

---

# Parking Supplementary Planning Document

---

**Consultation Statement  
February 2020**



**Elmbridge**

Borough Council

*... bridging the communities ...*



---

# Contents

---

1. Introduction .....	3
2. Draft Parking SPD 2020 consultation .....	5
3. The consultation response .....	8
4. How the comments have been incorporated into the Parking SPD.....	10
Appendix 1 – Consultation letter and e-mail content.....	12
Appendix 2 – Consultation webpage .....	13
Appendix 3 – Consultation response form .....	15
Appendix 4 – Press release at the start of consultation .....	16
Appendix 5 – Consultation representations and Council’s response .....	17

---

# 1. Introduction

---

## The purpose of the Consultation Statement

- 1.1 This consultation statement provides a record of the consultation undertaken as part of the preparation of the Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) which was held from 7 January until 4 February 2020.
- 1.2 It details how the Council has complied with the consultation requirements prescribed in the Town and Country planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulation 2012 (as amended) and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (adopted December 2018 amended 2019) in the preparation of the supplementary planning document.
- 1.3 The statement sets out:
- who was involved in the consultation
  - how people were involved
  - the main issues that were raised
  - the Council's response to representations
- 1.4 Respondents individual comments / and formal responses received can be viewed in appendix 5 and on the [draft Parking SPD consultation](#) webpage.

## Background to the Parking SPD

- 1.5 The Parking SPD has been prepared to support the implementation of Core Strategy (2011) Policy CS25: Travel and Accessibility and Policy DM7: Access and parking in the Development Management Plan (2015). It has been prepared in response to concerns by Members and residents over the application of the parking policies and standards as set out in the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan.
- 1.6 Respondents individual comments / and formal responses received can be viewed in appendix 5 and on the [draft Parking SPD consultation](#) webpage.
- 1.7 It will help to ensure that Parking Surveys that accompany planning applications contain sufficient information to support officers and Members in making decisions as well as helping statutory consultees to provide advice. It will also help to ensure that different vehicle parking requirements and the parking design and layout are considered when devising new developments in the Borough.

- 1.8 The draft SPD provides guidance on what the Council expects to be provided with planning applications to assist applicants regarding the layout and design of car parking, cycle parking, and other parking requirements. This will also ensure that sufficient information is provided to support decision making by officers and Members. Once adopted the SPD will be a material consideration in the planning process.

---

## 2. Draft Parking SPD 2020 consultation

---

### Who was consulted and how

- 2.1 The public consultation ran from 9am on 7 January to midnight on 4 February 2020.
- 2.2 Table 1 below is taken from Appendix 3 of the Statement of Community Involvement 2018. This sets out the public/stakeholder involvement arrangements for preparing an SPD. It states that the draft documents should be published for consultation for a minimum of four weeks and, at the start of the consultation period, should include:

Table 1: Public/ stakeholder involvement arrangements for preparing an SPD

Key Stages	Involvement Level	Public/ stakeholder involvement arrangements
<p><b>Draft SPDs</b> A draft SPD is prepared following the initial evidence gathering stage.</p>	<p>- Asking you what you think</p>	<p>Publish the Draft SPD for consultation for a minimum of four weeks, and, at the start of the consultation period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• make electronic copies of the document and supporting documents available on the Council's website;</li> <li>• make a hard copy of the plan available for inspection at the Civic Centre;</li> <li>• inform relevant specific and general consultees and those on the consultation database (this will be done by email where possible: postal mailing will be used where there is no email address on the database);</li> <li>• issue a press release if appropriate;</li> <li>• provide consultation information on Council's social media sites;</li> <li>• Arrange exhibitions or presentations to interest groups if appropriate.</li> </ul>

- 2.3 A specific consultation webpage was created for the consultation. This provided people with an introduction to the consultation, information of how to respond and included the library of consultation documents. In compliance with the above table, the sustainability appraisal and habitats regulation assessment and Equality Impact Assessment screening report was published on the consultation webpage.

- 2.4 In total, 8,106 people registered on our database were invited to participate in the consultation. This included specific consultees, residents and key stakeholders in line with regulation 18 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and Appendix 1 of the 2018 SCI.

### **Local Plan Working Group**

- 2.5 The draft SPD was presented to Members of the Local Plan Working Group (LPWG) on 19 November 2019. Members asked officers to amend the parking survey area to 500m and be undertaken when the highest number of residents would be home to consider the wider impact on parking stress.
- 2.6 The group recommended the SPD to be presented to Cabinet prior to a 4-week consultation.

### **Cabinet**

- 2.7 The draft 2018 SPD was presented to Members at meeting held on the 11 December 2019. The Cabinet supported the draft and it was resolved that the draft SPD be published for public consultation for 4 weeks from 7 January to 4 February 2020.

### **The public consultation**

- 2.8 Letters and e-mails were sent to specific and general consultees and everyone registered on the planning database informing them of the consultation. (See appendix 1 for a copy of the letter and e-mail). It notified consultees that the draft Development Contributions SPD had been prepared and asked whether they had any comments in relation to this document.
- 2.9 The consultation link provided people with a summary of the consultation, an explanation of why the document has been prepared, the draft document as a pdf and consultation questionnaire. (See appendix 2 for the consultation webpage information).
- 2.10 A press release informing people that consultation had started was published on 8 January 2020 (Appendix 4).
- 2.11 All information was made available on the Council's website including the Council's homepage. Copies of the document were also made available in all the borough libraries and was available for inspection at the Civic Centre, Esher.
- 2.12 The consultation included a simple questionnaire for respondents to answer with a space for additional comments (see appendix 3). There was

also an option to upload additional information if needed.2.13 E-mails were sent to all Councillors on 7 January, the day the consultation started and an e-mail was also be sent to all of Planning Services and Customer Services to ensure that everyone knew the consultation had started.

---

## 3. The consultation response

---

### Who responded?

- 3.1 In total, 8,106 people were invited to participate in the consultation. There were 130 respondents which came from:
- 7 residents' groups (FEDORA/VOX/Cobham and Downside Residents Association/Triangle Residents Association/Weybridge Society/Clare Hill (Esher)/Stoke D'Abernon Residents Association)
  - 10 organisations (Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust/Bellamy Roberts LLP/Ashill Land Ltd/Walton Charity/Paragon/Claygate Parish Council/Setplan Ltd/Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust/Savills/Turley)
  - 7 consultation bodies (Kingston Council/National Grid/Highways England/Natural England/Transport for London/Historic England/Surrey County Council)
- 3.2 The following statutory consultees offered their comments: Claygate Parish Council, The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames, Highways England, Transport for London, Historic England and Surrey County Council.
- 3.3 All individual comments / and formal responses received can be viewed in appendix 5 and on the [draft Parking SPD consultation](#) webpage.

### Key issues raised during the consultation

- 3.4 A number of respondents made comments that were outside of the scope of the SPD this included:
- Repetition of responses in relation to previous consultations on the new Local Plan;
  - Requests to change existing adopted planning policies; Quality of existing infrastructure; and
  - Quantity and cost of train station parking
- 3.5 The key issues raised relevant to the SPD were:
- Need for local conditions to be explained further and that the SPD should reference that the train links are good for commuting to and from London but not within and around the borough;
  - Requirements did not go far enough to ensure the provision of this infrastructure and that more should be done. The availability of public charging points in areas such as public car parks was also raised;
  - Inclusion of details on parking for motorcycles;
  - Need for better provision of cycle lanes and a cycle network in the borough as roads are narrow and some congested which makes cycling difficult



Requested additional bollard provision to be designed to pavement cycle spaces and for the two-tier cycle rack provision to be reconsidered as electric bikes are becoming popular which tend to be heavier and bulkier, and they are often used by those with mobility impairment and thus a two-tier rack is difficult to use;

Mixed responses regarding the increase in parking space size to accommodate larger vehicles (i.e. SUVs). Comments received considered the positives in vehicles not blocking pavements and the accessibility of spaces, however in contrast it was also considered to encourage the purchase of larger vehicles that contribute to carbon emissions;

The use of permeable surfaces for parking areas should be a requirement of design where possible; and

Suggestion that there should be daytime as well as night time surveys for residential development, and the survey area should be increased from 200m to 500m.

---

## 4. How the comments have been incorporated into the Parking SPD

---

### Amendments to the draft SPD

- 4.1 Many of the comments received related to a general dissatisfaction with the planning system, existing infrastructure and public transport provision, as well as comments specifically relating to the past Local Plan consultations. These issues fall outside the scope of the SPD which is to provide additional guidance to support the implementation of existing planning policies.
- 4.2 There were comments in relation to the existing adopted parking standards and the number of car parking spaces required per dwelling size. Comments were received that the car parking requirement should be increased, and others questioned why the requirement is expressed as a maximum and not a minimum; that car free development should be allowed, more disabled parking provision, and visitor and trade parking. Underground parking being considered more in new developments was also raised.
- 4.3 As an SPD cannot change existing policy, these comments will shape the new standards advanced in the draft Local Plan.
- 4.4 The majority of representations received did not lead to any changes being proposed to the draft SPD. The issues raised that were relevant to the SPD have been addressed and amendments and clarifications made to the document as necessary. This has included:
- 4.5 Inclusion of details on motorcycle parking, utilising best practice;  
Change in the area of parking survey to reflect consultation and Councillors comments. To enable assessment of the immediate and peripheral impact on parking stress from a development;  
Inclusion of daytime parking survey for residential development;  
Due to accessibility and the increase in popularity of electric bikes that are heavier, deletion of the appropriateness of two-tier bike parking racks has been included as appropriate;  
Inclusion of role of parking in landscaping and public realm; and  
Ensuring consistency such as reflecting the descriptions of the towns and centres in the Core Strategy 2011.
- 4.6 All comments received and an officer response including details of any action taken forward is available to view in appendix 5.

### General Corrections

- 4.7 There are several minor wordings, spelling and grammatical changes that have been made to the document.

### **Local Plan Working Group**

- 4.8 Members of the LPWG discussed the consultation responses at a meeting held on 11 February 2020. Amendments to the draft SPD were incorporated and a track changed document highlighting the changes made as a result of the consultation was presented and discussed at LPWG.
- 4.9 The LPWG requested the use of the term existing rather than adopted when referring to parking standards, to add in greater reference to the Development Management Plan 2015 and Policy DM 7 and to add clarity within the requirements of the parking survey that there may be occasions where the parameters of the survey will need to be adapted to a specific development and operations. These have been incorporated into the SPD

---

## Appendix 1 – Consultation letter and e-mail content

---

Dear Title Surname

### **Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) - Consultation**

Elmbridge Borough Council is seeking views on a new Parking SPD to support the existing Local Plan.

#### **How can I get involved?**

If you would like to comment, the consultation starts at **9am on 7 January and ends at midnight on 4 February 2020**. You can read the document online at [elmbridge.gov.uk/localplan](http://elmbridge.gov.uk/localplan) or alternatively hard copies are available to view at:

the Civic Centre, High Street, Esher, Surrey, KT10 9SD between 8.45am- 5pm (Monday to Thursday) and 8.45am- 4.45pm (Friday).

All libraries in the Borough – see the Surrey County Council website ([www.surreycc.gov.uk](http://www.surreycc.gov.uk)) or call 0300 200 1001 for locations and opening times.

#### **How can I comment?**

Please use the online consultation portal at [consult.elmbridge.gov.uk](http://consult.elmbridge.gov.uk) submit your comments by midnight on 4 February 2020. If you require assistance filling out the online response form, please e-mail us on [localplan@elmbridge.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@elmbridge.gov.uk) or call us on 01372474474.

Your comments will help to inform the final Supplementary Planning document. For further information on the Local Plan, please see our

webpage at [elmbridge.gov.uk/localplan](http://elmbridge.gov.uk/localplan)

Yours sincerely,






Mrs Kim Tagliarini, Head of Planning Services

# Appendix 2 – Consultation webpage

[Consultation Homepage](#) - [Parking Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\)](#) - [Elmbridge Borough Council](#) - Internet Explorer  
[https://consult.elmbridge.gov.uk/consult/tparking/consultation/home](#)  
[BBC - Home](#) [Google](#) [HomePage - Bridge-t](#) [Web Site Gallery](#)

[Home](#) » [Planning](#) » [Planning Policy](#) » [Parking Supplementary Planning Document \(SPD\)](#)

## Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

**Elmbridge Borough Coun...**

- [My Consultations](#)
- [My Profile](#)
- [Log out](#)
- Consultation Home**
- [Manage](#)
- [Setup](#)
- [Settings](#)
- [Homepage](#)
- [Questionnaires](#)
- [Documents](#)
- [Web Pages](#)
- [People](#)
- [Participants](#)
- [Invite](#)
- [Responses](#)
- [Questionnaire Responses](#)
- [Comments](#)
- [Moderate](#)
- [Tags](#)
- [Communication](#)
- [Mail Merge](#)
- [Letter Log](#)
- [Send Email](#)
- [Reports](#)
- [Recycle Bin](#)

**What is this consultation about?**

This consultation is to seek views on the new Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) to support the existing Local Plan, which consists of the Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Plan 2015.

**Where can I find more information?**

This consultation webpage includes the consultation document and all the supporting documents in the consultation library below. A hard copy version of the consultation document is also available to view at the Civic Centre and the borough's local libraries. Unfortunately, we are unable to provide hard copies to take away at reception but you can print out the document from the library below.

**Next steps**

Your comments will help to inform the final Supplementary Planning Document.

If you have any further queries, please do call us on 01372 474474 or e-mail us at [localplan@elmbridge.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@elmbridge.gov.uk)

**Timeline**

- Opened  
7 Jan 2020 at 09:00
- Closed  
4 Feb 2020 at 23:59

**Documents**

Unfortunately, we are unable to provide hard copies to take away at reception but you can print out the document from the library below.


- Invite
- Responses
- Questionnaire Responses
- Comments
- Moderate
- Tags
- Communication
- Mail Merge
- Letter Log
- Send Email
- Reports
- Recycle Bin
- Delete Consultation
- Help
- Open
- Closed
- Future
- Search
- Calendar


**Next steps**

Your comments will help to inform the final Supplementary Planning Document.






If you have any further queries, please do call us on 01372 474474 or e-mail us at localplan@elmbridge.gov.uk

**Timeline**


Opened  
7 Jan 2020 at 09:00


Closed  
4 Feb 2020 at 23:59

**Documents**

-  Parking Supplementary Planning Document consultation response form
-  Draft Parking Supplementary Planning Document
-  Draft parking supplementary planning document for consideration.
-  Statement of representations procedure
- This statement sets out the consultation title and subject matter, when the consultation finishes, where to view the draft SPD and supporting documents, how to submit your comment, next steps and contact for further information.
-  Sustainability Appraisal, HRA and EqIA
- Sustainability Appraisal (Strategic Environmental Assessment), Habitats Regulation Assessment and Equality Impact Assessment Screening Report.

**Links**

- I am no longer interested in this consultation

**Actions**

- Configure consultation dashboard

- Consultation Home
- Site Admin
- Reports
- Mail Merge
- Letter Log
- Stakeholders
- New Consultation

# Appendix 3 – Consultation response form

**Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)**

**Parking Supplementary Planning Document consultation response form - Parking Supplementary Plan - Internet Explorer**

Home » Planning » Planning Policy » Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

**Parking Supplementary Planning Document consultation response form**

Please use the add comment button below to submit any comments that you have on the draft Parking Supplementary Planning Document. You can also upload additional information here.

You must register and be logged in to comment.

[Add a comment](#)

**Comment Details**

Please provide your comment in the box below

Rich text editor toolbar: Edit, Insert, View, Format, Table, Tools, Undo, Redo, Bold, Italic, Link, Unlink, Bulleted List, Numbered List, Indent, Outdent, Text Color, Background Color, Font Size, Font Family, Paragraph, Table, Image, Video, Audio, Embed, Source, Full Screen, Help.

Attachments

Drop files here

Choose files

Navigation menu:

- Elmbridge Borough Coun...
- My Consultations
- My Profile
- Log out
- Consultation Home
- Manage
- Setup
- Settings
- Homepage
- Questionnaires
- Documents
- Web Pages
- People
- Participants
- Invite
- Responses
- Questionnaire Responses
- Comments
- Moderate
- Tags
- Communication
- Mail Merge
- Letter Log
- Send Email
- Reports
- Recycle Bin

# Appendix 4 – Press release at the start of consultation

The screenshot shows the Elmbridge Borough Council website. The browser address bar displays the URL: <https://www.elmbridge.gov.uk/news/planning-consultations-open/>. The page features a navigation menu with 'Home', 'News', and 'Planning consultations open'. The main content area is titled 'Planning consultations now open'. Below the title, there is a 'News' section with a list of links: Noticeboards, Newsletters and magazines, News archive, Image gallery, Planning consultations open, and Apologies for any inconvenience. The main article text begins with 'We are now consulting on two policy areas of the current Local Plan. These are specific to parking and to financial and on-site contributions from development in Elmbridge.' The article is titled 'Parking supplementary planning document' and discusses the aim of ensuring that all new developments in Elmbridge provide well-designed vehicle and cycle parking, that avoids issues associated with the provision of inadequate or poorly designed parking. It also mentions a national policy in relation to parking, emphasizing good design and sustainability. The article concludes with 'The consultation will run from Tuesday 7 January to 4 February. Consultation documents are available to view on our website, and a printed version can be viewed at the Civic Centre, High Street, Esher and in local libraries.' The article is signed by Cllr Karen Randolph, Portfolio Holder for Planning Services. A quote from her follows: 'This is the first of two planning consultations to open in January. Knowing how passionately our residents feel about planning issues and policies, we are eager to hear their views on our parking and development contribution supplementary planning documents. Just to be clear, these draft documents are related to the policies in the Core Strategy 2011 and the Development Management Plan 2015; we are in the process of preparing the new Local Plan (which will update both the strategy and the detailed policies)'.



## Appendix 5 – Consultation representations and Council’s response

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Surrey County Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Summary of SCC comments <b>(the full response can be found in appendix 1)</b></p> <p>Page 16, para 2.15 The Surrey County Council Vehicular and Cycling Guidance is being revised to require all new developments to provide EV charging points for 100% of dwellings with parking spaces. This is a change to the current requirement for 20% provision.</p> <p>Page 18, para 2.20 If the drop in applications for driving licenses results in a drop in car ownership, then it is possible that there might be an over provision of parking spaces in the medium to longer term. To prepare for such a scenario, car parking could be designed as a “transitional space,” the use of which may change over the lifetime of any development.</p> <p>Page 27, Para 4.6 In addition to the tapping rail, the county council’s Road Safety Team requests that higher visibility bollards be incorporated into the design for cycle parking facilities on footways, in order to allow for the visually impaired to see and avoid street furniture.</p> <p>Page 27, para 4.7 Two tier cycle stands, and vertical storage are not particularly accessible for those with reduced mobility as they require the bicycle to be lifted into the parking stand. This is becoming more of an issue as Electric Bicycle (ebikes) are becoming more popular. Ebikes tend to be heavier and more bulky, and</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD will be amended to take account of the future updated guidance from SCC, higher visibility bollards, the comments on two tier cycle stands, car club bays and the size of parking bays in front of garage doors.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>also tend to be used by those with mobility impairment. Two tier stands should therefore be used as a last resort.</p> <p>Page 31, para 4.13 Car club bays should be in areas accessible to members of the public, and, where possible, located on street, rather than within developments.</p> <p>Page 34, 5.11 Parking bays in front of doors and garages should allow for vehicles to be parked without encroaching onto the footway and allow for doors to be opened, the proposed 5.5 metre set back standard may not be sufficient and we therefore suggest a minimum of 6 metres.</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Claygate Parish Council	Statutory Consultee	<p>Summary of comments (<b>the full response can be found in appendix 2</b>):</p> <p>Additional wording suggested to be added to policies regarding traffic lights, roundabouts and pedestrian crossings.</p> <p>Encouragement of soft landscaping in larger developments</p> <p>Residential parking standards should be based on habitable rooms rather than the number of bedrooms</p> <p>Car free developments should demonstrate why it represents the best option</p> <p>Comments on cycle parking that it should be located in well-drained locations and well lit</p> <p>EV charging points should be in a convenient location</p>	Comments noted. Through this SPD we are unable to alter existing policy.
Claygate Parish Council (Shirley Round)	Parish Council	Duplicate of the comments above.	Comments noted. Through this SPD we are unable to alter existing policy.
Historic England	Statutory Consultee	No specific comments to make ( <b>the full response can be found on the consultation portal</b> )	Comment noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
The Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames (Kingsley Izundu)	Local Government	<p>Elmbridge Borough Council Consultations  Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)  Dear Madam/Sir</p> <p>Thank you for your email of 7th January 2020 consulting the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames on your Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) and seeking its views on this consultation which supports your existing Local Plan.</p> <p>This Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) sets out Elmbridge Council's approach to car and cycle parking in new developments in the borough and provides further detail to the adopted policies of the Council's Core Strategy 2011, specifically Policy CS25 Travel and Accessibility, and the Elmbridge Borough Council Development Management Plan 2015, specifically Policy DM7: Access and Parking</p> <p>Given that in preparing this SPD Elmbridge Borough Council took into account current national and local planning policies and local evidence in relation to transport matters, it is considered that this Parking SPD is consistent with the advice and requirements of the relevant policy documents.</p> <p>Consequently, the Royal Borough of Kingston upon Thames has no further comments to make.</p> <p>Kind regards,  Yours faithfully,  Strategic Policy Team</p> <p>RBKT</p>	Comment noted.
TfL	Statutory Consultee	<p>TfL has no detailed comments to make on the parking SPD which is a matter primarily for Elmbridge Borough as planning authority and Surrey County Council as transport authority. Within London, a restraint based approach to car parking which encourages car free development and sets consistent maximum standards at a strategic level across London is set</p>	Comment noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>out in the draft new London Plan. Minimum standards are set for cycle parking. This approach has been endorsed by the Panel Report following last year's Examination</p>	
Highways England	Statutory Consultee	<p>Thank you for your email of 3 January 2020 inviting Highways England to comment on the above consultation and indicating that a response was required by 4 February 2020.</p> <p>Highways England has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015 and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the strategic road network (SRN). The SRN is a critical national asset and, as such, Highways England works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs, as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. We will therefore be concerned with proposals that have the potential to impact the safe and efficient operation of the SRN.</p> <p>Having examined the consultation document, we are satisfied that its policies will not materially affect the safety, reliability and / or operation of the SRN (the tests set out in DfT C2/13 para's 9 &amp; 10 and MHCLG NPPF para 109). Based on this, Highways England does not offer any comments on the consultation at this time.</p>	Comment noted.
Residents Association			

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Cobham & Downside Residents Association (Steven Wood)	Residents Association/Group	<p>Cobham and Downside Residents' Association Comments on Parking SPD Consultation Document January 2020</p> <p>CDRA support:-  Increase in size of spaces to account for larger cars which are prevalent in our area, but should be 5.2m long not 5.0m. New SUV's are most popular car and many are longer than 5m.  Clear standards for spaces against solid walls.  Standards for turntables and preferably a ban is necessary.  Turntables are unreliable and inconvenient and lead to lack of use of car spaces.  CDRA believe that;-  The SPD should follow NDG paras 84 and 85 to respond to local conditions and avoid parking stress and pavement parking. 'One size fits all' on space numbers doesn't work in places such as Elmbridge which has no formal centre and splits into relatively small communities without viable local public transport and very limited roads suitable for safe cycling or dedicated cycle routes.  To achieve the correct level of parking spaces between minimum and maximum space standards for residential the SPD should direct an assessment of specific actual local conditions by developers. Transport Assessments and Statements should not use general census and other such data to overcome common sense. Residential schemes on small sites are being designed around the maximum residential units on site then the number of car spaces are shoehorned into the space left over. This is contrary to design policy and should be highlighted in the SPD as a key factor for approval.  The design has to be holistic and the SPD needs clear wording rather than broad statements. The request for a Traffic/Transport Survey with applications is helpful but it is still described in terms that encourage the developer to justify his</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>adopted position rather than achieve the optimum design solution.</p> <p>The Council should be supported in their desire to encourage environmental improvements by reducing car use. Car parking standards are impossible to use to achieve this in isolation.</p> <p>For example the SPD doesn't mention buses as public transport at all. Existing bus routes in Cobham and Downside are limited in the extreme. Cycling in certain parts of the borough and particularly Cobham and Downside is not encouraged by narrow busy roads, poor road surfaces, and some sharp hills.</p> <p>Restricting residential on-site parking spaces on environmental grounds in these areas is counterproductive. It increases on street parking, narrow street widths mean pavement parking, and it gives the false impressions that public transport or other modes is already capable of taking up the local travel demand and car ownership will be disincentivised.</p> <p>SPD should clarify that DM7 should be interpreted such that number of spaces provided must meet actual local demand, until alternative modes are in place to satisfy it and are suitable to attract travellers from the car.</p> <p>In future some form of transport linked developer contribution should be directed to help deliver this and change attitudes to local travel. At the moment there is no joined up travel policy or SPD which links SCC, EBC and National Government attitudes, policies and available funding for public transport.</p> <p>The concentration on the availability and advantages of the national rail and road network also gives a false impression. It is true that we have great rail links for commuters and travellers to London and Guildford. Ditto major roads. However the driver for local multiple car ownership is not commuting or distance car travel. It is driven by local journeys to shops,</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>schools, journeys to stations and the increasing tendency for children to stay at home longer. Developers are interpreting areas in Cobham as sustainable which are not, in local terms. The SPD should explain these local conditions and their importance.</p> <p>The SPD should take a wider view than electric cars and charging points as an environmental solution. It is quite likely that car manufacturers will begin to introduce other solutions such as hydrogen cells.</p> <p>The SPD avoids a key area of contention arising from the application of parking standards by planning officers for flats and higher density residential developments. It underestimates the number of cars per household as EBC's own assessment is for 1.5 cars per household across the Borough and 46% of households own 2 cars. The standard also has no specific requirement for visitor and delivery space whilst in practise this is an essential particularly with the increasing frequency of 'on line' deliveries.</p> <p>In not addressing these paradoxes developers, planners and residents are placed in unnecessary conflict. Application of the current wording on 'appropriate' parking provision in DM7 in the real world described above would resolve the conflict without detriment to development quality until alternative transport modes allow a change.</p>	



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Triangle Residents' Association (Nick Thripp)	Residents Association/Group	<p>TRG comments on draft Parking SPD, January 2020</p> <p>Preamble</p> <p>The Triangle Residents' Group (TRG) fully supports Elmbridge Borough Council's goal of ensuring a consistent, rigorous and transparent approach to the treatment of parking in planning applications. We recognise that work is underway on a new Local Plan and that will be accompanied by a Transport Assessment and Standards and that what we comment on below has the status of an interim document.</p> <p>We would, however, recommend that a similarly consistent, rigorous and transparent approach is adopted and developed further in those later documents.</p> <p>As an overall comment on the draft document under discussion, we would encourage greater specificity in the setting of standards and less scope for interpretation. Many of the comments made in this document are still couched in general terms and, unless these are tightened up and made more specific, we can foresee scope for significantly different interpretations continuing on the part of Planning Officers, Developers and Residents (and their representative bodies). Detailed Comments. (These follow the draft document's numbering)</p> <p>1.5 Bullet Point (BP) 1: Need definition of 'sustainable travel patterns'</p> <p>BP5: Little evidence seen.</p> <p>BP6: Not seen hitherto but would be very welcome.</p> <p>Suggest add BP 7: To ensure sufficient parking is provided with new developments to ensure neighbourhood amenity is not compromised.</p> <p>1.7 Suggest revised wording is substituted: 'It is mandatory that applicants refer to the Council's requirements in relation....'</p> <p>1.9 When will the Transport Assessment and Standards that</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>will be accompany the Local Plan be available?</p> <p>1.11 The categories used in this paragraph are confusing. Weybridge is far more similar to Esher or Cobham than it is to Walton</p> <p>1.14 We agree strongly that public transport links within the Borough are limited placing much more reliance on the car. This is rarely taken into account in applications where reference is made to the railway stations and to a bus service that is frequently patchy at best (often not running after early evening or on Sundays).</p> <p>1.15 The Elmbridge retail Assessment 2016 would appear to have been overtaken by events with these shopping centres now struggling. Suggest deletion of this claim.</p> <p>Suggested 1.17 A reference to the poor coverage of the Borough by buses.</p> <p>Suggested 1.18. The Borough experiences significant levels of traffic congestion and attendant air pollution which would be exacerbated by additional levels of on-street parking.</p> <p>2.2 Where is the evidence of an EBC policy?</p> <p>2.4 What constitutes 'compelling justification'?</p> <p>2.7 Fine words but needs to be supported by minimum standards</p> <p>2.11 (84) Conditions across Elmbridge vary significantly. One approach across the Borough may not be appropriate in various parts of it. How can these be set effectively to reflect local conditions?</p> <p>2.12 What is a 'sustainable location'? A definition is required. This ambition is one TRG supports strongly. How is it going to happen? What is EBC doing to bring it about?</p> <p>2.13.1 What constitutes 'good public transport accessibility'? A definition is required.</p> <p>2.13.6 TRG strongly supports greening the roadside and parking environment.</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>2.14 (b)i How is local defined? TRG would suggest 500m. Parking stress should also be quantified according to standard EBC norms.</p> <p>2.18 TRG would like to see this evidence, particularly broken down by age.</p> <p>Table 1. There appears to be no difference between the two columns.</p> <p>3.6 What constitutes local? TRG suggest 500m. What does 'demonstrate' mean? Needs definition. What evidence is to be provided and in what form?</p> <p>3.7 Specify what figures are meant.</p> <p>Table 2</p> <p>A1 retail: Examples of no space allocation. Eg Landmark Building, Queens Road.</p> <p>A3 &amp; A4 What constitutes a pub and what a restaurant? Eg the Waverley is replacing the British Volunteer in Heath Road, Weybridge. The former will seat 122 covers. The latter was a traditional, old-fashioned pub.</p> <p>Care Homes/Sheltered Housing: need provision for staff and visitors</p> <p>4.4 Fully agree.</p> <p>4.12 Car Clubs. Elmbridge appears at number 51 ( ie very low down) in the list of areas for which these are appropriate. This accords with TRG's views. In our view, they are only suited to well-connected metropolitan areas. If they are introduced further in Elmbridge, it should only be in developments of 50+ dwellings. The latest figures of which we are aware on the replacement rate is not 10 per car club, it is 6.6.</p> <p>Survey</p> <p>Parking surveys should be undertaken to a methodology specified by EBC. The timing of the survey must be appropriate for the area. The Triangle is primarily residential adjacent to a local centre and is therefore used by shop staff</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>and customers for parking. It is saturated during working hours causing massive inconvenience to residents during the hours of 08.00-18.00, particularly to those without off street parking (e.g the vast majority in New Road).</p> <p>The walking distance covered by the survey in our view should be 5 minutes not 2 and 500m not 200m.</p> <p>It is not clear why surveys should only be undertaken between Monday and Wednesday. Please explain the rationale. TRG strongly supports information on the different local developments being collated and their cumulative impact on parking conditions/stress assessed. This has been a serious omission hitherto, with Surrey Highways and Planning Officers only considering individual sites in isolation.</p> <p>Where photographs are used, they must be marked with exact location, date and time.</p> <p>29.1.20</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Cobham & Downside Residents Association (Dilip Mathew)	Residents Association/Group	<p>1. I support the provision of increase in size of spaces to account for larger cars and SUVs.</p> <p>2. I also support the prescriptive residential parking standards outlined in Table 1 (Page 19). However, I see that there is an increasing trend towards flats. The parking standards should include provision for visitor parking. I strongly recommend that we add 1 visitor parking for every 8 parking space stipulated in Table 1.</p>	Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.
VOX (Mike Wheeler)	Residents Association/Group	<p>These comments come from a resident of Oxshott and are therefore reflective of issues that affect the characteristics of this local community. They may not necessarily be reflective of other more densely populated parts of Elmbridge. This distinction needs to be understood by EBC who should develop parking policies that are not of a one size fits all nature. Different parts of the borough will need different approaches.</p> <p>With a growing population, Elmbridge will face increased traffic and hence increased congestion. This is a major irritant to residents with inefficient use of time and increased pollution. So in developing parking policies, EBC need to have as a key objective the need to minimise congestion and ease traffic flows. This applies particularly at morning and afternoon rush hours.</p> <p>Inevitably, households will aspire to multi car ownership. Those people cohabiting in a household will want their own cars in order to be able to lead their separate lives whether to pursue careers or to manage childcare. So, with increasing affluence, more cars will be owned not fewer and parking provision needs to recognise this likelihood.</p> <p>While EBC think that car journeys might be reduced by provision of public transport or cycling, this will not happen. People want point to point travel available on demand. Public transport within the borough does not achieve this and never</p>	Comments noted. Parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>will. Similarly cycling is a leisure activity and will not substitute for or replace car travel to any significant extent.</p> <p>Cycling could be a solution but not on current narrow, congested, poorly maintained roads with danger from speeding traffic, wide HGV's and potholes. Only when major trunk roads like the A244 are widened with separate dedicated cycle lanes will there ever be a shift towards travel by cycle not car. But as there is very little chance of Surrey CC ever upgrading the highway network, the need is for EBC to plan on the basis of reality not impossible ambition. Hence there will be an inevitable increase in car ownership and use of roads. This requires parking policies that are directed at facilitating efficient transport and reducing congestion by use of on street parking in busy areas particularly around schools.</p> <p>There are three key issues on which EBC need to focus:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. With the move towards higher density development with blocks of flats, provide for two car parking spaces per household and require that parking to be integral to the development so as to reduce on street parking. And the default position should be that such integral parking should be underground.</li> <li>2. Make sure that destinations such as stations and shopping centres have adequate parking provision so that off street parking is reduced thereby not creating congestion.</li> <li>3. In areas around schools, eliminate off street parking so that there is proper provision for parents to drop off and collect children in safety.</li> </ol>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
FEDORA (David Cooke)	Residents Association/Group	<p>Referring to 3.0 Current Parking Standards on page 19 Table 1: Residential Parking Standards, I do not believe that the on site (eg off street) parking allowance of 1 space for each 1 bed residential unit or !.5 spaces for each 2 bed residential unit is sufficient.</p> <p>For a couple in a 1 bed unit it is highly likely they will have 2 cars, and also provision should be made to accommodate visitor parking. This is even more the case for 2 bed residential units.</p> <p>I think it would be much more realistic if you would provide for 2 car parking spaces per unit whatever the number of bedrooms.</p>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
Cobham Conservation & Heriatge Trust	Residents Association/Group	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the Trust's view the current and proposed policy needs to be more prescriptive and the words "should" or "may" should be used less and rather more mandatory language used to accompany the policy. An example would be 2.14 in reciting and retaining DM7 has "the proposed parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents". Why is the word "must" not used so that it can be shortened to e.g. "the proposed parking provision must not result in any increase in on-street parking stress"?</li> <li>2. Paragraph 2.12 of the draft SPD reminds us that an object of policy is to direct development toward 'sustainable locations'. The Council must more readily assess and recognise those sites and areas that are not sustainable. A starting point is that national policy is clear – direct development toward previously developed land in Town Centres with good public transport.</li> <li>3. The document does not seek to change the required parking place numbers set by the existing policy and evidence is not provided to show how the current requirements work.</li> </ol>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>The Trust considers that present policy often requires too few parking spaces to be provided with development. While what is maintained may arise from the aspiration that walking and cycling more are to be encouraged (which the Trust supports), it does not reflect the ever increasing number of vehicles used per residence, in whatever location, due to increased mobility. Even if the future has vehicles as predominantly electric or even operating on hydrogen, they will still need spaces unless there is a revolution in the thinking about public transport.</p> <p>4. Nowhere in this document is there reference to underground car parking being required where that is feasible to be provided rather than using hardstanding taking up precious open and garden space. This is one measure that could feature as an urgent change to current policy. Further the use of non-permeable materials for the hard standing under parking spaces should simply be prohibited.</p> <p>5. Couching parking requirements in terms of the 'maximum' number allowed for each development is too simplistic. This has very often resulted in too few parking spaces being advanced by developers. The numbers must not only take account of increasing car ownership but also the dramatic increase in home delivery and similar. Parking place numbers for residential developments should be defined as minima not maxima. Multi-unit developments in particular must have a number of spaces provided for likes of visitors, tradesmen, carers and ambulances.</p> <p>6. The Trust is concerned about the lack of control on on-street parking. While that is a role that is undertaken by Surrey County Council there is a need for that authority to take account of the needs of Elmbridge and for developers to understand that key road links in the borough need to be kept free of parking (perhaps with clearways). There are other roads that have a character that does not make them</p>	



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>appropriate for on-street parking. There is no evidence of how the Council have liaised with Surrey County Council, whether for formulating this document or, on these aspects, for the purpose of policies to go into the emerging Local Plan. Locally, for instance, there is an urgent need to review loading/unloading in Cobham High Street particularly during times of high traffic stress and to mitigate the effects of HGVs. These need strong policies.</p> <p>8. The provision of electric charging is written with existing (even past) technology in mind. 'Trickle charging' is obsolete so references to this need removing. There is a case for every space to have a 'fast charger' (perhaps defined by reference to a DoT standard or similar).</p> <p>9. Appendix 1 deals with the requirement for a survey by developers. It should be made mandatory for every development.</p>	
Weybridge Society (David Arnold)	Residents Association/Group	<p>Summary of response please see appendix for full representation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- definition of sustainable required</li> <li>- more precise specifications on parking surveys, with more consideration of the local environment</li> <li>- specific comments on paragraphs in the SPD, including setting minimum standards for parking,</li> </ul>	
Clare Hill (Esher) Association Ltd (Stephen Cullis)	Residents Association/Group	<p>Summary of response, please see consultation portal for full representation. There have recently been a number of applications on, or in close proximity to, our Estate to redevelop single properties into flats. We have raised concerns about inadequate parking in every case.</p> <p>We appreciate your efforts to guide developers accordingly by producing this document. Our only comment is on the parking standards in Table 1. These are described as "the maximum</p>	Comments noted. The car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan process which will update the standards in line with National policy requirements.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>level of parking that the Council requires for new developments” (paragraph 3.6). We cannot see how the residential levels are sufficient and suggest they should be the minimum required. We would also like to see additional standards included for visitors, service vans, etc</p>	
Leonard Beighton	CAAC/Heritage/Conservation	<p>I wish to support all the comments made by the Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust.</p> <p>The Council's parking policy needs to be tightened up to ensure that there is sufficient parking for residents, visitors and delivery vehicles. The fact that developers feel able to appeal to the Planning Inspectorate about the Council's refusal for development at 36 Stoke Road, Cobham is itself evidence that the current policy is too loose. The developers propose that the residents should park in neighbouring roads: they are not of course concerned about the residents of those roads. The number of cars per residence is going up, Even if people do walk more and use a bus more, it will not cut the number of cars. So the Council must have a firmer policy.</p> <p>The Government announced today, ie since the CCHT sent in their comments, that new petrol and diesel cars will not be allowed after 2035. So the need for many more fast charging points has become even greater and the greater need should be reflected in the policy.</p>	<p>Comment noted. The car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan process.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Stoke D'Abernon Residents' Association (susan prentice)	Residents Association/Group	<p>I support the observations put forward by Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust, specifically</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- the current and proposed policy needs to be more prescriptive and the words “should” or “may” should be used less and rather more mandatory language used to accompany the policy.</li> <li>- Paragraph 2.12 of the draft SPD reminds us that an object of policy is to direct development toward ‘sustainable locations’. The Council must more readily assess and recognise those sites and areas that are not sustainable. – direct development toward previously developed land in Town Centres with good public transport.</li> <li>- 3. The document does not seek to change the required parking place numbers set by the existing policy and evidence is not provided to show how the current requirements work. Present policy often requires too few parking spaces to be provided with development.</li> <li>-4. Nowhere in this document is there reference to underground car parking being required where that is feasible to be provided rather than using hardstanding taking up precious open and garden space. T</li> <li>-5. Couching parking requirements in terms of the ‘maximum’ number allowed for each development is too simplistic. This has very often resulted in too few parking spaces being advanced by developers.</li> <li>- 6. I am concerned about the lack of control on on-street parking. While that is a role that is undertaken by Surrey County Council there is a need for that authority to take account of the needs of Elmbridge and for developers to understand that key road links in the borough need to be kept free of parking (perhaps with clearways). There are other roads that have a character that does not make them appropriate for on-street parking. There is no evidence of how</li> </ul>	Comments noted. The Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan process which will update the standards in line with National planning policy requirements. The EV charging requirements have been updated in the SPD to take account of changes in technology.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>the Council have liaised with Surrey County Council, whether for formulating this document or, on these aspects, for the purpose of policies to go into the emerging Local Plan. Locally, for instance, there is an urgent need to review loading/unloading in Cobham High Street particularly during times of high traffic stress and to mitigate the effects of HGVs. These need strong policies.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The provision of electric charging is written with existing (even past) technology in mind. 'Trickle charging' is obsolete so references to this need removing. There is a case for every space to have a 'fast charger' (perhaps defined by reference to a DoT standard or similar).</li> <li>- . Appendix 1 deals with the requirement for a survey by developers. It should be made mandatory for every development.</li> </ul>	
<b>Developer/ Builder/ Landowner</b>			
Whiteley Homes Trust (Rachel Hill)	Older People	<p>WHT commend the SPD in the separation out of C2 uses including care homes and elderly (sheltered) from C3 uses. Furthermore, the Parking standards introduce greater flexibility by featuring both a standard and/or individual assessment, with the standards providing the guide but an allowance for individual assessment in cases where a greater degree of parking be required. WHT support the flexibility that has been built into the SPD for C2 uses and supports the requirement for a justification via parking management plans, travel plans and cycle strategies to inform an 'individual assessment'. The SPD addresses additional requirements including spaces for staff and visitors. In relation to C2 uses, the amount of parking needed will depend upon the level of care needed. Care Homes are therefore likely to require less parking for</p>	Comments and support for the SPD noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>residents, but more parking for staff, visitors and visiting medical staff. The disabled car parking provision is clear and simply suggests that a standard figure of 5% of the total number of parking spaces to be agreed for disabled users or a minimum of 1 space per 750m<sup>2</sup>.</p>	
<p>Bellamy Roberts LLP (Ian Roberts)</p>	<p>Developer/Builder/Landowner</p>	<p>The below comments have been prepared by Bellamy Roberts LLP Highway Transportation and Infrastructure Consultants, on behalf of Claudel Venture Holdings Ltd.</p> <p>The SPD makes reference to the NPPF , and in particular para 105 which states that maximum standards should only be set where there is clear and compelling justification to do so . However the SPD at para. 2.15 refers to the Surrey County Councils standards of 2018 which whilst stating the guidance is intended to be applied in a pragmatic and flexible way states that Maximum standards are set out for residential and non residential developments . Para 3.6 of the SPD also refers to maximum level of parking. These statements clearly contradict themselves and the advice within the NPPF</p> <p>Furthermore, the draft SPD at para 2.14 (b) (i) suggests a minimum parking provision of 1 space per residential unit, again such a minimum standard contradicts the advice within the NPPF.</p> <p>The SPD should allow for car free development and currently does not refer to such a scenario.</p> <p>Table 1 : Whilst the table has two columns of parking provision ( town centre/edge of centre and suburban ), the parking requirement is exactly the same for the various dwelling sizes, irrespective of their location. The same parking requirement therefore applies to the whole Borough irrespective of the advice of para 105 (a-d ) of the NPPF .</p> <p>In summary, it is evident that whilst the SPD refers to the</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD is to provide guidance on existing policies in the Core Strategy and Development Management Plan and as such is working with the existing parking standards. This point will be made clearer in the adopted SPD. The car parking standards will be updated as part of the new Local Plan taking account of the requirements set out in National planning policy.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>NPPF's key elements of setting out local parking standards ( para 105 ) it does not apply such advise by setting out minimum and maximum standards.and appears to ignore accessibility, type , mix,public transport provision and local car ownership levels</p> <p>It may assist if Table 1, like in some instances in Table 2, refers to "OR individual assessment / justification"</p> <p>The draft SPD appears to be excessively prescriptive for residential development in the application of the Policy and does not allow for flexibility in line with the NPPF particularly with regard to sites in highly accessible locations.</p>	
Ashill Land Ltd (Tracy Puttock)	Developer/Builder/Landowner	<p>See Attachment titled 'Ashill Land Ltd' in G:\BUSINESS SUPPORT TEAM\SPD Consultations 2020\Parking SPD\Report 4 Attachments it is noted that the Draft Parking SPD is in conflict with Policy DM7 of the Elmbridge DMP that requires a minimum of 1 space per residential unit in areas of parking stress, given that the Draft Parking SPD introduces a maximum standard of 0.5 spaces per 1 bed flat (regardless of location).</p> <p>The provision of differing and inconsistent standards appears confused and contradictory and fails to provide a clear set of standards for developers (and their consultants) to adhere to. By promoting strict maximum parking standards for residential land uses (and given the reduction in maximum standards for the majority of dwelling types) it is considered likely that the Draft Parking SPD will result in an under-provision of car parking for residential land uses. Contrary to the aims of the Draft Parking SPD, this is likely to lead to overspill parking demands resulting in increased levels of parking stress,</p>	Comments noted. The final SPD parking standards will reflected those adopted under the Development Management Plan 2015.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>detrimental to the amenities of local residents (contrary to Policy DM7). Minimum car parking spaces have been defined (para 5.4 of the Draft Parking SPD) as 2.5 metres x 5.0 metres (increased from 2.4 m x 4.8 m). Given the increasing size of vehicles this appears sensible and is consistent with the approach being taken by other authorities. However, the justification for a minimum width of 2.6 metres for parallel parking bays (refer para 5.5 of the Draft Parking SPD) is unclear and contradicts guidance that is set out within the Department for Transport's 'Manual for Streets', which sets out a 2.0 metre width requirement (as parallel parking spaces often benefit from adjacent footway space, for example). Para 4.5 of the Draft Parking SPD sets out minimum dimensions for garages, if they are to be considered as also providing cycle parking. The Draft Parking SPD sets out minimum internal dimensions of 3.3 metres x 7 metres. This contradicts Elmbridge's Design and Character SPD, which sets out minimum internal dimensions of 3.3 metres x 6 metres (to accommodate cycle parking). Requirements for EVCPs (for residential land uses) is consistent with SCC's Parking Guidance although there are some drafting errors in terms of the layout of the table that should be rectified (for future clarity). The Draft standards (for EVCPs) is likely to have significant implications in terms of the electricity infrastructure and the scale and number of sub-stations required where there is insufficient network capacity to support the demand.</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Walton Charity (Jackie Lodge)	Housing Association	<p>Car space increasing to 5.0m x 2.5m to meet increased size of vehicles. This may not be appropriate for all developments where drivers have smaller vehicles. This a a blanket change which may impact on developments where smaller spaces would suffice.</p> <p>The SPD does not refer to buses as public transport. The lack of affordable transport - but in particularly buses will continue to drive up car use - (or exclude those who cannot afford). In the future it would be food to see some form of transport linked developer contribution to help deliver more affordable transport / joined up solutions.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>
Paragon Asra Housing (Chris Whelan)	Housing Association	<p>We are generally supportive of the Councils approach in this area provided the standards are genuinely set as maximum standards. We need to do much more to deal with global warming and to recognise that car ownership and use are major factors in this area. The world is changing rapidly in terms of the approach to transportation and car ownership and we need to encourage sustainable transport without the use of cars. More needs to be done by way of cycle use, car/lift sharing and car pools schemes such as the local Enterprise Car Club.</p> <p>If we reduce on site parking in sustainable locations we can achieve higher densities without creating undue parking stress if we use CPZ's and advertise on site and adjoining street car parking restrictions. Buyers and potential tenants can make informed choices in these circumstances.</p> <p>Car ownership amongst affordable housing occupiers is much lower that in the wider community and this needs to be</p>	<p>Comments of support are noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan process and consideration will be given to the requirements of different uses, communities and locations.</p>



<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		reflected in the approach when considering new applications which include affordable housing.	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
The Crown Estate (Savills)	Landowner	<p>The Crown Estate (TCE) highlight their land interests to EBC as they prepare their Documents and Evidence Base to form part of the emerging Local Plan. In addition, they wish to highlight areas that may wish to consider when preparing this information. TCE will seek to be policy compliant in any proposals on their land interests, should any of their sites obtain an allocation in the emerging plan.</p> <p>It is understood that the parking standards found in Appendix 1 of the Elmbridge Development Management Plan (2015) continue to apply, the guidance set out in this draft SPD is in line with this. EBC may want to consider building some flexibility into this policy in the draft SPD. Particularly to reflect the ever evolving sustainability movements promoted at a national level. In addition, development in more sustainable locations, such as sites adjacent or near to sustainable transport modes should not have the same parking requirements as developments in less sustainable locations. In addition, developments should be looking to promote more sustainable modes of transport in general.</p> <p>Understand that the draft SPD is seeking that the minimum dimension of a car parking space should be 2.5m x 5.0m. This is slightly above that which is nationally recognised, which is a requirement 2.4 metres x 4.8 metres. This slight difference is unlikely to cause any issues or difficulty on TCE land as the masterplanning exercise to date has been provided to demonstrate a broad composition of potential land uses for the sites. However, EBC may want to consider building some flexibility into this SPD principle, in order to encourage high quality public realm, and streets less</p>	<p>Noted. The draft SPD does not relate to the development of the spatial strategy of the emerging new Local Plan or site selection.</p> <p>Noted. It is considered that the existing policies of Core Strategy Policy CS25 and Development Management Policy DM7 provide such flexibility.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p> <p>There is a balance between providing sufficient parking spaces, promoting good design and using land efficiently. Agree that it is important to encourage high quality public realm not dominated by parking. Add in reference to public realm to paragraph 5.1</p> <p>The draft SPD does not preclude the use of tandem parking within development schemes. This would be covered under 'different</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>Note that the draft SPD is silent on the opportunity for tandem parking. TCE believe that this is an opportunity that should be explored by EBC, as it is useful realm.</p> <p>TCE will seek to comply with the required parking standards and the space standards, as per any adopted SPD principle, at the time of any planning application. Clearly there will be a balance to be struck between ensuring adequate parking, and well planned development, which achieves good quality public realm, and contributes to sustainable transport modes (bus/ rail connections).</p>	<p>layouts' in paragraph 5.9. Add specific reference to tandem parking as an example of a different layout.</p> <p>Comment noted.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Taylor Wimpey (Turleys)	Landowner/ housebuilder	<p>The draft SPD refers to the Local Planning Policy context as being established by the Core Strategy (2011) and the Development Management Plan (2015). However Taylor Wimpey note that the LPA is in the process of preparing a new Local Plan. The timetable in the most recent LDS suggests that the new Local Plan could be adopted in January 2021. Whilst the Plan may have been delayed, the LDS indicates the intention that the new Local Plan would be adopted in the short term.</p> <p>Similarly, the LPA has is currently carrying out a consultation on 'Creating our vision, objectives and the direction for development management policies 2020'.</p> <p>Whilst Taylor Wimpey understands that the Parking SPD has been prepared in order to support the Development Management Plan (2015), the LPA's commitment to updating the Local Plan (and development management policies) implies that the SPD may only be relevant for a short period of time. Furthermore, Taylor Wimpey consider that the preparation of this SPD should not fetter or obstruct in any way, the ability of the emerging Local Plan to support sustainable development over the period to 2036.</p> <p>More fundamentally, Taylor Wimpey note that the SPD seeks to establish new policy requirements and expectations which are not contained within Development Plan Documents. Whilst we are aware that the Development Management Plan does establish requirements in relation to EV charging points for example, these appear to differ from those in the SPD.</p> <p>Note that the PPG explains the role of SPDs and states that: "Supplementary planning documents (SPDs) should build</p>	<p>Noted. That is correct.</p> <p>This is correct. The Local Plan Consultation runs from 27 January to 9 March 2020.</p> <p>Comments noted. Agree, the introduction of an SPD to support existing policy will not influence the preparation of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The SPD will not introduce new standard for Electric Vehicle charging (EVc) but as acknowledge in the Development Management plan technology around electric charging are evolving and the standards should reflect the most up to date technologies. The draft SPD provides the latest guidance on the EVc which has been updated to reflect new developments in the technology.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>upon and provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in an adopted local plan. As they do not form part of the development plan, they cannot introduce new planning policies into the development plan. They are however a material consideration in decision-making. They should not add unnecessarily to the financial burdens on development.”</p> <p>Consequently, this SPD should only provide more detailed advice or guidance on policies in the adopted Local Plan. The SPD should not, as appears to be the case in this instance, seek to amend or change the requirements of the Local Plan.</p>	
<b>Planning consultant/ agent</b>			
Setplan Ltd (A Ward)	Planning Consultant/Agent	<p>Urban transport technology is being transformed and this must be reflected in how we plan our cities and towns - focused on walking, cycling, car clubs and mass transit. The deplorable national housing shortfall is manifest most acutely in the South East of England, resulting in cramped and expensive homes. The unrealistic current car parking standards both encourage private car ownership and prevent the achievement of the residential densities needed to address the housing shortfall at sustainable locations. High density housing supports public transport and reduces car dependence. The market for well-located high rise living is now proven and growing based on people’s desire to get out of traffic, long commutes and the heavy financial burden of car dependence.</p> <p>On street car parking stress is an essential element discouraging unnecessary private car ownership and should be abandoned as the standard by which proposals are</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		assessed, the only applicable standard should be highway safety.	
<b>Resident</b>			
Jonathan Pockson	Resident	<p>My main comment on the requirements of any new Parking SPD is that there is a realistic allowance for car parking spaces in any new residential developments within Elmbridge. The previous guidelines re 2 bed and 4 bed developments is inadequate. There should be a minimum requirement of 2 spaces for each 2 bed development and 3 spaces for 4 bed developments.</p> <p>The car ownership in Elmbridge I understand to be that 76% of adults own cars. This is not going to change in the foreseeable future. So any development has to allow for at least that many car parking spaces. Residential developments should be required to estimate the number of adults anticipated and that 76% of them will require a parking space. This number of spaces should be provided.</p> <p>In Esher in particular the distance to stations and schools is generally too far to walk and cycling is not an alternative. Any development with inadequate car parking spaces will result in unsafe street parking which will be frustrating and potentially dangerous to local residents and will destroy the character of the Borough.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Angela Phipps	Resident	<p>See Attachment titled 'Angela Phipps' in G:\BUSINESS SUPPORT TEAM\SPD Consultations 2020\Parking SPD\Report 4 Attachments I make the following observations on the content of the draft document. It considers that these support a more holistic approach being desirable.</p> <p>1 In my view the current and proposed policy needs to be more prescriptive and the words “should” or “may” should be used less and rather more mandatory language used to accompany the policy. An example would be 2.14 in reciting and retaining DM7 has “the proposed parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents”. Why is the word “must” not used so that it can be shortened to e.g. “the proposed parking provision must not result in any increase in on-street parking stress”?</p> <p>2. Paragraph 2.12 of the draft SPD reminds us that an object of policy is to direct development toward ‘sustainable locations’. The Council must more readily assess and recognise those sites and areas that are not sustainable. A starting point is that national policy is clear – direct development toward previously developed land in Town Centres with good public transport.</p> <p>3.The document does not seek to change the required parking place numbers set by the existing policy and evidence is not provided to show how the current requirements work. I consider that present policy often requires too few parking spaces to be provided with development. While what is maintained may arise from the aspiration that walking and cycling more are to be encouraged (which I support), it does not reflect the ever increasing number of vehicles used per residence, in whatever location, due to increased mobility. Even if the future has vehicles as predominantly electric or</p>	<p>Comments noted. The car parking standards will be updated as part of the new Local Plan process. Surrey County Council are a statutory consultee on all planning policy consultations and they have provided a response to the Parking SPD consultation.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>even operating on hydrogen, they will still need spaces unless there is a revolution in the thinking about public transport.</p> <p>4. Nowhere in this document is there reference to underground car parking being required where that is feasible to be provided rather than using hard standing taking up precious open and garden space. This is one measure that could feature as an urgent change to current policy. Further the use of non-permeable materials for the hard standing under parking spaces should simply be prohibited.</p> <p>5. Couching parking requirements in terms of the 'maximum' number allowed for each development is too simplistic. This has very often resulted in too few parking spaces being advanced by developers. The numbers must not only take account of increasing car ownership but also the dramatic increase in home delivery and similar. Parking place numbers for residential developments should be defined as minima not maxima. Multi-unit developments in particular must have a number of spaces provided for likes of visitors, tradesmen, carers and ambulances.</p> <p>6. I am concerned about the lack of control on on-street parking. While that is a role that is undertaken by Surrey County Council there is a need for that authority to take account of the needs of Elmbridge and for developers to understand that key road links in the borough need to be kept free of parking (perhaps with clearways). There are other roads that have a character that does not make them appropriate for on-street parking. There is no evidence of how the Council have liaised with Surrey County Council, whether for formulating this document or, on these aspects, for the purpose of policies to go into the emerging Local Plan. Locally, for instance, there is an urgent need to review loading/unloading in Cobham High Street particularly during times of high traffic stress and to mitigate the effects of HGVs.</p>	



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>These need strong policies.</p> <p>8. The provision of electric charging is written with existing (even past) technology in mind. 'Trickle charging' is obsolete so references to this need removing. There is a case for every space to have a 'fast charger' (perhaps defined by reference to a DoT standard or similar).</p> <p>9. Appendix 1 deals with the requirement for a survey by developers. It should be made mandatory for every development.</p>	
Duncan Crane	Resident	<p>These seem sensible improvements that take account of how residents' needs for adequate, effective and presentable parking provision are evolving. Thank you for inviting me to comment.</p>	Support noted.
Peter Harrison	Resident	<p>I include some points below but am confused as this does not a) seem to relate to the feedback provided in the local strategic plan (Oct 2019) and refers also to documentation which isn't available as part of the information pack. If we are to review with the right level of scrutiny, the date for submission should be postponed.</p> <p>Re immediate comments though, the document does not seek to change the required parking place numbers set by the existing policy and evidence is not provided to show how the current requirements work based on what was originally planned so there isn't a barometer for current performance. I assume that the need for current parking which is available to remain is a push for people to use public transport or cycling. As people move to electric cars, they will still need spaces with fast charging points unless there is a revolution in the thinking about public transport or cycling use. An idea may be to</p>	<p>Comments noted. The SPD related to the existing planning policies and there does not related to the previous consultations on the new Local Plan.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>consider underground car parking being required where that is feasible to be provided rather than using hardstanding taking up precious open and green space. This is one measure that could feature as a valid change to current policy. Reference parking requirements in Multi-unit developments in particular must have a number of spaces provided for likes of visitors, tradesmen, carers and ambulances such that parking does not spill out onto already congested roads. On that note, what are the considerations for minimising further on street parking? There are other roads that have a character that does not make them appropriate for on-street parking and main roads also should remain clear. There is no evidence of how Elmbridge Council have liaised with Surrey County Council, whether for formulating this document or, on these aspects, for the purpose of policies to go into the emerging Local Plan. Locally, my views remain that parking should remain very similar to what it is now and but cater correctly for right type of vehicles or alternative modes of transport. The parking cannot spill out onto roads as these are congested enough.</p>	
Frances Yelland	Resident	<p>Comments:  It is stated that there is good road accessibility through the borough to London (M25 and A3). The current access to these roads is very poor, aggravated by serious congestion. Whilst this is not a parking issue, it is not correct to make such a statement in a policy document, particularly where attention to the environment and air quality are cited as important . Access to and parking at railway stations needs to have greater emphasis. If adequate parking is provided (there is practically non at Hersham) this would assist the overall appeal of rail transport and remove excessive parking in surrounding (narrow) suburban streets.  It is essential that great emphasis is placed on removing on-</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>pavement parking. It is dangerous, pedestrians cannot get past cars on the pavements meaning they have to walk into the street (note for example West End Lane.) It is often allowed on narrow roads, causing congestion and dangerous driving behaviour.</p> <p>What is the point of the suggestion 1.5 spaces for a 2 bedroom unit. Who has 0.5 of a car? This may have mathematical logic but is not a practical recommendation.</p> <p>Finally, I could not find anywhere in the documentation, the sort of hard standing to be provided for development parking. Is there a possibility of specifying 'porous' materials to be used. We are in danger of concreting/tarmacng much of Elmbridge, effecting water run off and encouraging flooding.</p> <p>Thank you.</p>	
Carol de Sousa	Resident	<p>The document appears to be comprehensive.</p> <p>As emphasis is being placed on encouraging use of public transport, please can extra consideration be given to include local streets affected by commuter parking during your surveys at peak times. As an example, this has been a problem in Lodge Close, which is near Cobham Station but not adjacent to it. Surveys during the night would not highlight the congestion caused during the midweek from 07:30 onward. It rises whenever there is an increase in station/public car parking charges.</p> <p>Local uptake of bus services tends to be poor because of the infrequent/poor reliability of services &amp; lack of route choice to other local towns like Weybridge &amp; Chertsey. Cycling is a problem at pinch points that are potentially dangerous on certain roads e.g. the road bridge over the railway between Oxshott &amp; Cobham has a double bend &amp; I have witnessed near accidents involving cyclists &amp; pedestrians on numerous occasions at that site. People tend therefore to drive,</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The SPD will be amended to incorporate the suggested daytime parking survey.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		particularly during school pick up & drop off times, which adds to the parking congestion.	
Paul Ray	Resident	<p>Some general comments:  there appears to be a disconnect between style/delivery of parking covered in this documentation (which seems to be sensibly discussed) and the reality of how it all integrates into the total area plan. It almost feels like you are looking for support on something which is not clear or I cannot understand if you are really asking us a question.  as a Long Ditton resident, I'm pleased to see some reference to station travel (Surbiton) and retail access (Kingston upon Thames). However, given the absence of cross boundary planning, there is a giant hole here e.g. how can more people get through Surbiton station on a daily basis, how can more people get to Kingston etc. Infrastructure and services solutions must be detailed and delivered ahead of new residential/parking development so that people can actually trust proposals to not further spoil the existing area which is already strained. We seem to creep in a deteriorating direction as every year goes by with NO infrastructure or services solutions, so please do not be surprised that trust levels are very low. Examples could include: lack of station capacity for human/vehicle access flow  lack of ability to park at supermarkets in area  lack of ability to use recycling centre on Villiers Road (Kingston) which could save a lot of vehicle miles  lack of road capacity on Portsmouth Road following confusing cycle lane installations which reduces capacity, slows travel</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to secure service improvements for our communities.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>and probably increases air pollution from more stationary traffic  lack of any road network upgrade proposals to accommodate future growth e.g Hook Roundabout  all of the above is just as important as schools, doctors and other services accommodating growth etc.  Please join up the ideas here so that a greater level of trust can be built between the community and the planners.</p>	
L Wheeler	Resident	<p>I have seen no where in the Document where it states clearly that road parking should be positioned so as not to inconvenience the householders living on that road. In 2016 Surrey designated parking zones in Holtwood Road Oxshott that prevent access and egress to some driveways by anything other than a normal size car without mounting the pavement and verge. That these parking bays are occupied from 7am to 8pm or later by commuters means that one can be unable to have delivery and removal lorries drive into the property. More thought needs to be given to add the first sentence in my comment to the Supplementary Document</p>	Comments noted.
Emile De Sousa	Resident	<p>A significant factor in the number of private vehicles in use and therefore parking required is the lack of public transport both within the borough and out of the borough. For example there is only a 2 hourly bus service from Cobham to Weybridge. The only other public transport is a train via Surbiton. Another factor is the rise in parking charges at railway stations, which has led to overspill parking in suburban streets, often a significant distance from the stations. Elmbridge should engage with public transport providers to</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		address these problems.	secure service improvements for our communities.
graham thompson	Resident	This document is important for the environment of Surrey Parking in new developments is inadequate, which is evident from the numbers of vehicles parked along roads and verges .At least one space should be required for each bedroom in a property, and in addition a large number of spaces for visitors and trades people. Also delivery space.	Comments noted.  The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.
john ryan	Resident	Re 4.11 EV charging. These provisions are wholly inadequate. The target of 2040 for end of fossil vehicle sales is unrealistic - 2030 is necessary. New builds should be provided with infrastructure for 100% of bays to have EV charging, even if not all of these are fitted with charge outlets at this time. 5.3 car parking SUVs have caused serious environmental damage and have negated the effects of engine efficiency increases. We are a small country with limited space and narrow roads. Parking should firmly discourage SUV-sized vehicles. EVs will need to be smaller and lighter to be efficient and have good range. There should be provision for a limited number of larger bays, but minimum size should be set to suit smaller vehicles, thus discouraging purchase of SUV-sized vehicles.	Comments noted.  The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.
Michael Cloud	Resident	Two minor items: Mention is made of the new 2.5x5.0m parking spaces - can you advise what the previous space dimensions were so that if a current parking has the original dimensions how many parking spaces could be lost if they were resized? If on road parking dimensions were or are to expand to the new figure does that mean the central line in the middle of the road would be moved to accommodate this change - the	Comments noted.  The proposed parking space size increase would increase spaces from 2.4m x 4.8m to 2.5m x 5m and will only apply to spaces on private

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		'oversized' cars can be a problem for instance on Queens Road and Church Road in Weybridge where two way traffic often struggles to pass by.	development. This will be made clearer in the final SPD.
Julian Rye	Resident	A lot of development within the borough is the modification of what have been single dwellings to flats (e.g. one house to four flats). This is causing considerable parking stress as there is often insufficient room for the increased number of cars used by the four flats' occupants. Planning must be very careful to alleviate this stress. I would hope too that the levels outlined on Page 15 are fully applied, nit just the one space per unit as indicated in Page 19.	Comments noted.
Georgina Pye	Resident	I do not think it necessary to impose parking restrictions on the roads mentioned near to Hampton Court Station. These roads all have large driveways and therefore car parking on the unmarked areas should not inconvenience the residents, and the ability to park will encourage custom for local businesses. Also other roads nearby, with less access to driveways may well find the traffic moves to their roads with considerably more inconvenience. Perhaps a reduction in the station parking fees would be a suitable compromise? This obviously adds to the financial burden of commuters to London. (It would also seem counter-productive to take over existing carparking facilities (as in Molesey) for the building of further homes, as mentioned as a possibility in your planning document relating to new housing. This will also exacerbate the problem and deter shoppers). Obviously the more homes built by the Council, the greater the need will be for available parking places.	Comments noted.
stephen Bown	Resident	Parking near esher station rather than in station car park is big problem for congestion. Strongly advise increase parking spaces in station	Comments noted.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		if that does not work then consider residents only parking on ember lane and proximate side road	



Paul Smith	Resident	<p>Without a significant improvement in public transport the areas of Cobham, Oxshott and Stoke d'Abernon will continue to dependent on private transport and with an ageing population this is most likely to be using vehicles.</p> <p>Most of the roads in this area are unsuitable to on road parking and most roads are too dangerous to use cycles. The current situation that permits cycles on pavements is potentially too unsafe</p> <p>Consequently no development be it residential or otherwise can only be considered if the minimum car and cycle parking requirements are included and off road.</p> <p>Most roads cannot be widened to cater for cycle lanes and many residential roads are used as back doubles for commuters.</p> <p>Parking at Green railway stations can be very difficult, with no obvious way of increasing parking capacity without using areas of outstanding natural beauty etc.</p> <p>The only solution to both transport and parking problems, which will only deteriorate with new residential building proposals is to address the public transport system. A complete review of the public transport that exists in the borough and what is really needed is an urgent requirement.</p> <p>Currently the bus services are appalling and whilst your document claims a good rail system only Walton provides a decent train service, with Weybridge and Esher just about satisfactory. The survive at the remaining stations is dreadful, one train an hour in Sundays, often with a need to change en route is completely inadequate. However there is nothing that can be done by the Council here so it must address the bus services and work on a major overall of local, services that will</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The policies in the new Local Plan will be considering sustainable transport measures across the borough.</p>
------------	----------	--	---

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>stop people driving short distances.  The Council has no chance of improving the heavy load on the roads and the increasing need for public car parking without taking private vehicles off the road and improving public transport. Achieve this and the need for private cars can reduce. This can lead to reducing the level of off road parking on. New developments.  it would also help the rush hour traffic if the local schools started to ban private vehicles taking students to their establishments. One coach can take 50 pupils and each coach could take 30; to 40 cars out of the rush hour.</p>	
Karen Jones	Resident	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There is a conflict in the national policy stating that maximum standards are not recommended and lead to poor quality schemes, paras 2.4 and 2.8, and local parking standards for non-residential which are all expressed as maximum standards;</li> <li>2. There is no policy or guidance that is sufficiently discouraging car use;</li> <li>3. There are no implementation references to standards aimed at improving air quality and no mention of the designated AQMA's with CS &amp; DM references, and where location specific guidance can be found;</li> <li>4. Why are the space standard designing for and thus encouraging the use of larger vehicles? We should be encouraging smaller vehicles in urban areas;</li> <li>5. It should be recognised that existing residential areas often suffer from small front gardens that cannot accommodate large vehicles, they often overhang the footway causing a pedestrian hazard, and there are not policies for these situations where there are extensions proposed that increase the occupation sizes of houses. Additionally, infill sites in established areas might require smaller car parking spaces to</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.</p> <p>Statutory consultees have been consulted as part of this consultation, with included Surrey County Council.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>maintain the character of areas;</p> <p>6. There is no definition of “areas of high accessibility”. Where are these, they should be specified?</p> <p>7. Similarly, the standards are applied differently to Town centres/District Centres/Local Centres. This should be the opportunity to set the boundaries out in an Appendix and cross reference the relevant CS &amp; DM policies;</p> <p>8. It is not recognised that much of the borough does not have Controlled Parking Zones, thus over flow parking is always going to be an issue with maximum parking standards at 1:1. The CPZ's should be referenced in an appendix and to CS &amp; DM policy, and it should be made clear outside these areas that stress surveys are required;</p> <p>9. There is no reference to the involvement of SCC Highway in both pre-apps and the determination of planning applications. It should be made clear that EBC takes guidance from SCC;</p> <p>10. SCC Highways seem to be promoting electric vehicle charging 1 per each housing unit which is different to the standards in this guide;</p> <p>11. The para 2.18 reference to the WSP consultant study states “the background evidence can be found here”. There is no link to a report. Is this a summary of it? Has this report been published? Some statements need to be challenged. Does it conclude young people are driving less or less young people have driving licences, these are different things.</p>	

Mrs Pulford	Resident	Although I understand the difficulty the Council is facing regarding today's parking issues and congested roads, I am against the reduction of car parking spaces for new developments for the simple reason that we have very poor public transport i.e. buses to allow travel to towns like Kingston, Staines or Woking or to GP Surgeries or Hospitals. I get the impression that it would suit the Council cutting down on parking spaces in order to squeeze in more apartments. I	Comments noted.
-------------	----------	---	-----------------

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		have many times encouraged the Council to look in to a better Bus service. We are all heavily reliant on our cars to take us from A to B. We cannot all cycle in to the town or to work. What about the elderly generation? They are reliant on a car because of the poor bus service. I agree that Town centre parking should be reduced and car parking created outside where possible. Thank you.	
Mr (Andrew	Resident		Comments noted.

Benson)		<p>I am a long way from being an expert on parking but my opinions are that any parking needs to be integrated with transport and mobility generally. The document makes good points about the location of railway stations and the lack of public transport to link up many of the towns and suburban centres. Personally, we have experience in trying to help a young man that wanted to live in Esher but worked in Leatherhead. There was no public transport connectivity between the two. It is a 15 minute drive by car but requires several changes of trains and buses to get between the two. Public transport is geared to taking commuters to London and potentially serving Kingston and other larger retail centres. Car parking is therefore critical for efficient mobility and to help sustain the local environment. Much of what is written in the report seems very logical and the development of recharging points to support EV use also looks rational. I believe that we must think about next generation technology which is likely to be induction charging.</p> <p>I would urge councillors to future proof the investment in recharging. Within the foreseeable future, there will be a dramatic shift to autonomous driving and the associated shift to car sharing. Many people will choose to use some sort of app to hail a car where they subscribe to a car sharing service or just pay per ride. In effect this will require the modern day equivalent of taxis with cars being able to be charged at</p>	<p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.</p>
---------	--	--	--

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
-----------------	------------------------	----------	--------------------

		<p>they wait to be hired. This cannot be undertaken in a normal car park as it would cause too much congestion.</p> <p>I would also urge councillors to explore ways to provide public transport links, potentially with electric buses, to the many retail and other commercial, entertainment and economic centres across Elmbridge and to the other regional centres that include Woking, Dorking, Guildford, Leatherhead, Epsom, Kingston and Bookham.</p> <p>Station car parking is excessive and South Western Railways provides a shockingly bad service. the Cobham branch line is particularly poor.</p> <p>I do not find issue with the general outline of the plan but better consideration of public transport and the coming EV revolution need to be better considered as a way of reducing private transport without imposing excessive costs and/or deterrents as a mechanism for reducing private mobility.</p>	
Mark Zaremba-Tymieniecki	Resident	<p>The provision for electric charging is I believe inadequate. In all the building/usage types the ratio should be raised to 30%. In addition the site should be so designed that this can be increased without extensive building of electrical work being required. We know that petrol/diesel is being phased out by 2040 or even sooner. This is of course dependent upon politician's whose track record in decision making is well understood. It is better to start with a higher level and an infrastructure to expand now, than having to do this 'in a hurry' at much greater cost as the date approaches.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
William Corbett	Resident	<p>In section 4.4 Cycle Parking Standards Class 3 states Flats Houses without garages or gardens must have x No of spaces. Later standard refer to provision for households with garages / gardens, so why the restraint? Could the document just not require minimum standards for provision, whether there are gardens or not?</p> <p>I was surprised to see disabled parking provision was set at a standard of 1 in 20 on residential developments and that electric charging points are set at 1 in 5. This may fit in with long-term projections but seems insufficient (disabled parking provision) given projections for the next 10 - 20 years.</p> <p>As far as charging points are concerned, apart from the practicality of installing and managing the points, do spaces on residential schemes have to be allocated to a space? Isn't the restraint the accessibility of a charging point, so couldn't these be placed in an accessible position serving any parking bay rather than an allocated bay. It would be more practical long-term to require all parking on residential developments to be provided with a minimum one charging point per household.</p> <p>I'd also suggest that for city centre schemes where there is a case of excluding parking provisions, there should be a minimum number of both electric charging parking bays and disabled parking bays (these can be combined) with a ratio of 2 : 1 provided as contribution to the community. So a minimum standard of two bays with one allocated to disabled parking.</p>	Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Simon Batten	Resident	<p>I think the parking consultation document is overall quite comprehensive but have two suggestions:</p> <p>1. Station parking - on p14, 2.13, 5 - The Council will support improvements to stations and station parking that facilitate increased public transport use. It is not expressly addressed, but the if the policy is to encourage use of public transport, charging for a whole day of parking when people are going into London for a show is not wise nor fair. Similarly weekends: This is often when people take their family into London and, already faced with typically four fares, charging for weekends doesn't make sense.</p> <p>I think parking should be by the hour; stop at 6pm and not be charged at all at the weekends.</p> <p>2. Motorcycle parking - most insurers will not insure a motorcycle when it is parked if it is not securely chained to a post.</p> <p>I recommend the installation of secure posts at every motorcycle bay.</p>	<p>Comments noted. Station parking charges cannot be addressed through this SPD, however the wider Council is working with its partners to explore these issues.</p> <p>Motorcycle parking will be included in the final draft of the SPD.</p>



MRs Shone	Resident	<p>Please improve the cycle network in the area. We as a family wish to cycle to college and work, the distance is not a problem but the safety on the roads is - it is too much of a risk to cycle so we have to use the car instead.</p> <p>There are very few cycle lanes in the borough. And those cycle lanes that there are, cars are often parked on them which makes it dangerous for cyclists to pull out. Can the council look into disallowing cars to park in cycle lanes.</p> <p>By giving residents the option of being able to cycle safely to their destination should reduce the number of cars on the road and pollution.</p> <p>Also, can the council do anything about people parked with their engines left running? This is producing unnecessary pollution - often outside schools and clubs where children</p>	Comments noted.
-----------	----------	--	-----------------

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		<p>have to walk past the fumes. Car share scheme sounds like a great idea.</p>	
Gwen C	Resident	<p>The document has explained the requirements for parking survey and assessment, which is a great thing to see. We need to have proper assessment to reflect on the reality, hopefully we will stop seeing developers trying to get away from addressing parking problems by tweaking survey data. Similar should be set out for traffic assessment too.</p>	Support noted.

Penelope Loya	Resident	<p>There is very limited parking in Esher I have a blue badge due to mobility problems from surgery ( a spinal fusion) and other joint problems from arthritis.if there are no available spaces I have to go home.As a result I rarely visit Esher High St which is near to where I live.I now shop where I know I can park i am happy to pay for this privilege.i was a nurse in the NHS for 47 years and took mobility for granted.i never thought walking would be so difficult Getting on buses is hard and walking to bus stops worse i feel guilty using my car but the alternative is to stay home and lose contact with people</p>	Comments noted
John Rennocks	Resident	<p>2.20 The reference to fewer under 24's having driving licences is in part caused by the very high cost of property in Elmbridge which prevents the young from buying.</p> <p>2.23 and 4.8 The reference to Electric Vehicle charging points is weak. Is it recognised that by next year 50% of car sales need to be electric to meet EU and UK emission standards. The EV infrastructure needs to be built early, in all car parks, including stations, to encourage the rate of purchase of these vehicles. Without many more charging points in 2020 the</p>	Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

		worry over range anxiety and charging will not be met. You need to get the horse before the cart, not wait for people to buy and then abandon electric vehicles because of charging inadequacies. The present level of just 39 charging points is derisory for a borough that has a wealthy population who could buy electric if charging was available.	
Laurence Rosen	Resident	<p>Disabled Parking</p> <p>The High Street in Esher is a disaster for disabled drivers. There appear to be just 17 publicly - available disabled bays in the whole of the town centre, so impossible for us to shop during Monday to Saturday. There are thought to be 2334 Disabled Parking Permit holders living in Elmbridge!!</p> <p>In the evenings, we are unable to park, even in the southerly end of the High Street where the restaurants are. Double yellow lines should be altered to allow for Disabled Parking after 1830 hrs.</p> <p>Electric Vehicle Charging Points</p> <p>We want to purchase electric hybrid vehicles, but Elmbridge offers no public charging points - the Car Park behind the Civic Centre could provide opportunities, but why must we wait for two further years?</p>	Comments noted.
Ian Lamb	Resident	<p>Unless I have suffered a fundamental flaw in my understanding this proposal sets out guidelines to provide new housing and businesses that don't meet what people (you know, tax payers and voters) actually want, parking with their home/business, but rather benefits property developers whilst not penalising the council. It actually benefits the council indirectly by forcing people into chargeable parking.</p> <p>Why on earth would you express any sort of principle of a document as a MAXIMUM? If it is sufficient a problem to have a policy about then surely the standards must be a minimum.</p> <p>Te whole premise of the document is that car ownership will drop significantly - this is not a given. What is a given is that it</p>	Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>will make things much worse in the short term. Someone with a degree of common sense might propose that new developments have separate garaging/parking areas that are accessible to the road and can be made available in future for alternative development IF demand for vehicles drops.</p>	
1957 (Linda Quinn)	Resident	<p>Good afternoon,  I appreciate your document and note your guidelines, but I am bemused that you can describe our rail services as good to very good.  If the public transportation infrastructure could be improved the higher percentile of road usage would surely drop.  In Cobham there are 2 trains an hour and 1 bus every 1.5 hours, hence the need to use a car.  Kind regards,  Linda Quinn</p>	Comments noted.
Keith Evetts	Resident	<p>The draft seems very thorough. I have one suggestion (although it need not find its way into the draft): where there is a new large residential development of many units, and given the acknowledged need for access to railway stations, provision could/should be made for a commuter bus shuttle service, either by the developers (especially if the development will have communal service charges) or perhaps by the authorities. I realise that it is SCC not EBC that is responsible for public bus services; but I do think more serious integrated thought could be given to shuttling residents to stations and back at peak times.</p>	Comments noted.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

Ian Donaldson	Resident	<p>Electric vehicle spaces and charging points need to be considered, so they are suitably located, sited and designed to avoid street clutter.</p> <p>Public car parks i. Public off-street parking will continue to be provided where it supports the economic or recreational use of the immediate area and provides dual use allowing parking for residents and shoppers/employees, particularly in town centres.</p> <p>Not only car charging points but electric bike charging points</p> <p>2.24 The trend in garage use for car parking is continuing to decline across the UK with more used for storage within residential units, but it should be noted that garages also serve a function for cycle parking.</p> <p>All garages should provide power points for charging electric cars and bikes</p> <p>A mix of short and long stay cycle parking should be provided in new commercial or mixed use developments. Short stay cycle parking should be provided in the type of Sheffield type stands as they provide more stability and security than can be achieved by using the type of stand that only allows the front wheel to be locked. Short stay cycle parking should:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Allow natural surveillance;</li> <li>• Be well lit;</li> <li>• Be conveniently located within a short distance of the building entrance and, where possible, offer a real advantage over the nearest parking space;</li> <li>• Be located away from bin stores and smoking shelter (or other features that may deter use); and</li> <li>• When located in the footway, stands should include a tapping rail to warn the visually impaired.</li> </ul> <p>Table 4: Requirements for Electric Vehicle Charging Points (from SCC Vehicular and Cycle Parking Guidance January 2018)</p> <p>All new cycle racks in public and residential apartments should be provided with electric power points for charging.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.</p>
---------------	----------	---	--

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>Town Centre parking  All town centre car parks should have FREE car parking on Saturdays not just a few in certain local councillors choice areas. Weybridge is suffering with closing shops and shoppers going to FREE car parks on Saturdays!</p>	
Mrs (Rachel Liechti)	Resident	<p>Having looked at all suggestions, only option 2 strikes us as feasible. It gives more of a balanced outcome, which can then be reviewed if necessary towards the end of the 15 year implementation period.</p> <p>Whilst option 5 provides all the space needed, the precedent set by utilising the proposed green belt areas fills us with fear. Once such a step is taken, it will then be very difficult to put a stop to future development.</p> <p>In 20/30 years will we be living in yet another urban landscape, our beautiful open spaces gone for good?</p>	Noted. This consultation is regarding additional guidance on parking in the borough and not the Options put forward in consultation on the new Local Plan.
Mr & Mrs Hare	Resident	<p>It should be a requirement that all parking bays have a white line front and rear to indicate space for each vehicle. This is not the case</p> <p>in Hersham Road and Stompond Lane where absence of such lines leads to fewer vehicles being parked there than the parking area could accommodate.</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Nicholas Taylor	Resident	<p>1.1 - second sentence - "It is generally accepted..." - what is this statement of alleged fact meant to mean/conclude?</p> <p>1.14 - states a causal relationship between perceived poor public transport links to areas other than central London and higher car ownership. Is there evidence . to support this causal relationship? or is the relationship economic?</p> <p>2.18 - where is "here"?</p> <p>Generally, the SPD is framed from the position of ICE cars....with cycles and EVs, etc as very much a secondary thought. EBC should take the opportunity to step back and frame a SPD "Planning for/accommodating/integrating/embracing our sustainable future transport needs" - and have a policy approach which looks forward to shaping the future - not just tracing inevitable change</p> <p>4.9 - where are they? EBC should encourage a strategy to encourage strategic placement of these - be a leader&gt;&gt;&gt;</p> <p>4.11 - these relate to new developments? Is there a strategy to "retro-fit" the borough with chargers?</p> <p>Generally feel silent / quiet on how to encourage (i) walking (ii) cycling, and (iii) role of public transport in borough...but maybe that is not role of SPD...?</p>	Comments noted.
John Montgomery	Resident	I support	Comment of support noted.



M (joy Reymond)	Resident	I did not see anything in the report on the impact of self-drive vehicles. Did I miss it> In the next decade, self-drive cars and presumably buses, will become more prevalent, and people may well move to rental or ride-share arrangements, rather than owning and parking their own car on their own property. New technologies which support scheduling - eg. to get commuters from home to the	Comment on self-drive cars is noted.  Through the new local plan process policies will be reviewed and updated to
-----------------	----------	---	---

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		train station, will emerge, and the need for station parking will decline. I would be curious to see expert analysis of this projected trend towards car rental not ownership.	reflect changes in policy and evidence.

Louise McDonagh	Resident	<p>1) In order to provide better intra-borough public transport I suggest Council-operated minibuses (such as they have in Exeter etc) to serve strategically connected routes with a regular and reliable timetable. So, for example, we could have a service - with paying customers of course - with hourly or half-hourly minibus services departing from and arriving at main village/town car parks. e.g. a Walton-Molesey-Thames Ditton-Esher-Cobham-Whitely-Weybridge-Walton route and a similar reverse route and another one taking in Long Ditton, Claygate, Hersham, Brooklands etc. If Elmbridge was to be regularly serviced by ecologically compliant minibuses, this would be a massive benefit to the community and help reduce the need for car travel along our already-congested roads. Here's a picture of the kind of vehicle that would suit the smaller roads of Elmbridge and would have fewer empty seats per trip.</p> <p>2) for new developments, sink all car parking under ground on a lower level with the residential building on top at ground level.</p> <p>3) support the 'Ringrail' strategy whereby the Croydon Tramlink is extended from Wimbledon to connect the quadrants of London inside the M25 in a circular manner connecting Wimbledon to Surbiton, Hampton Court, Kingston and northwards towards Richmond, Kew, Ealing then on round to the North and East quadrants and back to Crystal Palace, and Croydon.</p>	<p>Comments on public transport and underground parking are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>
-----------------	----------	---	--

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
-----------------	------------------------	----------	--------------------

Julian Domszy	Resident	<p>What is the point of having this parking document when it can be totally ignored in making planning application decisions  As an example the following part of the document refers to a minimum provision of one space per residential unit. A recent planning approval on 2 Hillcrest gardens allowed only 4 spaces for 8 residential units.  "b. Parking i. The proposed parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents. In such instances, a minimum provision of one space per residential unit will be required."  Seems to be a total waste of time and money  Dr Julian Domszy</p>	<p>Comments noted.   The adopted Parking SPD will be a material consideration in decision making on planning applications.</p>
Alice Shuff	Resident	<p>While appreciating the problems in Palace and Wolesey Roads, please take into consideration the problems already existing in Manor, Kent , Park , Pemberton, Dennis and Vine Roads.  These are very narrow roads with parking problems of their own [residents, two churches, two nursery school s, a village hall , a very busy surgery and a junior school ]  The double yellow lines are routinely ignored at busy times.  Why cannot the parking behind the station and off Walton Road be made available at sensible, not greedy ,rates  Alice Shuff</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>
J Gardner	Resident	<p>For parallel parking design, a round dot painted on the road to guide the driver to align their door with the dot is a suggestion. This will maximize the number of cars that can fit in along the pavement.  The parking bays at Oxshott station are awful and numerous cars park randomly over lines taking up two spaces. The parking area is not maintained at all and the lines aren't clear and the leaves are never removed.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Kay Kenyon	Resident	<p>My comments are of a general nature. Firstly you will never decrease car usage unless you improve bus and train transport. I have friends who live on the other side of the river and they make frequent use of the bus service (e.g. Hampton, Teddington etc) and yet everybody I speak to in Elmbridge has the same view that I have which is the bus service is so bad that it might as well not exist. I don't see how the train links can be improved but it has to be said that we can't get a direct train to very close locations like Sunbury Shepperton and Kingston, this puts even more emphasis on the bus routes. There is never enough parking at the train stations. As for cycle parking, my family has had 3 cycles stolen now from Walton Station so that's put paid to anybody in this family cycling to the station again. Why do Hotels have 1.5 cars per room? How many people who share a room arrive separately? Town centre parking should be a minimal charge or free, our town centres are dying. 2.5 meters wide is too small for a car parking space, with a disabled mother, I know that the car door has to be wide open before she can even attempt to get out. There are not enough spaces allocated for doctor surgeries or hospitals and certainly not enough disabled spaces. As the population is getting older they will obviously become more reliant on their cars, I for example live at least a 20 minute walk from the nearest bus stop or train station and I live in Walton. I don't know how you can solve this problem. What it does mean though is you have to have enough car parking provision for any new development in Elmbridge, whether it be a Doctors, housing, restaurant etc</p>	<p>Comments are noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

M R O'Sullivan	Resident	<p>Dear Sir/Madam</p> <p>It is widely known that Weybridge town has significant parking congestion on unrestricted residential roads, aprticularly around its two main retail areas in the High Street and Queens Road.</p> <p>In 2018, the Weybridge Society's detailed initiative quantified the issue, identified its primary cause, and even suggested a simple solution that would meet the needs of the 3 stakeholders involved; residents, shoppers and businesses (including schools and shops).</p> <p>The initiative determined that of the 2,456 workers interviewed, 66% (1,620) drove into the Town and parked all day, every working day. Of those, 54% (866) had no allocated parking space at their place of work, so had to park elsewhere. Due to the lack and unaffordability of off-street public space, a massive 84% (724) of this 54% parked in a residential road. As 66.08% of all businesses in the KT13 area were interviewed, it's not unreasonable to extrapolate that between 724 and 1,096 commuter vehicles park in residential roads every working day, so inconveniencing residents and deterring shoppers away from the retail areas, so depressing their trade. All this goes to show that a combination of the volume of all-day commuter parking and a lack of affordable off-street space that is causing the congestion in residential roads, and threatening high street trade.</p> <p>Accordingly, and in addition to the wider provision of more public car parking space and the establishment of comprehensive, time-restricted parking zoning around the retail centres, any new development must itself provide off-street space to house at least two vehicles per unit, and that no resident in any such development should be allowed to purchase a resident's parking permit for use in any residential road.</p>	Comments noted.
----------------	----------	--	-----------------

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
timothy sullivan	Resident	There should be more parking free of charge and a less cynical approach to parking revenue. FOR EXAMPLE; The Lay-by in Oxshott high street should be free to all max 30 minutes parking. Simple	Comments noted.
Martin Lawrence	Resident	Fully support the increase in parking bay sizes: not needed in an ideal world, the prevalence of the Chelsea Tractor-type vehicle in the area makes this a sensible move. EV charging: area, like much of the UK, is woefully under-resourced. Plan needs to be more forward thinking in this respect and, specifically, needs to include a commitment to deter non-EV drivers from occupying such spaces.	Comments noted. The electric vehicle charging infrastructure will be reviewed in the new Local Plan.
Pamela Ling	Resident	I support option 2 as it is time to start limiting the impact on the Walton/Hersham area from new developments.	Comments noted. This consultation is regarding additional guidance on parking in the borough and not the Options put forward in consultation on the new Local Plan.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Barry Murray	Resident	I find it disappointing to find no reference to the provision of motorcycle parking in any of the development policies. Surely encouragement of the use of powered two wheelers both reduces road congestion and vehicle parking space. Design of car parking on residential property should be such to avoid the practice of overhang on to footways.	Comments noted. The draft SPD will include a section on motorcycle parking.
Victoria Klincke	Resident	There seems to be no reference to the provision of motorcycle parking in any of the development policies. Surely encouragement of the use of powered two wheelers both reduces road congestion and vehicle parking space. Design of car parking on residential property should be such to avoid the practice of overhang on to footways.	Comments noted. The draft SPD will include a section on motorcycle parking.



Keith Baldwin	Resident	<p>The document provides a lengthy discussion of various parking standards. However, it does not appear to properly address one of the major problems with parking, which is on-street parking and the question of who pays for this. While some on-street parking is very often necessary, there are areas suffering particular stress with this and I see nothing in this document to address this problem. For example, the area around Thames Ditton railway station is very heavily congested with excessive parking. This is because Thames Ditton is the only TfL Zone 6 station for many miles around which has no parking restrictions at all. The result is excessive car use, unsafe parking, heavy congestion (which of course adds to pollution) and great inconvenience to local residents. There should be a general principle expressed in this policy document that those who wish to drive should also pay to leave their cars (when not at home or in areas with specifically designated parking, such as commercial premises or sports clubs), just as they pay to drive them. This would not only control parking much better,</p>	Comments noted.
---------------	----------	---	-----------------

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		<p>but create cleaner less congested roads and less inconvenience to those who have the misfortune to live near high parking density locations. This policy document does not seem to address this question at all, though it is one of the most important issues.</p>	
Noel Newton	Resident	<p>I would have preferred to be asked to answer some specific questions rather than be asked to comment on a daunting amount of statements and backing information.</p>	<p>Comment noted for future SPD consultations.</p>

Carol Bogle	Resident	<p>Restricting parking spaces associated with new developments should only happen if public transport in Elmbridge, particularly local bus services, is improved or there is more availability of car club vehicles.</p> <p>I try to use my bike in preference to my car for short journeys so I support the proposed improvements for cycle parking which is no longer adequate in most shopping areas of Weybridge. Retailers should not be allowed to attach their business signs to cycle parking - e.g. as at York Road/Queen's Road junction in Weybridge. The issue of local flat dwellers leaving bikes apparently permanently chained - e.g. in Oatlands Drive shopping area - restricts use by visiting shoppers and should be looked into.</p>	Comments noted.
-------------	----------	---	-----------------

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
-----------------	------------------------	----------	--------------------

David Williams	Resident	<p>I welcome the fact that the Council is raising the profile of cycling and walking in the planning process but I fear that it is not being ambitious enough and the specifications do not take account of current and future developments in cycle use and planning design.</p> <p>My first observation is the requirement for cycle parking at non-residential developments isn't very generous and may represent current requirements it doesn't allow for the growth of cycling that the plan hopes to encourage. There is no mention of providing a route to this development that is segregated from motor vehicles. If parents are to be expected to visit shops/restaurants with children then better protected-space is needed.</p> <p>There is no mention of providing space for non-convention cycles, Britain is seeing a boom in the use of cargo and Dutch-style family bikes. These do not fit well in conventional Sheffield-style stands unless the stands are spaced wider. These types of bike are severely limited by barriers and chicanes that are installed on some cycle infrastructure projects. The same limitations apply to bikes adapted for use as mobility aids. I would like to see mention of better accessibility considerations in the plan.</p> <p>I am pleased to see the acknowledgement of the future of electric vehicles will play in our towns. I am concerned that some local authorities are using pedestrian space to provide charging points. I think this is a dangerous precedent, I would like to see the plan provide some protection of pavement space from the encroachment of charging points on the footways.</p> <p>Within residential developments, I would like to see better protection for walking space with a minimum pavement width and a ban on pavement parking. Designs of developments need to take an approach that parking is only allowed in</p>	Comments noted.
----------------	----------	--	-----------------

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>permitted, off-set bays this would provide a safer continuous space for cyclist and pedestrians.</p> <p>Where a development, either residential or otherwise is enclosed with only limited road access there should be greater consideration to alternative, additional access arrangements for foot and cycle travel. No-cycle alleyways are not part of these solutions. Too often we see a 2-mile drive to the shops or school could be a half-mile walk or cycle with better planning.</p> <p>My final point is that I think pedestrian and cycleways need to prioritised at junctions with the use of Copenhagen-style junctions. These have numerous benefits, they reinforce the idea that the driver is entering a residential area where the motor vehicle is a guest. They slow vehicles, within residential spaces too many junctions have wide junctions that invite turns at unsuitable speeds. They make easier for push-chair and wheel-chair to cross roads without having to push up and down dropped curbs.</p>	
V Braun	Resident	<p>4.0 - cycle parking. I would have liked to see (high) standards for cycle parking provision near public transport points (rail stations). Even if it isn't directly related to this PSP, it would be a good reference to include.</p> <p>5.10 - garages. It doesn't make much sense to set enlarged requirements for provision of garages, when, per your document, less than half of all car garages are used for parking. Garages take up precious space, and residents shouldn't be encouraged to dump their infrequently used belongings therein.</p>	Comments noted. Cycle standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Janine Martin	Resident	<p>I find this parking SPD to be quite a 'vanilla' document with no apparent surprises. I am however interested in the comments in section 2.20 which states that there is a reduction in full driving licences for the under 24's and this could be utilised for future sustainable travel. From my own experiences the reduction in full driving licences does not mean less are driving, due to the more costly and increasingly difficult tests both theory, hazard and practical in order to obtain a full licences, together with the extortionate insurance costs for under 24's which basically are out of any of their reaches it just means that the more than ever young people are driving without licences or insurance. You only have to look at insurance stats to see this is the case. The so-called reduction in licences does not mean less are on the road.</p>	Comments noted.

John Pringle	Resident	<p>All non residential developments should provide a higher ratio of car spaces than highlighted as underestimated. For example, one space per GP consultant room is too low. Many GP surgeries are accessed by car as practices merge and often you are in a queue to see the GP, so parking space assumption is too simplistic and incorrect. Likewise, school expansion results in more less local staff, sixth formers who drive, etc all requiring parking as on-street parking is already an issue in most areas. Lower car ownership for under 24s is driven by cost not necessarily need, so reduction identified is more likely to be timing as car ownership for families and households likely to be increasing with modern lifestyles and also older children staying longer in the family home. More underground parking also desirable to minimise land used for hard standing car spaces, allowing more green garden space. Poor public transport for Elmbridge requires car ownership for commute and leisure activities, therefore assumption should be to plan</p>	Comments noted.
--------------	----------	--	-----------------

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		<p>all developments with high car ownership, as lack of planned car spaces will only have knock on effect on on-street parking as the case with many recent developments.</p>	

Jason Lee	Resident	<p>I acknowledge that there has been some consideration for car clubs, EVs, and the relatively high proportion of cars per household. Please can Elmbridge consider granting car clubs such as Zipcar parking control consent for flexible use of resident spaces- e.g. the Flex scheme in Wimbledon. Such a scheme allows the car club electric vehicles to use any resident permit spaces free of charge; the company is responsible for charging the cars so there is no dependency on charge points. This tackles major issues mentioned (car density, air pollution, carbon footprint) in one solution.</p> <p>This video shows how the scheme works in more detail:</p> <p><a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9WBQM6tGLM">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-9WBQM6tGLM</a></p>	Comments noted. The car club bays in Elmbridge are operated under a Surrey County Council scheme.
Martin Higgs	Resident	<p>Relating to section 4.11 electric vehicle charging points. The availability of charging points will be one of the keys drivers in the move to electric vehicles therefore in order to promote the use of electric cars the % of charging points should be higher as follows:</p> <p>for flats/apartments etc: 25% fitted and the other 75% provided with a power supply</p> <p>commercial development: 20% fitted and further 30% provided with a power supply</p>	Comments noted. EV charging point standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
Michael Wilson	Resident	<p>All good except that Table 1: Residential Parking Standards identifies the number of parking places "recommended as a maximum".</p> <p>This needs to be read in conjunction with "The proposed</p>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
-----------------	------------------------	----------	--------------------

		<p>parking provision should be appropriate to the development and not result in an increase in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents". Roadside and even pavement parking within the built up areas of Elmbridge is a cause of traffic delay and danger. The council should not be using rationing of car park spaces as a lever to reduce car usage (this should be the job of government in terms of public transport subsidy and private transport taxation). Based on the current average number of cars per household within the built up areas of Elmbridge Table 1 should be minimum requirement and not a maximum. Anything else will just mean more roadside parking and traffic upset.</p>	
Timothy Pope	Resident	<p>It is all very well having a tome of a document that establishes standards and all sorts of comfortable statements based on thos. BUT the fact is there is not nearly enough parking spaces at domestic or retail or commercial premises in Surrey. Town centres everywhere have been damaged by this and economically drained by out of town retail eg Brooklands. This has massively damaged the retail activity and footfall in the towns with the consequence that they are full of charity shops, coffee shops and a few surviving businesses. Addlestone is an example where the huge Tesco and parking in the middle of the town results in this footfall benefitting the surrounding retail businesses. You must increase town centre parking by whatever means and stop yellow lining etc. Housing developments need to be required to provide far more parking. What is the use of a standard that allows for 1 and a half cars? I have never seen anyone parking half a car. In all cases two spaces per 1 bedroom developments are needed because most couples have two cars. Larger houses need three or four spaces and these should be on site not on road parking. I</p>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		would suggest this is a long bureaucratic compliance document that is precisely useless at solving the problem.	
Nicholas Banks	Resident	<p>Dear Council,</p> <p>Thank you for the documentation, which I read with great interest.</p> <p>My comments are mainly based around two items that struck me as being negative to what you are trying to achieve. Firstly, the number of car spaces provided for hotels and sports facilities seems to be high and encourage separate car journeys to the same end point. You state that a hotel will be</p>	Comments noted. Both hotels and tennis clubs parking requirements are determined through an individual assessment provided with a planning application.

		<p>allowed two car spaces per bedroom, surely the people staying in a room together would also travel there together the majority of the time and by allowing only one car per room, would actively encourage car sharing.</p> <p>Likewise 4 car spaces per tennis court at a health club seems to encourage all players, who generally know each other and live within a couple of miles of each other, to travel separately to the court.</p> <p>We are supposed to now encourage lower Co2 emissions and a healthier environment for the continued sustainability of the planet, it should be encouraged to "car shame" people who are over using the petrol or diesel engine to carry out simple tasks or using multiple vehicles where one would suffice.</p> <p>Having a borough with such a high percentage of homes with over three cars is ludicrous, especially as most of those cars do less that 4000 miles per annum.</p> <p>Secondly, the council need to do more to encourage people to switch to electric vehicles or public transport, again, car journey shaming and positive marketing towards fewer,</p>	<p>Electric vehicle charging point standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.</p>
--	--	--	--

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

		<p>smaller and more electric is where we should be aiming and to help with this, far more charging points within car parks and retail outlets need to be encouraged, perhaps a discount in business rates for a set number of years, would encourage more car park owners to install electric car points, which would then encourage shoppers to those locations as they could shop and charge their vehicles simultaneously, which as we all want everything done immediately, helps with this.</p>	
Geoffrey Owen	Resident	<p>Parking across the Borough needs to be simplified, current system works reasonably well  In Long Ditton/Thames Ditton Area where I reside and Will be considerably better around and in Long Ditton Recreation Ground when Guy Salmonds transfer their workshops to new premises in Sunbury on Thames. I very rarely visit other parts of Elmbridge as I am loath pay ever increasing car parking fees.  has Elmbridge ever made a profit from the out sourcing of parking control. These costs are exhorbitant and killing local shopping areas. If car parks were free or a nominal 50 pence then people might start using our local high streets within the Borough</p>	<p>Comments noted. Public car parking is not an area covered by the SPD.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

Martin Elbourne	Resident	<p>The Parking SPD appears to avoid a key area of contention which arises as a result of the application of the Residential Parking Standards by planning officers when considering plans for flats and higher density developments. Apart from demonstrably underestimating the number of cars per household (EBC own figures state that 1.5 cars is the average per household across the Borough and that 46% of households own 2 cars), the Standards also make no parking space allowance for visitors or the increasingly frequent presence of 'online shopping' delivery vehicles.</p> <p>As a result of not addressing these issues, developers, planners and local residents will continue to engage in ongoing arguments about insufficient/unrealistic parking spaces related to new developments. Despite Policy DM7 requiring new developments to provide parking levels that are 'appropriate to the development and do not result in on-street parking stress that would be detrimental to the amenities of local residents', the application of the current Parking Standards in such circumstances results in exactly the opposite i.e. on-street parking stress and inappropriate pavement parking detrimental to the amenities of local residents .</p> <p>The issuing of an updated Parking SPD is therefore an ideal opportunity to address this ongoing issue around the provision of insufficient/unrealistic parking spaces associated with new high density developments. Either the Residential Parking Standards are updated to reflect the real world, or specific provision is made within the SPD to cater for the circumstances identified above.</p>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
-----------------	----------	---	---

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Allan Carruthers	Resident	<p>the updated parking space limits are sensible considering the larger sized cars owned by many Elmbridge residents. Although I could not spot any reference to multi story car park requirements the problem here as I see it is the increased size of the a/m cars. You MUST consider the vehicle's height as the size of most SUV's is higher than the average car.</p>	Comments noted.
Health at hand (Adrian Dilworth)	Resident	<p>In light of the fact that I am vehemently against the development of greenbelt for residential properties I am also vehemently against the use of greenbelt for parking facilities. Any bridleroads should be left as bridle roads and not for access to new developments, changed to alternative surfaces to accommodate traffic and parking. As a resident of Claygate I feel that sufficient parking, based on the available space, has been allocated to the local parade, the train station and surrounding residential roads. Electric points should be provided at local garages and petrol stations, particularly with fast charging that now exists. Further on road parking should not be promoted in any circumstance to continue to create a sense of space and deter excessive number of cars per household</p>	Comments noted.

Peter Galazka	Resident	<p>Overall a good document subject to the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Too few public parking spaces in local town centres (eg. Cobham) resulting in traffic jams, pollution &amp; frustration.</li> </ul> <p>Ultimately if people cannot easily park they won't visit &amp; it will have a detrimental economic impact on healthy High Streets. Public transport to the likes of Cobham is extremely limited &amp; bicycle use totally unrealistic for people to do the family shop so cars remain paramount</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The council makes money on parking which is a great way to help fund overall budget deficit &amp; self finance the additional</li> </ul>	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
---------------	----------	---	---

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>spaces required</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Provision of Electric charging points too low &amp; the main 6 Khw spec outdated (latest rapid chargers are 50 to 100 Khw)</li> <li>- For private developments minimising on street parking pressure is absolutely critical on Elmbridge's over crowded roads. Provision guidelines seem very modest eg. Only 1 space per 2 bed dwelling- what about visitors which includes carers, trades people, friends, etc. Same true for commercial development car parks that can fill up very fast &amp; cause traffic jams eg. Waitrose Cobham</li> <li>- Greater coordination with railway station parking required.</li> </ul> <p>Recent price increases &amp; longer chargeable periods simply forces parking onto roads whist the car parks themselves can be under use on certain days (eg weekends)</p>	

Emma Harris	Resident	<p>I whole heartedly agree that new residential developments should have two car spaces where the unit is 3 bedroom or more.</p> <p>The inevitable rise in electric or hybrid vehicles is (I predict) going to be concentrated in areas such as Elmbridge. This is because of the large proportion of suburban housing stock with front gardens/driveways into which charging points can be installed.</p> <p>This minimum car parking requirement will also help stop developers trying to squeeze larger and larger houses onto smaller and smaller plots with green space (such as gardens for children and wildlife) sacrificed to profit. Attempts to do just</p>	Comments noted. Car parking and EV charging standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
-------------	----------	--	---

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		this have been notable in planning permissions submitted to Elmbridge in my local area.	



Geoffrey Bills	Resident	The document suggests that the Borough wishes and intends to limit the freedom of choice to use private car transport in the longer term in this case by rationing car parking provision within home developments and business destinations. Partly based on adherence to the runaway Greenhouse effect theory/belief which is just that and for which it has no public mandate.	Comments noted.
Trevor Newley	Resident	I am surprised that the document describes the standards as "maximums". In a 'reductio ad absurdum' sense this could imply indeed that it is acceptable to provide no parking provision, which is presumably not the intent. Surely they are minimums, not maximums, or at the very least as a standard, what is expected with a good case needed for a development to have less parking, cycle storage or EV charging capability than described in the standard	Comments noted.
Anita Morrish	Resident	Your proposals look generally sensible but there is also considerable work to do in dealing with the current problem in Cobham. Since the erection of the old people's apartments in the High Street, the available parking for those who work or shop there has become totally inadequate. Although Elmbridge, I understand, added some more spaces to the other car park, they are few in number and on a paying basis that most people who work in the High Street cannot afford, and, still, many of the business owners in the High Street have told me that they are losing business because customers	Comments noted. Car parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		cannot find a place to park.	

		<p>I live in Leigh Road, which is an easy walk to the High Street, and from 8.00 - 8.30 am Monday to Saturday every single available place to park in the road is taken, usually by people who work in the High Street. Those cars do not move again until 5.00-6.00pm and it makes it impossible for the residents' legitimate visitors and for the residents if we need to move our cars around (many houses have a straight and narrow driveway, meaning that the car in front has to come out while the second car leaves). A number of householders have been forced to pave over their front gardens, to provide parking or manoeuvring areas for themselves and visitors. All of this comes at a huge environmental cost as trees, hedges and plants are ripped up by the residents because they have no practical alternative. Copse Road is also badly affected (many patients at the health centre use it) whilst Cleves Close has become a permanently full car park. It would be a good idea if someone from Elmbridge took the trouble to walk along these roads during business hours in the course of Monday-Friday or Saturday and see how bad the problem is. I see that your own consultation paper suggests that on street parking is undesirable, yet these roads have been turned into a car park for the High Street and health centre.</p> <p>There is little point trying to resolves issues for the future unless the current problems are resolved.</p>	
A Douch (V Douch)	Resident	<p>We live in Station Road, Thames Ditton and do not have off street parking. We are keen to get an electric car but have no way of charging it at the moment as there are no charging points nearby. The only options we can think of are to apply for off street parking or to press for charging points in the village. We</p>	<p>Comments noted. Electric vehicle charging point standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>generally park in the few parking spaces near our house on Station Rd, but this isn't always possible and our parked car has been damaged by passing traffic in the recent past. I'm sure you are aware that too much traffic uses the village as a cut through and this often causes very obvious pollution in this small village. Rather than encouraging SUV's by making parking spaces larger, we should be encouraging people to buy smaller electric cars in the future and creating traffic systems that allow traffic to enter villages/towns where it needs to stop, but discourages it where it is just passing through. This might also stop the daily frustration and anger we have witnessed between cars trying to drive through Thames Ditton as quickly as they can. Anthony and Viviane Douch</p>	
Kenneth Day	Resident	<p>I think more emphasis needs to be given to the safe and convenient parking of cycles. If we are to reduce the use of cars we must provide user friendly parking facilities for cycles. I note that recommended cycle parking spaces per m2 of floor space/consulting room is significantly less than allowed for cars in all categories. I think cycle parking allocation should be increased if we do intend to reduce car use, and the facilities should be secure and covered if possible.</p> <p>I believe that cyclists in Elmbridge are more at risk from traffic behaviour and poor road surfaces that at any time in my 65 years of cycling. We need to improve the safety of cycling and pedestrian facilities if we are to encourage more people to walk and cycle. If we can replace cars with cyclists and pedestrians we will reduce environmental damage and improve the physical health of participants and reduce demands on the NHS</p>	Comments noted. Cycle parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

Karon Kerr	Resident	<p>Maximum parking standards should be minimum parking standards. 'Zero' parking in urban areas does not accommodate current or future reality. Lack car reduces good job opportunities. Provision of local bus services needs to meet that in the London area. Walton on Thames bus service disgraceful in terms of what is served and frequency (No direct service to St Peter's Hospital during daytime so journey extremely long. Get local transport PERMANENTLY more frequent and to more destinations. Policy all sticks and no carrots.</p> <p>Forget cycling lanes - improve roads surfaces for all users. Most cyclists ride on the road, not in cycle lanes!</p> <p>Fine motorists parking on verges and pavements.</p> <p>Limit the size of commercial vehicles that can use Elmbridge roads. - they struggle.</p> <p>One parking space per housing unit inadequate - leads to parking on street. Lack of/ cost of on street parking is a major factor in the death of the high street. - cheaper to use internet and pay delivery charges.</p> <p>Every car parking space in a housing development should have an electric charging point.. Should be 100% per parking place in flats and apartments too. The developer pays for these so what is the problem?</p> <p>Charge Chelsea Tractors more to park or ban them from on-street [parking and maybe car parks.</p> <p>Garages must be large enough to be used for parking - they are too small for modern day needs.</p> <p>Residential parking table - insufficient parking as does not accommodate visitor/workmen parking requirements. Too few spaces for size of dwelling - young people need a car too if they are to work flexible hours in this 24 hour culture.</p> <p>Parking for restaurants and shopping is totally insufficient - this is why the high street is failing, including food outlets. Who is</p>	Comments noted. Parking standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
------------	----------	---	---

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		going to cycle for a night out/ when little public transport? Have to rely on taxi services - this document does not take into account taxis	
Steve Butler	Resident	My only comments are that the starting point for parking in the planning process should be higher, minimum 2 spaces for any 1 bedroom flat or house, and increase to 3 for 4 and 5 bedroom properties. The width of any roads need to be considered , less street parking is essential. Public parking / station parking needs to reflect real needs ie Hampton Court station proposals are well below needs for commuters, potential hotel and tourists.	Comment noted. The parking requirements are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan process.
David Fryer	Resident	I think that your standard of 2 cars for three and four bedroom units is totally inadequate. I believe that there is a need to provide alternative means of transport to enable you to encourage a reduction in car movements. Electric cars are certainly the future for cars but it would be incorrect to assume that this will lead to a reduction in car numbers. Some of our shopping centres, certainly Esher, are failing to attract visitors/residents, any reduction in parking or excessive charging will exacerbate this problem.	Comment noted. The parking requirements are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan process.
Trevor Sherwood	Resident	Cant find any questionnaire to respond to but I think parking fees should be increased substationally by at least 50%.	Comment noted.

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
------------------------	-------------------------------	-----------------	---------------------------

<p>PopUpArena (Guy Bracewell)</p>	<p>Resident</p>	<p>Thank you for this opportunity to make observations. Clearly a decent consultation process with 39 pages of useful and insightful information.</p> <p>Whilst many tweeks to existing infrastructure can make improvements which must be done, there should also be a parallel strategy to change mind sets across the borough to the use of cars where able bodied people can cycle or walk. Not only obvious reduction in cars journeys and with that subsequent parking bottle necks and less traffic on the road causing pollution. There are of course major health benefits in exercise.</p> <p>Where I live on Weston Green, there are several schools, Esher college and the station and there is often complete chaos on the roads in each drop off and pick up window. Perhaps many of those with cars have driven just a mile or less more from home? This is the type of quantative research this consultation should focus on.</p> <p>My underlying message to the council is similar to that for the new properties build consultation.</p> <p>Be radical and exemplar in innovation to these challenges. We have to alter culture and behaviour of the local community, visitors to our borough, land and property developers, politicians and civil servants. Lead with something different - make our borough proud that sets an example to the every other borough in the UK. Do that and the borough will be proud, engaged and will support you. This would be a great leadership model.</p> <p>Big call - but go and 'break a window'</p>	<p>Comment noted.</p>
-----------------------------------	-----------------	--	-----------------------



<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Patrick Barr	Resident	<p>The problem is that this consultation is principally limited to car and cycle parking so a more radical approach to the promotion of cycling and the provision of better cycle paths cannot be achieved since that requires Surrey Council involvement. Why worry about cycle parking if the roads and routes continue to be built as they are with little regard for or don't encourage more cycling?</p> <p>One aspect for every new build should be that any new housing or commercial development should come with a need to build a cycle route within and leading up to it. Over time each such provision can then be linked up to start to create a better cycling infrastructure.</p> <p>As an example, if some 8 years ago the reconfiguration of Kempton Park racecourse parking and some new fencing had come with a requirement to relinquish some of their land alongside the Sunbury - Hampton road then it could have led to a new piece of cycle track alongside a narrow road which is currently dangerous for cyclists.</p>	Comment noted.

David Downing	Resident	<p>I feel that a lot of new developments do not provide sufficient off-street parking. Two near me, the Walton Road police station and Sandra/Radnor house look to be very short of spaces particularly since your document states that car ownership in the borough is above average. I fear that when these developments are occupied the local on street parking will become even worse. I would like you to consider making Matham Road part of the residents parking scheme. The road currently is full of cars parked on pavements, particularly on the part of the road near St Paul's church. Parking here is mainly by those working in local shops and businesses.</p> <p>As an alternative why not make the Walton Road car park free to park. There is plenty of space during the week and it would reduce the parking problems that blight many local roads.</p>	Comment noted.
---------------	----------	---	----------------

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		<p>Please just walk down Matham Road any week day to see the nature and scope of the problem.</p> <p>I would also like there to be more disabled parking spaces throughout the borough. We have an elderly population who need to be helped.</p>	

Paul Edwards	Resident	<p>The document reads very well. I would only suggest that the electric charging point numbers seem low if we are going to be fully electric in future years. If the aim is to be at say 50% EV ownership by 2040 (only 20 years away) then having only c10-20% of spaces with a EV charging point is too low. It is probably about right for say the next 5 years but low thereafter? I would have thought that it would also help drive EV ownership if the public could see widely available charging points rather than having to hunt around for one.</p> <p>Please also aim to exceed and not just match any guidelines for tree planting.</p> <p>Thank you</p>	<p>Comment noted. EV charging point standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.</p>
--------------	----------	---	---

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
Frances Eleanor	Resident	The consultation document has much to commend it taking	Comments noted.

Butler

into account change in car usage, and moves to reduce emissions.

I welcome Para 2.14 A Access (on Page 19) and strongly support iii. "Provisions for loading, unloading and turning of service vehicles are expected to be designed into the scheme ensuring highway and pedestrian safety" and minimise the impact on vehicle and traffic nuisance.

Recently a development with no provision for service vehicles was completed and another development with height restricted access to the parking area resulting in no access for service vehicles is under consideration. In the interests of traffic flow such situations are to be avoided.

Walking and cycling are to be encouraged however this must go hand in hand with improved cycle tracks, Surrey's roads are narrow and twisty and I would not consider cycling on the open road.

In addition improvements to pavements is necessary. Many pavements in Weybridge are uneven with trip hazards, sloping to a degree which makes it difficult to walk normally and subject to dog fouling (with no apparent enforcement officers in place).

Public Transport links will need review

Weybridge is fortunate to have a station with an adequate frequency of service however it is situated at the edge of the town, this makes it less accessible on foot by the elderly.

Bus services are infrequent and journeys to neighbouring towns are circuitous with lengthy journey times.

Improvement to transport services would be welcome.

5. Parking Design and Layout

5.3 the proposal to provide larger parking spaces to meet the anticipated rise in larger vehicles / SUVs does not sit

Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>comfortably with Elmbridge's declared pledge (17th July 2019) to become carbon neutral by 2030.</p> <p>The statement in Para 1 1.5 also states that this SPD seeks to meet objectives including "To help tackle climate change and support the transition to a low carbon future, reducing CO2 emissions and improving air quality</p> <p>The growing demand for SUVs has been cited as the second largest contributor to the increase in global CO2 emissions 2010-2018 (International Energy Agency).</p> <p>Elmbridge may wish to reconsider this proposal which does nothing to discourage ownership of these heavily polluting vehicles.</p>	
Thomas Cutler	Resident	<p>The over-arching point I would like to make, is that there has been a tendency, in many planning and other government policies, to rail against the car, and car parking, using the issue of climate change as a reason. There is no doubt that climate change is an issue to be dealt with. However, attacking the car is not the answer. The type of vehicles used will be solely electric within 15 years, and therefore the number of cars, and how often they are used will not change. So we need to provide parking, and not persecute the car, this policy update should promote provision of off street parking to free up parking on the road, particularly around small businesses which need stimulus, and should also actively encourage basement car parking. We have a lack of space in the UK, particularly the SE and it amazes me how little basements are under used, if you look at Spain, Portugal and</p>	Comments noted.

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		other countries, they have significantly more below ground parking. It makes economic, social, and commercial sense.	
John Dare	Resident	<p>PARKING etc.</p> <p>Whilst I will leave it to others with more knowledge on the provision, number and size of parking places, just a few thoughts concerning electric vehicles.</p> <p>Whilst rightly consideration is given to the increasing use of electric vehicles I feel that the council needs to give more attention to both parking and charging. Whether fossil fuel or electric but in your document there seems to be a general assumption that cars can be brought off the street to be recharged either in a front garden or a garage. This may be true for many (most) properties within the borough but there are still a considerable number of terraced houses without front gardens. For electric vehicles, to avoid having trailing cables strewn across the public footway, each of these properties will require either a dedicated charging pillar in the street with associated underground cabling or connection to a lamppost. The later not really being practical as they are rather too few and far between. All of this is a problem that some other areas have already encountered with rushed and ill thought out schemes even with the few electric vehicles currently around. Importantly, there will also be a need to prevent others parking by and, possibly using pillars dedicated to a certain property.</p>	Comments noted. Car parking and EV charging standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.

		Secondly you advocate 7kW fast charging but in future when the majority of cars are electric and most likely being charged at much the same time (probably in the evening) the underground cabling must be able to cope with many vehicles all being charged simultaneously, something possibly most of	
--	--	---	--

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		<p>the current (excuse pun) cabling may not be able to support. I realise this may not be an Elmbridge problem per se but it needs to be 'put into the mix'.</p> <p>Many of the likely problems with rows of terraced houses etc will be encountered with flats above shops etc.</p> <p>Finally, especially with the likely fairly modest range of battery vehicles, there will be a need for public recharging points for travellers just passing through the borough. Whether existing filling stations will provide this service would be dependent on the large oil companies who even in 20 or more years time will still be providing fossil fuels for the many petrol/diesel cars that will still be on the roads. The existing Elmbridge allocation of public charging points will need to increased greatly.</p>	

Rachel Bavidge	Resident	Lots of good stuff in it but too many homes being built in too small a space - we live in Oxshott and getting hemmed in on all sides as where one house stood, now 5 with two or even three cars now stand. No-one with a large income uses public transport, they buy status cars that wreck the environment and the character of the village. It also means its getting impossible to park in supermarkets, doctors, train station car parks as the cars are simply too big. There is no joined up thinking about school transport - so lots of us have to collect kids as often there isn't a bus for 3 hours and no direct trains eg Leatherhead to Oxshott. Often the local buses drive past the kids in the morning if too full too. We have an electric car but really struggle to find anywhere to charge it - the point in Cobham is often broken. Need charging points everywhere people park. Stop charging ridiculous amounts to use the local car parks, make weekends free, support more car sharing opportunities - all those kids that go to Danes Hill for	Comments noted.
----------------	----------	---	-----------------



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>example. We would love to cycle more but the drivers round here are insane and drive so badly - we need cycle lanes off the roads so the kids can use them to get to school. All the planning for car parking won't work if there are simply too many cars in too small an area. Even if you legislate for 1 car per dwelling, everyone who needs to travel for work has to have one, so a couple in a one bed flat will need 2 spaces.</p>	
Nicholas Hatch	Resident	<p>Dear Sir I have read the submission from the Cobham Green Belt organisation to you in relation to the Parking SPD and agree with all the points that they have raised. Yours sincerely</p>	Comments noted.
Chris Brookes	Resident	<p>The main supporting document details, amongst other things, the number of parking places to be incorporated into new residential developments. In many cases this is 1 per dwelling; and I think this is inadequate, as it doesn't allow for multiple car ownership, or allow for many visitors.</p> <p>There is great emphasis put on reducing car use, which is a good thing, but difficult to achieve when the bus services are not frequent enough when required. Also, on a personal note, I live in Hersham, and there is not a direct link to Hampton Court station. Why is this? It is the one thing that would encourage me to travel to London by public transport (other than by train).</p> <p>If you want to encourage more use of public transport, provide more buses and more routes. It may take some time to pick up, but would improve in the long term. When I go into London there are many more buses, often every 10-15 minutes on some routes. Also, why do senior bus passes now start at 66? They should start earlier, (they used to start at 60), so that</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>seniors can get around while they still can. If you live in London, you get a Freedom Pass at 60 for bus and train travel. Just how expensive would it be to introduce (1) senior bus passes at 60, and (2) freedom-pass at 60. We pay one of the highest rates of council tax in the country; -council tax in London is lower, yet they gat a better transport system. The provision of public EV charging points in Elmbridge (less than 30) seems inadequate to cope with the expected increase in EV's. EBC has stated it wants to tackle the Climate Emergency; - more EV charging points would go some way to help in this respect</p>	
Nick Russell	Resident	<p>The planning document accepts that public transport does not meet the needs of travel within the borough. The routes are too limited and do not directly connect many local centers. The document acknowledges that this is reflected in the level of private car ownership in the borough. While I accept that the environmental impact of vehicles must be limited, this is often used to justify other measures aimed simply at reducing car usage. This aim should not be part of council policy as most people have a car because public transport is inadequate for their needs. Either it doesn't go where they need to, the journey involves several changes so the journey time is excessively long, the cost of privately owned and profit making 'public' transport is too high or simply that they need to carry things with them that make public transport impractical. Image a teacher trying to take books home to mark on the bus for example. With this in mind, I would support the provision of electric vehicle charging points, but I would not be in favour of measures to limit the use of petrol vehicles in the transition period while they are naturally falling out of use. Nor would I be in favour of restricting the use of private vehicles in the borough, be they petrol or electric. Similarly, I would not</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Whilst the Council has no direct control over the provision of public transport services in the borough, the Council is committed to working with partners and infrastructure providers to provide service improvements for our communities.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		support residential housing developments that do not provide parking.	
Paul Hazeldine	Resident	The residential space for houses is quoted as the maximum	Comments noted.
		the number of cars in Elmbridge. There should be a set minimum and it should set to the current maximum and the current maximum scrapped.	Car parking and EV charging standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.
		Saying there is a decline for under 24's without giving analysis and reasons is likely to unreasonably influence the outcome towards a decline in provision of future spaces. This age group does not accurately reflect future needs as their current lifestyle is only temporary. For example the considerable increase in the student population in recent decades coupled with staying away from home usually defers car purchase till later on. Similarly living near or at a university location means any student owned car is parked in the university town rather than the home town so the need for future residential parking in Elmbridge is likely to be underestimated.	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Simon Harker	Resident	<p>I support the letter on this topic from the Cobham Conservation &amp; Heritage Trust dated 29 January. In particular I have the following comments.</p> <p>Paragraph 2.12 of the draft states that an objective is to direct development toward 'sustainable locations'. A starting point is that national policy is clear – direct development toward previously developed land in Town Centres with good public transport.</p> <p>Present policy often requires too few parking spaces to be provided with development. Even if the future has vehicles as predominantly electric or even operating on hydrogen, they will still need spaces.</p> <p>The use of non-permeable materials for the hard standing under parking spaces should simply be prohibited.</p> <p>Parking place numbers for residential developments should be defined as minima not maxima. Multi-unit developments in particular must have a number of spaces provided for likes of visitors, tradesmen, carers and ambulances.</p> <p>Please control on-street parking. While that is a role that is undertaken by Surrey County Council there is a need for that authority to take account of the needs of Elmbridge and for developers to understand that key road links in the borough need to be kept free of parking (perhaps with clearways).</p> <p>There are other roads that have a character that does not make them appropriate for on-street parking. There is no evidence of how the Council have liaised with Surrey County Council, whether for formulating this document or, on these aspects, for the purpose of policies to go into the emerging Local Plan.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Car parking and EV charging standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.</p>



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>It is simply therefore wholly inadequate to suggest 'maximum' numbers of parking spaces. They should be defined as a minimum of two spaces per household, with additional allowance for visitors, services, tradesmen, etc. if our streets are not to become further clogged.</p> <p>3. It should be a fundamental requirement for every parking space to have access to electric charging. 'Trickle charging' will soon become as obsolete as diesel cars.</p> <p>4. Consideration should be made to encouraging provision for parking as an integral (and adequately sized) part of the abodes, underground parking where feasible.</p> <p>5. The area in which we live is already vulnerable to flooding and climate change will exacerbate this with time. It is essential that every consideration be given to promoting clean energy, good drainage, and minimal hard surfaces that promote run-off. Consequently, it is essential that all outdoor parking facilities be required to be finished (and maintained) in permeable materials or construction methods.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Andi Price</p>	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
Roger Price	Resident	<p>Dear Sirs</p> <p>Consultation on Parking Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) (“the consultation”)</p> <p>I write with reference to your consultation document detailed above.</p> <p>Consultation timing</p> <p>Had I not received notification from the Cobham Green Belt Group I would not have been even aware that this consultation was underway, despite having signed up to the Council’s website so as to be consulted on any development proposals that affect our area. It seems unduly onerous to expect that one needs to keep a close eye on the Council’s website to ascertain whether any new consultations arise, especially those with as brief a consultation period as this one. I would hope in future the Council gives wider and more timely notice to residents of any consultations that affect the principles and rules that will govern the way in which our surroundings are to be developed. Indeed, I think it would be appropriate to extend the consultation on this document to close on the same date as the Regulation 18 consultation on “Creating our vision, objectives and the direction for development management policies 2020 to which this refers, namely 9 March 2020.</p> <p>Observations</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The policy should be more prescriptive and clearly set out the minimum standards that would be acceptable.</li> <li>2. The document acknowledges that household ownership of cars is somewhat higher than the average at 1.5 cars per household, and 46% of households owning more than 2 cars. It is simply therefore wholly inadequate to suggest ‘maximum’ numbers of parking spaces. They should be defined as a minimum of two spaces per household, with additional allowance for visitors, services, tradesmen, etc. if our streets are not to become further clogged.</li> </ol>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>Car parking and EV charging standards are being reviewed as part of the new Local Plan.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>3. It should be a fundamental requirement for every parking space to have access to electric charging. 'Trickle charging' will soon become as obsolete as diesel cars.</p> <p>4. Consideration should be made to encouraging provision for parking as an integral (and adequately sized) part of the abodes, underground parking where feasible.</p> <p>5. The area in which we live is already vulnerable to flooding and climate change will exacerbate this with time. It is essential that every consideration be given to promoting clean energy, good drainage, and minimal hard surfaces that promote run-off. Consequently, it is essential that all outdoor parking facilities be required to be finished (and maintained) in permeable materials or construction methods.</p> <p>Yours faithfully Roger Price</p>	
Mrs Hurrell	Resident	<p>Dear Sir/Madam,</p> <p>I know that the Cobham Conservation and Heritage Trust has sent you a letter with their comments. I wish to support their views on the Parking issues.</p> <p>Many thanks, E Hurrell</p>	Comment noted.
Martin Bone	Resident	<p>I have a number of comments/observations:</p> <p>a. Parking planning must be considered and developed in conjunction with public transport developments. Not until improved public transport is in place will people actually be persuaded to reduce their car use.</p> <p>b. With the increase in electric vehicles the issue of how these vehicles will be charged if only on-street parking is available, needs to be addressed. This is particularly relevant to the design of new residential developments.</p> <p>c. I believe many peoples requirements could be met by car clubs if these were more widespread.</p>	



Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>d. If high street shopping centres are to survive then reasonably priced parking and/or public transport is essential, otherwise people will increasingly go to retail parks and/or shop online.</p>	
Vivienne Collins	Resident	<p>The provision for car parking spaces per residential unit are minimal, two spaces for three or four bedroom houses is not sufficient. Many households now have adult children at home who use cars. Whilst use of public transport, cycling and walking should be encouraged it must be recognised that this is not always possible.</p> <p>Whilst train service are on the whole fairly good ( although overcrowded) in Elmbridge bus services are infrequent and are often very indirect and slow. If a train station is 2 miles away although it is possible to walk this takes more time, if the bus service is infrequent and does not tie in with train times this takes more time. Many working families do not have this time available, taking children to school, getting to work, returning from work to collect children from school requires reliable efficient public transport that does not exist in Elmbridge. Having lived in the borough for over sixty years I can remember when one could catch buses more frequently and to a greater range of destinations and I understand why they were stopped as they were uneconomic (everyone started using cars) but we cannot expect people to give up their cars when there is no viable alternative.</p>	<p>Comments noted. The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan..</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
FEDORA (Anthony Wolfe)	Resident	<p>The timetable for responses was very tight, especially bearing in mind the starting point being so close to the Christmas and New Year holidays. If the quantity of responses is poor then consideration should be given to extending the timetable - and ensure that any such extension is given sufficient profile and publicity.</p> <p>Any proposed provision for parking MUST NOT result in any increase in on-street parking.</p> <p>An emphasis on underground parking where it is feasible.</p> <p>The use of non-permeable materials for parking spaces MUST be prohibited.</p> <p>All developments should have a defined MINIMUM number of car spaces that takes into account the number of residents, the number of visitors and the likely number of home deliveries, a new and significant factor in traffic and parking issues.</p> <p>There is a need to assess those thoroughfares that need to be kept clear of all parked vehicles, and also areas where the character of the locality does not make them appropriate for on-street parking.</p> <p>Surrey Highways need to deliver on the double yellow lines through the village of Oxshott that were agreed as a part of their 2018-19 Parking Plan, and so address the urgent to prevent the dangerous loading/unloading that currently takes place in the Oxshott High Street.</p> <p>Consider the provision of some form of limited parking scheme for local workers in Oxshott.</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.</p>

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
David Darling	Resident	<p>PARKING in Elmbridge..An extremely difficult problem to plan for.</p> <p>At present the large numbers of cars parked on the roadway adjacent to residents homes can cause serious congestion to traffic flow...An example are areas around Portmore Park Road, Weybridge. Supplying further parking for local businesses,shoppers etc.is not really feasible. It's important to plan for parking suitable for the next 10 / 20 years when we are likely to have a very large number of electric vehicles. Visit Oslo or Bergen in Norway to see how to organise Charging Points &amp; Parking in Cities.</p> <p>Perhaps in 20 years we may be calling a small self driving electric vehicle on our phone, giving it a post code &amp; it will drop us off as required. Then be available for next user. As not our own car, less or certainly different parking is likely to be required in the future, particularly in vicinity of Housing, Work &amp; Leisure areas.</p> <p>All a headache for planners.....</p>	Comments noted.
Robert Redfearn	Resident	<p>Having carefully reviewed the documentation, I wish to express my concern that the minimum parking standards are not mandatory for any proposed future residential development. By the Councils own information Elmbridge has one of the highest car ownership. This is clearly evident from the current reality of areas of congested street parking. The Council policy should be made very clear, that future residential development must include off street parking that meets or exceeds the minimum stated requirements. Any vague wording that suggests it would depend on specific case</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.</p>

<b>Respondent Name</b>	<b>Organisation/ resident</b>	<b>Response</b>	<b>Council's response</b>
		by case review will lead to endless debate and pressure by developers.	
Ian Dilks	Resident	See full representation on consultation portal	Comments noted.
Iain Nisbet	Resident	The minimum parking standard of one space per residential	Comments noted.
		in the SPD) is good, but needs to be enforced rigorously. All too often, in areas of obvious severe parking stress, developers claim 'sustainable transport opportunities' as an excuse not to apply DM7, when by 'sustainable transport opportunities' they mean a 25 minute walk to the station for a train only into or out of London, or a bus service that is one-hourly or worse, only over the working day and not seven days a week. A one-hourly bus service is never going to attract serious travellers – since if one is cancelled, the wait for the next is inordinate. In my view, no bus service less frequent than quarter-hourly Mon-Fri 6am – 11pm, or half-hourly Sat/Sun 7am – 10pm should be counted as a bus service. It's certainly not 'sustainable transport'! Bus services are patchy and inadequate over much of the borough (especially those not provided by TfL), and often travel over routes that include multiple housing estates and therefore greatly increase travel time.	The parking standards are being updated as part of the new Local Plan, including the requirements for EV charging points.
		The government has just expressed the intention to bring forward the end of sale of petrol or diesel vehicles to 2035, so electric vehicle charging points will become much more important very soon. In my view, the provision of charging points specified in the SPD is very inadequate, especially for flats/apartments, where I think that EVERY space should be provided with a charging point (or at least the wiring for a unit in areas of parking stress given in DM7 (and reproduced	

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		<p>future point). Otherwise you will have residents queuing to use the few spaces provided. For residents without reserved off-road parking of their own, the inability to charge an electric vehicle at home is likely to be the biggest disincentive to change to electric. (It is the deal-breaker for me).</p> <p>If car clubs are to have a significant effect, there need to be many more of them – basically, within respectable walking distance for everyone. The SPD says there are four within the borough, but looking at the Enterprise Car Club map, I could see only three (all in Walton), with a fourth just outside the borough in Addlestone.</p>	

Clive Atkinson	Resident	<p>Whilst this SPD includes policies around combatting climate change, it should also be supported by a policy that clearly states that significant development on green belt should be prevented to protect the environment and prevent any detrimental impact on climate. It should state that open spaces and green belt are precious and should not be replaced by new development and parking. Section 2.5 states that "In considering development proposals the NPPF states that development should only be prevented or refused on highway grounds if there would be an unacceptable impact on highway safety, or the residual cumulative impacts on the road network would be severe." When combined with section 1.5 which states that "This SPD seeks to meet the following principle objectives in addressing parking in the borough: ..... To help tackle climate change and support the transition to a low carbon future, reducing CO2 emissions and improving air quality." The impact of proposed development in Claygate from all but Option 4 would in my view support refusing the development due to the severe impact on road network set out in section 2.5 and the fact that significant development will not</p>	Comments noted.
----------------	----------	--	-----------------

Respondent Name	Organisation/ resident	Response	Council's response
		only fail to achieve the objective of tackling climate change from section 1.5 but also make it significantly worse.	
Ms Sennema	Individual (outside Elmbridge)	Why is pavement parking still allowed in Elmbridge? Why are cycle lanes allowed to have parked cars in them? Fix both these issues are both are a serious deterrent to safe cycling and walking in Elmbridge.	Comments noted.