

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
<b>Andrew Jones</b>		<p>What is the point of your asking residents of Farnham for our suggestions as to the parking needs of the town when I believe it is the case that some of our own Waverley councillors and the developers Crest Nicholson, hoping to push through a major redevelopment scheme now referred to by many locals as Woolmead 2, deliberately misled us and your Planning Department by pretending that one of the towns' largest and longest established car parks, on the site of a long-demolished cinema, doesn't actually exist? If the scheme goes ahead, this car park and the 80-odd spaces it currently provides will be lost. I trust that you will take this into consideration when preparing your guidelines. You might like to check that this is the case with councillor Carole King.</p>	<p>The proposed guidelines are not intended to address public pay and display car parks. The East Street development already has approval so increased parking provision on site could not be required retrospectively.</p>	None
<b>Pamela Pownall</b>	South Farnham Residents Association	<p>We believe that the minimum levels set are not adequate. Such low levels of on site parking provision equate to "planning for chaos" because these proposed levels :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) do not reflect the current emerging trends of house occupation in the South East</li> <li>2) do not acknowledge the physical limitations of Waverley's narrow roads with the congestion already being experienced</li> <li>3) do not acknowledge the increasing tendency of Surrey Highways to restrict on road parking.</li> </ol>	<p>Noted – the guideline figures are being increased. Also comment that the residential parking guidelines are expressed as a minimum. This does not preclude the provision of additional parking where space permits</p>	<p>Guideline figures increased and note added to make it clear that where space permits additional residential parking can be provided</p>
		<p>The council acknowledges that the average car ownership in Waverley is 1.5 cars per household. It further states on page 4, para.4.7 that " In Waverley practical alternatives to the car are fairly limited" and on page 6, para.4.9 " It is accepted that in Waverley, in most cases, local residents' principal means of travel will be by car" - so it is unlikely that there is going to be any change from car ownership and usage to using public transport. It should also be remembered that these are minimum standards and that these levels include provision for visitors.</p>	See comments above	See above

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
		<p>On a practical note, what is the meaning of providing 1.5 parking spaces for a dwelling? This designation may have some sense as an average stipulation for a block of flats, but it is meaningless as a standard for an individual new house being built. Two spaces should be the minimum for any dwelling of 2 bedrooms, especially as there is the need to accommodate visitors as well. At the current proposed level of 1(town centre) and 1.5 (rest of Waverley), it is inevitable that cars will need to be parked in the road. This would contravene the stipulations of the Surrey Local Transport Plan which has as an objective to "reduce congestion caused by parked vehicles". (See also 2 and 3 above)</p>	See comments above	See above
		<p>Because of the lack of affordable homes in the Waverley area, it is an increasing trend to see school leavers and those finishing their tertiary education returning to live at home rather than buying or renting their own properties. As a result, a 3 bedroom house will most likely accommodate parents and at least one child. Given the limitations expressed above by the Council about public transport, it is probable that the child/children will also need to have a car of some sort. A parking stipulation for a 3 bedroom house of 1.5 (town centre) or 2 (rest of Waverley) is respectively meaningless and inadequate. To include visitor provision as well and avoid overspill onto the roads, the lower limits should be 3 and 4.</p> <p>For larger houses, the scale should be raised in similar proportion.</p>	See comments above	See above
		<p>As a general principle, on site parking provision levels will presumably be arrived at for justifiable and sound reasons. The minimum on site parking stipulation will act as a material consideration in planning applications. It is therefore hard to understand the note to appendix 2 which states "If it is considered that the number of spaces required is more than is necessary, information should be submitted with the application to justify a decreased provision". Surely a minimum standard should be a minimum standard? How is it possible to dispense with a material consideration at will? This note should be deleted.</p>	Whilst the residential guidelines are expressed as the minimum normally expected, it is right to have some flexibility to respond to particular local circumstances	None

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
John Sharkey	University of the Creative Arts	The university is content with the document's treatment of developments for Higher/Further Education (HFE), which is part of the D1 category, as the proposal is, effectively, that each proposal will be considered individually.	Noted	None
		However, UCA has a concern with that part of the document that deals with residential development. The guidelines seem to have been written with mainly "standard housing" in mind, and UCA fully recognises why that would be the case, given the make-up of most of the housing in the borough. However, it would seem to be inappropriate for those parking standards to be applied to purpose-built or purpose-adapted student residential accommodation, and UCA feels that such schemes should be treated in the same way as HFE (D1) developments i.e. "individual assessment/justification."	Noted	Add text to commercial guidelines to include student accommodation
Madge Green		Since my husband became very disabled about a year ago; unable to walk without the aid of sticks and wheeled walking gadgets, we speedily observed the dearth of disabled parking spaces for such folk i.e. Castle Street, Farnham, the Central and Wagon Yard car parks; Waitrose too gets its valuable spaces quickly filled and so unavailable to the really needy.	Noted - this document is not however dealing with public pay and display car parking provision	None
		As we are all aware many more citizens will soon be slipping into old age – with its unavoidable frailties; the happy provision of many more disabled badge holders spaces, close to the shops, the banks and so on, will surely be a definite 'must' for our future health, wellbeing and happiness.	Noted - this document is not however dealing with public pay and display car parking provision	None
Phil Elisha		Over the week end I downloaded the above Draft Guide and noticed the total number of homes in Waverley stated 47176 I feel this may be not correct . Last year I contacted the rating department over other figures quoted on web page which were incorrect and the error was very low so it did no make a large difference . The data waste results states 51170 customers on Waverley and on Surrey 472380 last year (page 5).I hope the figures I have stated are incorrect because it will effect the other results in the draft.	Noted. However 2011 census data has not been published fully at time of production so 2001 census figures are used.	None

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
<b>Derrick Price</b>		Outside the town centres I believe insufficient parking provision is being proposed. Bearing in mind the relatively high penetration of vehicles in Waverley, I believe a more appropriate rule would be one car parking space per bedroom to be provided within the curtilage of the dwelling.	Noted – Guideline figure is being increased and comment that the residential parking guidelines are expressed as a minimum. This does not preclude the provision of additional parking where space permits	Guideline figure increased and note added to make it clear that where space permits additional residential parking can be provided
<b>Geoff Reeve</b>	Wadham & Isherwood	<p>Thank you for your letter of 25th May the contents of which I am interested to note for car parking for commercial development has become very much a crucial factor that prospective occupiers take into account when looking at new accommodation and unless there is adequate parking not buildings will be rejected out of hand.</p> <p>As a prime example of this we have been marketing Endeavour Place at Coxbridge Business Park for longer than I care to remember (I would estimate since early 2005) this development has undoubtedly suffered from the fact that the developers were only able to provide reduced parking standards and many potential purchasers/occupiers that have expressed interest have decided against proceeding due to the lack of adequate parking. We have been marketing the development with two other commercial specialists, Hollis Hockley and Kingstons on behalf of Durngate Developments.</p>	Change to say that the standards for non-residential development are not expressed as either a maximum or a minimum. Where a developer wishes to provide extra car parking then it would be necessary to justify this taking account of factors like the location and the current and future accessibility to other modes of transport.	Non-residential guidelines not expressed as a maximum
		It has therefore taken us some 6 years to finally dispose of these buildings although we still have one ground floor suite of 947 sq.ft. available now being offered at very competitive terms as per the attached. This suite will have the benefit of only 3 spaces but the accommodation could comfortably accommodate 8 staff, 10 being more likely, but this would obviously create a massive shortfall on parking. The majority of the companies who have inspected have picked up on the lack of parking and despite various attempts on behalf of the owners we have been unable to overcome the problem.	See comments above	None

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
		<p>It is I would suggest time that the reality of this situation, which is not of course restricted to this development, dawns on the Authorities for it is totally unrealistic to expect staff to arrive at work either by public transport or by cycle and particularly in outer town schemes. This is undoubtedly our experience at Endeavour Place, and this has caused considerable financial hardship to the developers and the funding company, for I would strongly suggest that had we been able to offer adequate parking, and despite the recession, the buildings would have been let far more speedily.</p>	See comments above	None
<p><b>David Butcher</b> <b>(Gregory Gray Associates)</b></p>	First Wessex	<p>It is noted that the Parking Guidelines in the main follow Surrey County Council's (SCC) January 2012 adopted guidance, but departs from it with regard to the residential parking element. The SCC guidelines are considered to be more flexible than what is being proposed in the Draft Waverley document and in particular takes into account the more sustainable nature of Town Centre locations. It sets a recommended guidance of only 1 space per unit for all sizes of development within the Town Centre location and also provides for greater flexibility based upon site characteristics than the proposed Waverley guidelines. It is therefore considered that Appendix 2 of the draft residential guidance should be amended to bring it more in line with that proposed in the Surrey CC January 2012 guidance.</p>	<p>One of the reasons for preparing the local guidelines was as a result of concerns that inadequate car parking was being provided in some residential developments. It is still open to a developer who considers that too much parking is required to put forward the local justification for providing a lower level of parking</p>	None
		See proposed table of standards in representation	See comments above	None
		<p>Waverley should also give consideration to including the use of off-site car parking such as town centre car parks to serve residential development in town and district centres. This allows for making the best use of previously developed land in the most sustainable locations and better use of existing facilities. A new policy should therefore be included within the Draft Parking Guidelines, as follows:</p> <p>“Where the proposal would support the regeneration of a town or district centre, applicants may consider the use of public parking or other off-site locations to meet the parking standard where these are within a reasonable walking distance of the development site.”</p>	<p>Noted - However it would not be appropriate as a matter of principle to assume that all parking needs can be met by using existing public car parks. There is still an expectation that provision for parking is made within the development</p>	None

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
		<p>Given sustainable locations, over-provision of parking spaces can lead to unnecessary reduction in important units. Therefore, as can be seen, the suggested amendments are designed to allow greater flexibility to maximise the redevelopment of existing brownfield sites in sustainable locations, particularly to meet the high demand for affordable housing.</p>	<p>Noted - however a driving force behind these guidelines is insufficient parking provision on developments, particularly around town centre locations. The proposed guidelines do allow a certain degree of flexibility and it would be up to the developer to justify decreased provision.</p>	<p>None</p>
<p><b>Parish Clerk</b></p>	<p>Wonersh Parish Council</p>	<p>WPC notes the broad thrust of policy drivers aiming to encourage sustainable transport and is generally supportive. There are, of course, considerable associated resource implications. For instance, WBC's draft core strategy (2.7) acknowledges that key matters to be considered in the promotion of new development include the encouragement of new and improved footpaths, bridleways and cycleways. Given current financial constraints, and their likely continuation, there is a severe risk that adequate provision, and particularly adequate improvement, will not take place. Evidence to date tends to support this contention. WPC recommends that improvement and maintenance of footpaths, bridleways and cycleways retain their high priority.</p>	<p>Noted however this is not a matter to be dealt with by this document</p>	<p>None</p>
		<p>WBC rightly draws attention to the high car ownership (4.3) in the area and the patchy provision of public transport (4.7ff). WPC agrees with the conclusion that there is no immediate reliable alternative to the car (4.9). Indeed, WPC suggests that, given the relatively affluent nature of the borough, it is unlikely that even if public transport were significantly improved that car ownership would be materially affected and that residential parking guidelines should reflect this situation.</p>	<p>Noted</p>	<p>None</p>
		<p>While WPC believes that this guidance is generally adequate it is concerned that in rural areas some development, particularly under use class A, may by adhering to this guidance provide inadequate parking facilities thereby leading to increased on-street parking in narrow lanes and roads.</p>	<p>Noted however the commercial guidelines are more generous for retail in particular in relation to rural settlements</p>	<p>None</p>

Name	Organisation (if applicable)	Response	Officer Response	Proposed Amendment (if any)
		WPC believes that the guidance is generally adequate. However, it suggests that specific reference be made to rural areas where on-street parking is already severely constrained and that in such cases the guidance be regarded as an absolute minimum with an expectation that more generous provision be made if at all possible.	Noted – Guideline figures being increased also comment that In relation to residential car parking the guidelines are expressed as a minimum, but also recognise that where space permits, additional provision may be justified.	Guideline figures increased and note added to make it clear that where space permits additional residential parking can be provided
		WPC note that the guidance recommends that “a parking management plan be prepared...where parking is an acknowledged problem”. WPC suggests that such a plan should be prepared under all circumstances.	Noted - However this provision relates specifically to parking at schools.	None
		While noting the suggestion that parking beneath or to the rear of buildings is a preferred solution (para 3) WPC believes that this is probably more appropriate to town setting rather than rural ones. In the latter case it believes that individual circumstances, in particular the existing street scene and the location and layout of neighbouring properties should be a principal concern.	Noted	Amend text in Appendix 4 to recognise that design standards and appropriate solutions to parking will vary from site to site, including between rural and urban environments.
		On-street parking (para 3), as per earlier comments, is often not a viable proposition in rural settings.	See comments above	See comment above

		With respect to the design of parking surfaces, WPC suggests stronger wording than “should be considered” be adopted. Climate change has the potential to result in more extreme weather conditions and new developments should accommodate this possibility. Furthermore, in rural areas, impermeable hard standing is often detrimental to the street scene and out of character with the neighbourhood.	This is a purely a guidance note. It would be for the Site Allocations and Development Management DPD to include development management policies on SUDs	None
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation (if applicable)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment (if any)</b>
<b>Jamie Melvin</b>	Natural England	We can see nothing within the above document that is likely to affect any of Natural England’s concerns and we therefore make a return of ‘no comment’.	Noted	None
<b>Patrick Blake</b>	Highways Agency	The HA will be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN. We have reviewed the consultation and do not have any comment at this time.	Noted	None
<b>John Kelly</b>	Berkeley Strategic	Each development location and site is unique and requires bespoke solutions in terms of parking. Guidance as to the quantum of parking should not be straitjacketed to minimum or maximum standards	Noted - It is considered that these Guidelines are flexible enough to respond to local circumstances. In relation to residential development, the guidelines allow for provision above the minimum where space allows. Where standards are expressed as a maximum, it is still open for a developer to put forward justification for providing a higher level of parking provision.	None
		The quantum as well as the location and arrangement of parking should be a balanced solution in terms of purchaser choice, site conditions and context, optimum residential layout and the encouragement of sustainable travel behaviour - this should be explicit in this guidance.	See comments above	None
		Residents want to park as close to their door as possible with the car either in view or within a secure garage.	The general design considerations make reference to this however states that it needs to be balanced against the need to maintain the overall design for the area.	None



		We do not agree with the statement that parking in front of buildings makes 'enclosure of space more difficult'. The guidance should refer to research undertaken and published by English Partnerships in the document 'Car Parking, What Works Where' (March 2006) which presents many case studies of parking to the front of dwellings successfully generating distinctive, creative responses to numerous layout conditions.	Noted - make reference to this document in the text	Amend text in Appendix 4 to note this guidance and outcomes of it.
<b>Name</b>	<b>Organisation (if applicable)</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Officer Response</b>	<b>Proposed Amendment (if any)</b>
		Rear parking courts come with a number of issues. If vehicles are out of site residents tend to park their vehicles in non-designated spaces to the front of their properties for safety/convenience	Noted	None
		Maximum standards further exacerbate on-street parking problems created by the rear parking courts. As well as the cluttered, uncontrolled appearance of additional cars, vehicles are sometimes parked in dangerous locations or in other cases adjacent to landscaped areas, where the action of access and egress out of vehicles causes damage to plants.	Amend to say that non-residential guidelines are not a maximum.	Amend to state that non-residential guidelines are not a maximum.
		In summary we support the refinement of County residential parking standards to the local level but submit that flexibility should be intrinsic to the guidance to allow developers to deliver sensitive and well thought out place making, with parking for both cars and cycle parking in appropriate locations attuned to resident requirements and expectations.	Noted - the guidelines do allow for a degree of flexibility.	None