a number of criteria against which development proposals will be assessed.

**Parking provision should seek to meet parking needs in ways that do not harm the streetscene of a development. Over provision of parking could detract from the overall aims of this policy which requires a balanced approach to parking standards.**

- *Policy CS21: Retail Development in Town Centres* promotes the choice of modes of transport in retail development and improves access to key services and facilities.
- *Policy CS22: Out of Town Centre Retail Development* states that development will not be permitted unless accessible by a choice of means of transport amongst other criteria.
- *Policy CS23: Transport* states that the Council, will use its planning and transport powers promote alternative modes of travel.

**These policies do not support the over provision of parking provision which could undermine sustainability by not promoting choice of modes of transport.**

***Local Transport Plan Core Strategy and Implementation Plan (LTP3)(2011)***

**1.7** Policy TP16: Parking states the Council's overall policy for parking which is:

*The Council will continue to facilitate the provision of parking in the Borough through:*

- *The use of Development Management to bring about appropriate parking provision in all forms of new development and redevelopment within an overall Parking Strategy.*
- *Improving the provision, quality, convenience and security of public parking facilities for cycles.*
- *Improving the quality, security and convenience of public car parks.*
- *Managing car parking to support sustainable local facilities.*
- *Promoting dedicated parking bays with recharging points for electric vehicles.*
- *The Parking Strategy which sets out council provision of on street parking within the borough, provision of public parking areas and the role of enforcement within those provisions.*

**This is the Local Highway Authority's overall policy for parking in the Borough. The Parking Standards SPD will help to deliver this policy strand relating to new development.**

## **B. Census 2011 Data**

**1.8** This section reviews the latest statistics from the 2011 Census with regards to car ownership levels across the Borough and compares them with the previous count in 2001.

**One key point is that the existing parking standards for new development generally fit with the actual levels of car/van ownership.**

**1.9** The tables in Appendix 1 provide comparisons between both censuses and the following paragraphs pick out the key points and analysis.

**1.10** Appendix 1, Table 1 shows the average car ownership per household in the Borough has risen from 1.4 cars per household in 2001 to 1.5 in 2011. The average for the developments in the recent resident's survey was 1.53 (see section C below).

**1.11** Tables 2 and 3 of Appendix 1 show the number of cars/vans per household for 2001 and 2011. Table 3 shows the difference between both Census dates showing increases in green and decreases in red. The headlines are:

- The total number of cars increased by 6291 from 2001 and 2011 vehicles compared to an increase of 2,486 households with the total number of vehicles in 2001 being 62,083 rising to 68,374 by 2011.
- The make-up of cars/vans per household in 2011 was:
  - 6275 households with no cars/vans (13.7% of all households).
  - 17,818 households with 1 car/van (38.8%).
  - 16,656 households with 2 cars/vans (36.3).
  - 3,794 households with 3 cars/vans (8.3%).
  - 1,335 households with 4 or more (2.9%).
- There have been increases in the numbers households with cars/vans as follows:
  - 321 more households with 1 car/van (+1.5%);
  - 1,127 more with 2 (+1.5%);
  - 729 more with 3 (+1.2%); and,
  - 341 more with 4 or more vehicles (+0.6%).
- Within the individual wards, most of the percentage increases/decreases as a proportion of each household category between 2001 and 2011 have been minor (under 2%).
- Focusing on increases/decreases greater than 3% in each household category, the following points are highlighted:
  - College Town has seen a drop of 4.7% as a proportion of households with 2 cars/van from 2001 to 2011 (i.e. 41% of households in this ward had 2 in 2001 falling to 36.3% in 2011).
  - Crown Wood saw a decrease of 3.5% of its proportion of households with 1 car or van (47.4% in 2001 compared to 43.9% in 2011).
  - Great Hollands North has seen a fall of 5% in the proportion with no vehicles (20.3% in 2001 and 15.3 in 2011). This ward has also: seen a 3.8% decrease in 1 vehicle households (44.1% in 2001 to 40.3% in 2011). These falls in proportion have been at the expense of a large proportional increase in households with 2 cars/vans of 8.5% (27.2% of households in Great Holland North in 2001 rising to 35.7% in 2011).
  - Harmans Water has seen a fall of 3% of household with 1 car or van (44.6% proportion in 2001 falling to 41.6% proportion in 2011).
  - Old Bracknell has seen an increased proportion of 2 or more cars/vans of 3.5% (25.5% proportion in 2001 rising to 29% in 2011).
  - Priestwood and Garth has seen a fall by proportion in no car ownership of 3% (26.7% in 2001 to 23.7% in 2011).
  - In Warfield Harvest Ride there has been a 6% drop in 1 car households (38% in 2001 to 32% in 2011) but a 3.4% increase in 2 car households (50.2% in 2001 and 53.5% in 2011).
  - Wildridings and Central has seen a fall in households with no car/van of 3.4% (29.8% in 2001 to 26.4% in 2011).
  - Winkfield and Cranborne has seen a 5.2% decrease in 2 car households (41.7% in 2001 to 36.5% in 2011).

**1.12** From the Census information the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Whilst car ownership has increased from 2001, the increases have been small scale.
- Where there are high increases by percentage within wards (e.g. Great Hollands North and Harmans Water) this is explained by the large new developments being built in these wards leading to an increase in households resulting in more cars/vans.
- The average number of cars per household for each ward in 2011 can be compared to the results in the residents' survey of new developments (see Appendix 1, Table 1). This shows that most of the new developments are consistent with the census findings. However, Wykery Copse has a high level of ownership (1.92 cars/vans per household) which is not consistent with the ward figure. Table 5 indicates that it is because of a high proportion of 3 bedroom dwellings with 1 of their allocated spaces being a garage (which is often not used for car parking). Locational factors might also contribute to this high average car/van ownership.

**1.13** When combining the number of households with 1 car/van with those having 2 cars/vans it accounted for 75.1% of all households in 2011 (compared with 76.1% in 2001). There are similar results between both censuses for overall provision also which validates the rationale that the parking standards need minor revisions rather than wholesale changes.

## C. New Developments Residents' Survey

**1.14** A survey of residents in new developments was undertaken in July 2014. The results were published in September 2014 and can be found on this link: (<http://www.bracknell-forest.gov.uk/new-developments-residents-report.pdf>). Consultancy Qa Research was commissioned to ask residents of new developments their opinions on a number of issues relating to their homes, the wider development and the neighbourhood. They were also asked a number of questions about car ownership and parking habits, problems and desires. The survey is published alongside the Consultation Draft Parking Standards SPD.

**1.15** The key observations that can be made from this analysis are:

- **Generally, for market housing the existing residential parking standards meet the recorded levels of car/van ownership but parking was still seen as a problem for many.**
- **Garages are under-utilised for parking cars leading to on-street parking problems**
- **Garages were cited as being too small for car parking and used for storage instead.**
- **Affordable housing development has generally lower car/van ownership levels than market housing which means that there is a need for more flexibility in provision.**

Other findings relevant to parking provision were:

- There is low satisfaction with parking provision from the sample (3%, See Figure 24 of the survey) and high dissatisfaction. Two of the three things least liked about the development people lived in related to a lack of parking (23%) and badly parked vehicles (21%), Figure 25.
- 36% stated that parking is one of the three things that most needs improving (Figure 27).

- The vast majority (90%) of households have 1 or more cars. 37% have 1 car, 47% have 2, and 6% have 3 or more; while only 9% are without any car or van (Figure 33).
- Car (or van) ownership is 1.53 vehicles per household on average (Figure 34).
- Of the larger developments, The Parks has an average of 1.64 (Figure 35) and Jennetts Park 1.67, Figure 36).
- Wykery Copse has the highest average vehicle ownership (1.92, Figure 26) and a high proportion of allocated spaces being used daily (98%). On this development, of those with a garage, 67% say their garage is too small, 45% use their garage daily and 100% say their garage is used for storage and 92% say there is not enough parking (all Figure 41).
- Davey Place has the lowest average car/van ownership at 0.92 per household (Figure 26).
- Developments with a high proportion of market housing generally have a high car ownership at 90% and social housing developments generally have a lower percentage (in the range 67% - 72%) (Figure 34).
- Less than a quarter of households (23%) use their garage for parking on a daily basis (Figure 37).
- Of the households who do not use their garages, 73% say this is because it is used for storage and 40% say it is too small (Figure 38).
- When householders are asked why they park on the street, 52% said it was because they needed more space than is allocated and 28% said it was because there is nowhere else to park (Figure 39).
- A majority (60%) of all respondents said that there is not adequate parking for their needs compared to 36% who said there is (Figure 40).

**1.16** The residents survey indicates a number of issues that should be addressed, these are:

- Car ownership at an average of just over 1.5 per household is not as high as might have been predicted, and does not suggest that the Council's current parking standards are too low. This indicates that there is no overriding need to completely change standards. Minor changes are necessary though to allow more flexibility in their application in appropriate situations and where this is properly justified and/or where alternative measures are proposed.
- The findings suggest that a lower standard may be appropriate for affordable housing.
- Garages, whilst counting towards parking provision under the current standards, are often not being used for parking.
- Whilst a high proportion of respondents stated that they are unhappy with parking provision, it should be noted that the actual stated car ownership is not far off the standards of provision on the site. This suggests that minor revisions to the standards might be required. It may also be worth looking at how efficiently the overall parking provision is being used – for example is the balance between allocated and unallocated spaces appropriate.
- Within the phases of The Parks and Jennetts Park there are variations in ownership with some showing lower than average car ownership against the other phases. This appears to apply to parcels containing affordable dwellings which have a similar average number of cars per household as the other affordable dwelling schemes such as Chadwick Mews.
- Appendix 1, Table 5 shows which of the developments were built in accordance to the Parking Standards SPD and those which were not. Comments on the parking for each development explains why there may be some negative responses coming out of the residents' survey.

- Appendix 1, Table 5 also shows that many of the developments were not built to the BFC parking standards which may contribute to the recorded dissatisfaction.

## D. Officer Considerations

**1.17** A number of issues have been identified which should be addressed through the new Parking Standards SPD including:

- how the standards impact and how they might need to change;
- changes in design standards; and,
- advances in technology.

### ***Local Highway Authority***

**1.18** Regarding residential parking provision, there is a need to address the issue of displacement of parking onto the street (roads and footways) from the lack of use of garages for on-plot parking. The Council has received numerous complaints and requests to deal with on-street parking issues. There is concern that even making garages larger for combined parking and storage will still not guarantee cars will be parked in them. There is a need to ensure that streets can safely operate and function for residents and accessibly by large service vehicles and emergency vehicles. There may be a need for combined measures to accompany larger garages such as imposing conditions on the use of garages and /or other regulation. There should be reference to how the use of car ports provides a usable alternative with a similar land take to a garage. Further in respect to residential standards the current Parking Standards omits visitor parking which needs to be addressed

**1.19** If parking courts are to be relied upon, there is a need to ensure they designed to be visible, easy to park in, with easy access to properties they serve. This has implications for greater land take but will be essential if they are to be fully utilised.

**1.20** Observations at schools in the borough supported by mode of travel to school data, show that there are a significant number of parents who choose to drive their children to school. Parking generally occurs as close to the school gate as restrictions will allow, which causes conflict with pedestrians and other road users and can impact on residential amenity. When contemplating parking at schools consideration should therefore be given to providing a degree of managed parent parking on site. Without an effective solution such pressure can cause safety concerns for vulnerable people (children) if not properly managed. New schools should recognise the likely impacts and provide adequate facilities as part of the proposal. Any expanded schools will need to consider current habits and introduce a raft of measures to provide and control parking as well as encourage the use of other facilities (park and stride locations) and increase travel by non-car modes.

**1.21** The standards for Churches need increasing (to more like 1 space per 4 seats for the main hall although further survey work may be required) based upon the experience of the Council and consideration to other operational spaces within churches because churches are now being used as community facilities which have considerably different demand compared to religious services. Reference to other religious facilities that have specific religious operations should be included as the parking impacts are quite different to a church.

With regard to Employment development, the most up-to-date employment densities should be used to increase parking standards slightly for B1 offices. This would help meet parking demand and also help meet the needs of local businesses, some of

which are trying to increase parking of their sites. There made be also a need to ensure there is flexibility if there is clear and robust evidence to demonstrate the need for less parking.

- 1.22 Other areas requiring further thought are restaurants with a drive through which can create issues with parking. The standards for nursing homes need to be expanded to consider dementia type care as well. Also there is a need to expand
- 1.23 The Council is currently undertaking a two-year trial for Residential Parking Zones. Should the trail prove to be successful and they are made permanent and there is a further expansion into other residential areas, then any new residential properties that are constructed within such zones need to provide adequate parking. This may also result in restricting new residents to visitor passes only to alleviate further vehicles parking in the street to avoid further pressure to that area.

#### ***Urban Design***

- 1.24 The Parking Standards SPD needs to balance a range of issues such as individual plot or garden size, amenity or landscaping in the streetscene. There is concern that losing garages altogether from the standards might meet resistance from developers because they are an important part of their marketing model. If garages are provided in addition to the required spaces (or if parking standards are increased generally) this would increase the land take for parking and could harm amenity, landscaping, house/garden sizes and/or reduce the density of development. If densities are lowered then site capacities will be reduced and more land will be required to deliver overall housing numbers. This would place more pressure on the countryside. Options for consideration should be developed.
- 1.25 Application of the standards should allow for flexibility (above or below normal standards) where clear evidence demonstrates that this is desirable and would not cause unacceptable problems. This approach could support a range of alternative solutions and allow the other benefits of development to be considered alongside parking provision. Mitigation measures may be required that promote alternative and more sustainable transport modes. Careful consideration needs to be given to various options and it should be ensured that the streetscene is not dominated by parked vehicles.
- 1.26 Forms of acceptable parking are on and off plot purposely designed spaces, car ports, parking barns, larger garages and well-designed parking courts. Further, the technical annexes require amending as they are out-of-date or not entirely clear in their intention. Revisions have been made to these annexes as shown in the Draft SPD taking account of the options for parking solutions as detail in Chapter 3. The finalised annexes should be produced in tandem with which options the Parking Standards SPD adopts.

#### ***Climate Change***

- 1.27 The Government has a vision that by 2050, almost every car and van in the UK will be an ultra-low emission vehicle (ULEV), i.e. a motor vehicle that emits extremely low (under 75g of CO<sub>2</sub> per km) levels of emissions – these are not necessarily fully electric as hybrids with small combustion engines also fit this category.
- 1.28 While owners of ULEVs are likely to install charging points at their own property, there will be a need for public access charging points for visitors and for those needing a top-up while parking in the borough.

- 1.29** There are various electric vehicle (EV) chargers available for residential, car park, and fleet use as well as fast chargers allowing users to charge up to 80% of the battery in 30 minutes. Suitable EV chargers should be installed in public parking areas to encourage and support the growth of ULEVs in the borough.
- 1.30** While “trickle” chargers might be suitable in long-term parking areas, such as the Station Car Park, fast chargers should be installed in Bracknell Town Centre and major leisure sites, where customers require a faster turn-around.
- 1.31** Hotter summers anticipated from a changing climate may increase the demand for shading of motor vehicles in public car parks. While shade structures would increase the cost of car parking, the structures could be used to generate solar electricity, which would provide an income stream to off-set the additional cost.
- 1.32** Climate change is predicted to result in more frequent and severe extreme weather events, including increased incidence of storms and flooding in the UK. Run-off from paved parking areas could increase the risk of localised flooding and damage to property. Consideration should be given to permeable parking surfaces or other sustainable drainage solutions.

## **E. Other Local Authority Standards**

- 1.33** Examples of up-to-date parking standards from three local authorities (a Unitary, County, District Council and London) have been reviewed. These are all considered relevant to Bracknell Forest in terms of high parking demand and the limited use of garages etc. The relevant part of the London Plan Implementation Framework covering electric charging points has also been reviewed.

### ***Wokingham Borough Council***

- 1.34** Wokingham published their parking standards in the Managing Development Delivery Document (Local Plan) (2014). Regarding residential standards they taken a formulaic approach based on empirical data where the amount of parking depends on type of dwelling, location and the amount of unallocated demand for spaces (i.e. off-plot parking). The limitations are that it is based on census 2001 data on a ward basis which reflects all development. However the Council are taking an approach which takes account of need from new development (section C above). Therefore, both methods are not necessarily compatible

### ***Essex County Council***

- 1.35** Essex CC’s Parking Standards Design and Good Practice document (2009) focuses on parking standards for all modes of transport and design guidance. It also clearly shows good and bad examples of parking provision which is a useful visual aid to developers. It states that for garages to be counted as part of the residential parking standards they need to be a minimum size to accommodate an average sized family car and additional storage.

### ***Fareham District Council***

- 1.36** Fareham has adopted a Residential Car and Cycle Parking SPD (2009) which has eight key requirements:
- Residential development provides parking in accordance to the standards
  - Lesser standards will only be considered in areas of high accessibility or specific residential development that creates lower parking demand subject to evidence

- Where 50% of spaces are allocated, an extra 0.2 visitor spaces per dwelling should be provided.
- 10% of all spaces must be disabled spaces with a 3.6m width
- Garages will not normally count towards overall parking provision unless it is demonstrated it is the only means of parking. Conditions to retain use for parking will also be sought
- Every sub-divided dwelling will be expected to meet the standards
- All new developments must provide appropriately located and designed cycle parking to meet the standards
- All new developments should follow the design principles in the SPD

### ***London Mayor***

- 1.37** The Land for Industry and Transport Supplementary Planning Guidance (2012) forms part of the London Plan 2011, Implementation Framework. This document supplements the London Plan strategy to gear up London for an increase in electric vehicle charging. It cites evidence that 16% of vehicles will be electric in 2020 increasing to 60% by 2030. The document provides technical and implementation guidance to help meet the target for 20% of parking spaces to be active (full provision of infrastructure and charging points) and 20% to be passive (the infrastructure and cabling in place for easy adaption in the future). The conclusions are that the Council should consider options for a similar level of type and provision.

## **F. Employment Survey and Employment Density Review**

### ***Business Survey 2014 (Infrastructure) April 2015.***

- 1.38** A piece of research was undertaken on behalf of the Council seeking to engage with businesses in the borough to understand their views regarding local infrastructure. The research involved 350 telephone interviews with a range of businesses in 2014. Of these 291 were local companies; 29 national and 26 international companies. Of the questions asked, respondents gave a satisfaction rating between 1 and 5 ( with 1 being extremely poor and rating as excellent).
- 1.39** Regarding parking:
- 46% cent of respondents gave a score of 4 or 5 on the availability of car parking;
  - 64% felt there was sufficient available;
  - almost a third (31%) saying otherwise that there was not sufficient parking;
  - only 5% prioritised more availability of car parking as the most important aspect needed to improve the borough with 2% saying that the Council and partners could grow the Bracknell Forest economy by increasing its availability..
- 1.40** Of the third of respondents saying that there was not sufficient parking, when asked where the biggest problems were:
- Bracknell town centre (41%)
  - Crowthorne (13%)
  - Sandhurst 12 (12%)
  - Residential estates (11%)
  - Everywhere (10%)
  - Railway station areas (7%)
  - Great Hollands (5%)
  - Industrial estates (3%)
  - Ascot 2 (2%)
  - Other (7%)

- Don't know (2%)

**1.41** These respondents were also asked if their organisation does anything to help provide parking for employees with 41% saying parking is provided on the premises and a fifth (21%) say they park at home/ work from home.

**1.42** Overall there are some concerns with the availability of parking and that the main area of concern is the availability of parking within Bracknell Town Centre. As a result it is necessary to including extra within the SPD to help business where appropriate and that there may need to be a review of Bracknell Town Centre standards as the regeneration takes hold.

### ***Employment densities***

**1.43** The employment densities used in the 2007 Parking Standards are out of date (source: Berkshire Employment Density Study (1998)) and need to be revised. It is proposed that the evidence base for updating parking standards for various employment related uses is based upon the Homes and Communities Agency Employment Densities Guide 2010 (2<sup>nd</sup> edition) as follows:

**Table 1**

Use Class	Use	Metres <sup>2</sup>
<b>Industrial</b>		
B2	General	36 GIA <a href="#">see Note 1</a>
B1(c)	Light Industry (business park)	47 NIA <a href="#">Note 2</a>
<b>Warehouse and distribution</b>		
B8	General	70 GEA <a href="#">Note 3</a>
B8	Large Scale and High Bay Warehousing	80 GEA
<b>Office</b>		
B1(a)	General Office	12 NIA
B1(a)	Call centres	8 NIA
B1(a)	IT/Data Centres	47 NIA
B1(a)	Business Park	10 NIA
B1(a)	Serviced Office	10 NIA
<b>Retail</b>		
A1	High Street	19 NIA
A1	Food superstores	17 NIA
A1	Other superstores / Retail Warehouses	90 NIA
A2	Financial and professional services	16 NIA
A3	Restaurants and cafes	18 NIA
<b>Leisure and Visitor Attractions</b>		
C1	Budget Hotels	1 employee per 3 bedrooms plus casual staff
C1	General Hotels (3 star)	1 employee per 2 bedrooms
C1	4/5 Star Hotels	1 employee per 1.25 bedrooms
D1	Cultural Attractions	36 GIA
D2	Cinemas	9 GIA
D2 <a href="#">Note 4</a>	Amusement and entertainment centres	70 GIA
D2	Sports centres and private clubs	65 GIA

**Notes:**

Note 1 – GIA - Gross Internal Area (floorspace m<sup>2</sup>)

Note 2 – NIA - Net Internal Area (floorspace m<sup>2</sup>)

Note 3 – GEA – Gross External Area (floorspace m<sup>2</sup>)

Note 4 – Some Sui Generis use classes are applicable – includes laundrettes, taxi businesses, car hire businesses, filling stations, scrap yards, shops selling or displaying motor vehicles for sale, retail warehouse clubs, hostels, theatres, amusement arcades and centres, fun fairs, night clubs and casinos.

## **G. Places of Worship**

**1.44** All existing places of worship were contacted by the Council for their opinions on parking needs. Appendix 2 details the responses to the questions asked in this survey. In summary, parking issues are mixed for places of worship where the age of the building and its site is a factor as is the location. Obviously where people live within easy walking distance the majority of the congregation walks, however, those less able require on-site or easy accessible parking nearby. In certain situations parking is at a premium and better solutions are needed. There cannot be an overall conclusion drawn from the results to justify a blanket ratio especially when places of worship have wider community uses and hire out there facility for community an income generation. Therefore, parking requirements for places of worship should be on a case-by case basis.

Appendix 1

Table 1

Borough/Ward	2001 Census Average No. of Cars or Vans per Household	2011 Census Average No. of Cars or Vans per Household	Residents survey site	Residents survey Sample Average No. of Cars or Vans per Household
Bracknell Forest	1.4	1.5	All sites	1.53
Ascot	1.6	1.7		
Binfield with Warfield	1.7	1.7	Wykery Copse	1.92
			Jadine Place	1.31
Bullbrook	1.2	1.2	Davey Place	0.92
			Kelvin Gate	0.96
Central Sandhurst	1.5	1.6		
College Town	1.6	1.6		
Crown Wood	1.4	1.4		
Crowthorne	1.5	1.6	78-84 Waterloo Road	1.00
			Kings Court	1.33
Great Hollands North	1.3	1.4	Jennetts Park	1.67
Great Hollands South	1.6	1.6		
Hanworth	1.3	1.4		
Harmans Water	1.3	1.3	Rufford Gate	1.75
			The Parks	1.64
Little Sandhurst and Wellington	1.7	1.7		
Old Bracknell	1.2	1.2	Chadwick Mews	0.93
			Dalton Mews	1.67
			Netherby Gardens	1.13
Owlsmoor	1.7	1.7		
Priestwood and Garth	1.1	1.2		
Warfield Harvest Ride	1.6	1.7		
Wildridings and Central	1.0	1.1	Windermere Gate	1.36
Winkfield and Cranborne	1.7	1.7		

**Table 2: Car or Van Availability (KS404EW) March 2011**

Borough /Ward	All Households	No Cars or Vans in Household		1 Car or Van in Household		2 Cars or Vans in Household		3 Cars or Vans in Household		4 or more cars or Vans in Household		All cars or Vans in the Area
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
<b>Bracknell Forest</b>	<b>45,878</b>	<b>6,275</b>	<b>13.7</b>	<b>17,818</b>	<b>38.8</b>	<b>16,656</b>	<b>36.3</b>	<b>3,794</b>	<b>8.3</b>	<b>1,335</b>	<b>2.9</b>	<b>68,374</b>
Ascot	2,228	186	8.3	804	36.1	922	41.4	231	10.4	85	3.8	3,730
Binfield with Warfield	3,534	250	7.1	1,228	34.7	1,560	44.1	357	10.1	139	3.9	6,045
Bullbrook	2,531	593	23.4	1,042	41.2	676	26.7	166	6.6	54	2.1	3,122
Central Sandhurst	2,124	208	9.8	824	38.8	820	38.6	201	9.5	71	3.3	3,362
College Town	2,055	208	10.1	831	40.4	746	36.3	192	9.3	78	3.8	3,239
Crown Wood	3,381	415	12.3	1,483	43.9	1,162	34.4	252	7.5	69	2	4,866
Crowthorne	2,095	283	13.5	707	33.7	824	39.3	209	10	72	3.4	3,301
Great Hollands North	2,188	335	15.3	882	40.3	781	35.7	151	6.9	39	1.8	3,061
Great Hollands South	1,910	255	13.4	679	35.5	723	37.9	187	9.8	66	3.5	2,964
Hanworth	3,476	507	14.6	1,495	43	1,167	33.6	239	6.9	68	2	4,841
Harmans Water	3,420	637	18.6	1,422	41.6	1,060	31	222	6.5	79	2.3	4,560
Little Sandhurst and Wellington	2,006	184	9.2	659	32.9	833	41.5	232	11.6	98	4.9	3,465
Old Bracknell	2,402	492	20.5	1,057	44	697	29	120	5	36	1.5	2,963
Owlsmoor	1,997	150	7.5	645	32.3	889	44.5	222	11.1	91	4.6	3,483
Priestwood and Garth	3,191	757	23.7	1,285	40.3	863	27	223	7	63	2	3,970
Warfield Harvest Ride	3,112	120	3.9	997	32	1,665	53.5	255	8.2	75	2.4	5,409
Wildridings and Central	2,073	548	26.4	915	44.1	482	23.3	93	4.5	35	1.7	2,302
Winkfield and Cranborne	2,155	147	6.8	863	40	786	36.5	242	11.2	117	5.4	3,691

Crown Copyright 2013

**Table 3: Cars or Vans - (Table KS17) March 2001**

Borough /Ward	All Households	No Cars or Vans in Household		1 Car or Van in Household		2 Cars or Vans in Household		3 Cars or Vans in Household		4 or more cars or Vans in Household		All cars or Vans in the Area
		Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count	%	Count
<b>Bracknell Forest</b>	<b>43,392</b>	<b>6,307</b>	<b>14.5</b>	<b>17,497</b>	<b>40.3</b>	<b>15,529</b>	<b>35.8</b>	<b>3,065</b>	<b>7.1</b>	<b>994</b>	<b>2.3</b>	<b>62,083</b>
Ascot	2038	222	10.9	714	35.0	850	41.7	189	9.3	63	3.1	3247
Binfield with Warfield	3234	221	6.8	1157	35.8	1479	45.7	294	9.1	83	2.6	5376
Bullbrook	2102	516	24.6	848	40.3	592	28.2	105	5.0	41	2.0	2535
Central Sandhurst	2168	241	11.1	829	38.2	856	39.5	171	7.9	71	3.3	3353
College Town	1979	170	8.6	780	39.4	811	41.0	164	8.3	54	2.7	3135
Crown Wood	3503	439	12.5	1661	47.4	1189	33.9	176	5.0	38	1.1	4738
Crowthorne	1923	306	15.9	667	34.7	729	37.9	146	7.6	75	3.9	2887
Great Hollands North	1634	331	20.3	720	44.1	444	27.2	109	6.7	30	1.8	2064
Great Hollands South	1950	221	11.3	732	37.5	735	37.7	202	10.4	60	3.1	3060
Hanworth	3606	577	16.0	1596	44.3	1150	31.9	219	6.1	64	1.8	4829
Harmans Water	3074	582	18.9	1371	44.6	873	28.4	193	6.3	55	1.8	3935
Little Sandhurst and Wellington	1900	178	9.4	614	32.3	813	42.8	216	11.4	79	4.2	3222
Old Bracknell	1951	410	21.0	935	47.9	498	25.5	84	4.3	24	1.2	2290
Owlsmoor	2064	157	7.6	704	34.1	939	45.5	202	9.8	62	3.0	3448
Priestwood and Garth	3106	829	26.7	1338	43.1	748	24.1	137	4.4	54	1.7	3484
Warfield Harvest Ride	3322	141	4.2	1261	38.0	1666	50.2	209	6.3	45	1.4	5409
Wildridings and Central	2125	633	29.8	951	44.8	442	20.8	77	3.6	22	1.0	2163
Winkfield and Cranborne	1713	133	7.8	619	36.1	715	41.7	172	10.0	74	4.3	2908

Crown Copyright 2003

**Table 4: Difference 2001 -2011**

Borough /Ward	All Households	No Cars or Vans in Household		1 Car or Van in Household		2 Cars or Vans in Household		3 Cars or Vans in Household		4 or more cars or Vans in Household		All cars or Vans in the Area
		Count	% Diff	Count	% Diff	Count	% Diff	Count	% Diff	Count	% Diff	Count
<b>Bracknell Forest</b>	<b>2,486</b>	<b>-32</b>	<b>-0.8</b>	<b>321</b>	<b>-1.5</b>	<b>1,127</b>	<b>0.5</b>	<b>729</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>341</b>	<b>0.6</b>	<b>6,291</b>
Ascot	190	-36	-2.6	90	1.1	72	-0.3	42	1.1	22	0.7	483
Binfield with Warfield	300	29	0.3	71	-1.1	81	-1.6	63	1.0	56	1.3	669
Bullbrook	429	77	-1.2	194	0.9	84	-1.5	61	1.6	13	0.2	587
Central Sandhurst	-44	-33	-1.3	-5	0.6	-36	-0.9	30	1.6	0	0.0	9
College Town	76	38	1.5	51	1.0	-65	-4.7	28	1.0	24	1.1	104
Crown Wood	-122	-24	-0.2	-178	-3.5	-27	0.5	76	2.5	31	0.9	128
Crowthorne	172	-23	-2.4	40	-1.0	95	1.4	63	2.4	-3	-0.5	414
Great Hollands North	554	4	-5.0	162	-3.8	337	8.5	42	0.2	9	0.0	997
Great Hollands South	-40	34	2.1	-53	-2.0	-12	0.2	-15	-0.6	6	0.4	-96
Hanworth	-130	-70	-1.4	-101	-1.3	17	1.7	20	0.8	4	0.2	12
Harmans Water	346	55	-0.3	51	-3.0	187	2.6	29	0.2	24	0.5	625
Little Sandhurst and Wellington	106	6	-0.2	45	0.6	20	-1.3	16	0.2	19	0.7	243
Old Bracknell	451	82	-0.5	122	-3.9	199	3.5	36	0.7	12	0.3	673
Owlsmoor	-67	-7	-0.1	-59	-1.8	-50	-1.0	20	1.3	29	1.6	35
Priestwood and Garth	85	-72	-3.0	-53	-2.8	115	2.9	86	2.6	9	0.3	486
Warfield Harvest Ride	-210	-21	-0.3	-264	-6.0	-1	3.4	46	1.9	30	1.1	0
Wildridings and Central	-52	-85	-3.4	-36	-0.6	40	2.5	16	0.9	13	0.7	139
Winkfield and Cranborne	442	14	-1.0	244	3.9	71	-5.2	70	1.2	43	1.1	783

**Table 5 –Number of cars or vans by development with officer comments**

Development	Base	Percentage with net: Any cars/van	Mean number of cars/vans	Built to current parking standards	Officer observations/comments
Wykery Copse	53	98%	1.92	YES	Considerable amount of 3 bed units with one space in a garage.
Rufford Gate	8	100%	1.75	NO	Previous applications under old standards. Many units with one space in a garage, no visitor parking
Davey Place	12	67%	0.92	YES	Resident parking to standard on site no visitor parking due to public car park adjacent
New Manor House	-	-	-	YES	Parking 1 space per unit, exceeds TC standard
Jadine Place	13	92%	1.31	YES	Many units with 1 space in a garage
Chadwick Mews	31	71%	0.93	YES	No garages, most parking in front of units some rear parking courts
Dalton Mews	6	100%	1.67	YES	Limited garages, car ports and open parking
Windermere Gate	11	91%	1.36	NO	3 bed units have 2 spaces 2 bed units have average of 1.5 spaces. No garages all open parking
Netherby Gardens	8	88%	1.13	NO	All open parking and at least 1.5 space per dwelling
78 – 84 Waterloo Road	2	100%	1.00	YES	Rear parking courts for the houses and garages make up a large part of the parking stock.
Kelvin Gate	75	72%	0.96	NO	Planning appeal allowed at 1 space per unit. Private management company operates parking restrictions.
Kings Court	3	100%	1.33		
Old Tollgate Close	-	-	-	YES	Large properties with garages but many have 2 on plot parking spaces as well.
The Parks	159	96%	1.64	NO	Consented under previous standards, many parts have parking to standards but garages are not to current size.
Jennetts Park	238	93%	1.67	YES	Parking provision varies across the development older parts under previous standards, later consents to current standards including visitor provision
Total	619	90%	1.53		

**(Source: Data from Figure 34. From Qa Research results)**



Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
Holy Ghost Catholic Church 51 New Wokingham Road, Crowthorne	250	9	No	No	Nearby streets	Overspill of parking into neighbouring residential streets can, at peak times, cause congestion and upset the residents. Traveller's funerals and weddings always present parking challenges and usually block the road.	Sundays between 10.45am and 12.00noon and weddings and funerals, on any given day.	n/a	n/a



Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
Holy Trinity Church, The Ring									
New Covenant Church, Crowthorne Rd North	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received
The Methodist Church, Shepherds Lane	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received	No response received
St Peter's Hatchet Lane, Cranbourne	120	No onsite parking – all parking is on Hatchet Lane	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	Sundays at 11 am plus occasional weddings and funerals	Indoor bowling on Thursday afternoons – few cars. Vicar's tea party on first Thursday of each month – few cars. Pre-school worship on first Friday of each month – few cars	n/a

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
Parish Church of St John the Baptist, Waterloo Road, Crowthorne	No response received	No Car Park. People park in the surrounding roads.	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
St Andrew's, Priestwood Court Road	150	12 & no disabled designated	St Andrews has 12 spaces. But the community centre car park and the Admiral Cunningham car park are close by. So although parking is not adequate at St Andrews there is close by provision.	One size doesn't fit all. The urban context of St Andrews means yes. The rural context of St Mikes means no.	n/a	n/a	St Andrews is Sunday's mainly.	youth group, kids groups, toddlers groups, Brownines	n/a

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
St Mark's Church, Popeswood Road	200	15	No	No	parking on the roads around the churches.	n/a	At ST Marks, Sunday morning, Monday morning, Friday evening, Saturday morning.	St Marks doubles up as a hall and church so gets used for services on a Sunday and midweek at lunchtime and in the evening once a month, keep fit, youth club, prayer meetings, clothes sorting for clothesbank, meetings, coffee mornings.	Is there a grant that would help us to create more parking spaces around St Marks?

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
All Saints Church, Church Hill/Terrace Rd North	500	20	No	No	parking on the roads around the churches.	At All Saints the roads are not very wide and the church is on a blind corner which makes crossing difficult for those with children and those who are less mobile.	Sunday mornings at All Saints mainly. Some Weddings which are mainly on Saturdays, some Funerals	n/a	n/a
St Martin's, Church Road, Chavey Down	60-80	45-50 parking spaces	yes	yes	<i>The provision meets our need. The local community however need further parking so frequently use the church car park</i>	None	<i>It is in constant use as the church car park includes the hall.</i>	<i>The hall is used by the community for various activities including: brownies, bridge, keep fit, most afternoons and evenings</i>	No

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
St Mary's, Church Road, Winkfield	250 pew spaces	15	No	No	On road Parking	Insufficient parking spaces for weddings, baptisms and funerals and special services	Church related activity meetings	n/a	n/a
Kerith Centre Church Road, Bracknell	650 seated, 1000 standing	2 Disabled, 55 regular	No	No	Hire of the Bracknell and Wokingham College Car park for Sunday Meetings	Not enough spaces for Sunday Meetings, Unauthorised parking by students and shoppers/town workers during week preventing spaces being used by church visitors	Sunday (All Day) Mon pm/Tues am/Fri am during our mothers and toddlers group sessions	Yes, as above as well as social justice ministries including Foodbank, job club, conferences, prayer meetings etc. Daily Mon - Sun	Parking is a continual struggle as the church and social justice needs of the community grows

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
St Michaels, Church Lane, Warfield	240	46 & 4 disabled	However, St Michaels often exceed this with children's activities and parents and toddlers etc. The car park has recently been extended to cope with the demand. It now has 50 spaces. So working with your 1:10 model. Nevertheless the rural location of St Mikes means everyone has to drive, so car parking is often a	One size doesn't fit all. The urban context of St Andrews means yes. The rural context of St Mikes means no.	Unfortunately the park on the verges at St Mikes and cause our neighbours some difficulties.	n/a	St Mikes is Sunday, Monday and Friday	St Mikes is youth group, kids groups, toddlers groups, etc.	n/a

Location	The capacity of your place of worship (number of seats available)?	The number of on-site parking spaces (including disabled parking provision)?	Whether this provision meets your current demand?	Whether the current provision meets your anticipated future demand?	If your parking provision does not meet your current demand, how is the demand met (nearby car parks or streets etc.)?	What are your parking issues/problems, if any?	What are the peak times and days for demand?	Do you use your facility for other community uses and if so, what use and when?	Any other comments?
			problem. While the ratio remains 1:10 we will not be able to increase provision further so a lower ratio would help us here. Say 1:8 or even 1:5						
St Joseph's Catholic Church, Stanley Walk	500	40 (2 disabled)	Nope	No	used to be able to park in BFC service yard D, however now part off regeneration town centre, so normally Princess Sq.	Not enough spaces	Saturday 6pm, Sunday 8.30 , 10.30, tues/weds/thurs 9.30, Friday midday	Toddler groups, spiritual groups, youth & elderly groups	ongoing - bollards installation,