



# Consultation statement

Parking Standards for New Developments  
Supplementary Planning Document

**A great place to live and work.**

## 1.0 Introduction

This consultation statement sets out the approach taken to carrying out the public consultation on Central Bedfordshire Council’s draft Parking Standards for New Developments Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). It covers the consultation process, analyses the comments received, sets out our response to them and discusses what will happen next.

### 1.1 What is Parking Standards for New Developments SPD?

Parking Standards for New Developments is a new SPD which covers cycle parking, car parking, disabled parking, powered two-wheeler parking and operational parking requirements. It sets out the number of parking spaces required for new developments in both residential and commercial settings. The document gives comprehensive guidance on the types of parking that should and shouldn’t be provided. The Parking Standards for New Developments SPD updates and replaces existing standards, whilst providing more detailed guidance, and bringing existing standards into one document.

### 1.2 What is a supplementary planning document?

A supplementary planning document (SPD) is a document that builds upon and provides more detailed guidance on policies adopted in the [Local Plan](#). The current version of the Local Plan was adopted in July 2021. Section 14 of the Local Plan covers transport, with section 14.9 relating to parking. Policy T3 gives an overview of the policies related to parking. The Parking Standards for New Developments SPD gives more detail to the policies outlined in T3 of the Local Plan.

Once adopted the Parking Standards for New Developments SPD will replace existing standards in the following documents:

**Table 1: Existing parking standards to be replaced by Parking Standards for New Developments SPD**

Document title	Standard that is replaced
LTP3: Car Parking Strategy	Appendices B, C and D
Design Guide: 1. Place making in Central Bedfordshire	1.14 Residential and Commercial Parking Standards (p29).
LTP3: Cycle Parking Annexes	Whole document

### 1.3 Why is a new Parking Standards for New Developments SPD required?

Central Bedfordshire Council is committed to tackling climate change. One of the ways in which we can make a positive difference is through effective parking provision for all vehicle types in new developments. We want to encourage more walking and cycling for shorter journeys, and for longer journeys encourage more sustainable options such as using public transport wherever possible. Ensuring that routes are attractive and useable for pedestrians and cyclists is key to achieving this. Providing sufficient parking for all types of vehicles will

be necessary so that parked vehicles do not dominate the street scene or prevent access for pedestrians and cyclists.

The Council's [Sustainability Plan](#) was adopted in September 2020. The plan sets out the actions the Council will take to achieve carbon neutrality by 2030. The transport choices that individuals make will strongly influence the Council's ability to achieve this target; active travel and shared transport are promoted within the plan over private car use.

We know that nationally car ownership continues to increase, with car ownership in Central Bedfordshire at higher rates than the national average. It is clear from previous parking standards that reducing the number of car parking spaces per residential property does not result in reduced levels of car ownership. Doing so can be detrimental to encouraging walking and cycling, where routes intended for pedestrians and cyclists become overflow parking areas.

This SPD provides detailed guidance on all types of parking for new developments. The document brings together several existing standards into one document. More detail is provided on the types of parking that the Council wants developers to provide and the types of parking that have proven to be less successful and will not be accepted.

## 2.0 Consultation approach

### 2.1 Who was consulted and how?

The Council sought to consult all known interested parties and inform them of the opportunity to comment on the draft Parking Standards for New Developments SPD. An e-mail was sent to statutory consultees, as well as all other consultees and interested parties who have expressed an interest in being informed about highway related proposals and / or the Local Plan, and whose details are held in a dedicated database. E-mails were sent out to town and parish councils and local MPs.

Additionally, a press release was issued to mark the start of the consultation. The consultation was published on the Council's consultation web page. Posters advertising the consultation were sent to local libraries, leisure centres, and to town and parish councils to display. The consultation was also advertised on the Council's social media platforms, with reminders sent throughout the consultation period.

**Table 2: People notified of the consultation.**

People consulted	Number
Statutory consultees	68
Those signed up to the Local Plan consultation list	1,115 who have signed up with a postal address, 3,155 who have signed up via e-mail.
Those signed up to Central Bedfordshire Council social media updates related to highways	28,581
Central Bedfordshire MPs	4
Central Bedfordshire Council's elected members	58
Central Bedfordshire town and parish councils	79
Neighbouring authority areas to Central Bedfordshire	14

### 2.2 When was the consultation?

The consultation started at 10am on Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> November 2022, and closed at 10am on Thursday 5<sup>th</sup> January 2023.

### 2.3 How could people respond to the consultation?

Consultees were able to respond online, by email, or by post.

### 3.0 Consultation analysis

#### 3.1 How many responses were received?

A total of 85 responses were received during the consultation.

#### 3.2 Who responded to the consultation?

Responses were received from the following sources:

**Table 3: Respondents**

	Number	%*
Residents in Central Bedfordshire	40	48
Those representing a business related to housebuilding in Central Bedfordshire (architects, planners, designers, housebuilders etc.)	8	9
Those representing a business in Central Bedfordshire (not related to housebuilding)	1	1
Town and parish councils	7	8
Those representing a public body	10	12
Not stated	19	22
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>

\*Rounded to nearest whole number

### 3.3 Of those that are residents in Central Bedfordshire, where do they live?

Responses were received from residents throughout Central Bedfordshire. This demonstrates that the communication methods used to inform members of the public about the consultation were effective.

**Table 4: Respondent locations in Central Bedfordshire**

	Number	%*
Amphill	1	3
Biggleswade	7	18
Blunham	2	5
Campton	1	3
Cockayne Hatley	1	3
Dunstable	1	3
Everton	1	3
Flitwick	1	3
Heath & Reach	1	3
Harlington	1	3
Houghton Regis	1	3
Langford	2	5
Leighton Buzzard	1	3
Lidlington	3	8
Linslade	1	3
Lower Stondon	1	3
Marston Moreteyne	1	3
Maulden	1	3
Meppershall	1	3
Potton	3	8
Shefford	3	8
Shillington	1	3
Silsoe	1	3
Stanbridge	1	3
Sutton	1	3
Toddington	1	3
<b>Total</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>

\*Rounded to nearest whole number

### 3.4 How did people respond?

One respondent chose to write a letter. 36 submitted a response using the online consultation page and 48 responded via e-mail.

**Table 5: How people responded to the consultation**

	Number	%
Via the online consultation page	36	42
E-mail	48	57
Letter	1	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.5 Did those that responded support the strategy, object, or leave a comment?

78% of respondents chose to submit a comment which didn't necessarily support or object to the SPD. 10% supported the SPD and 12% objected to the SPD.

**Table 6: Level of support for the strategy**

	Number	%
Supports the Parking Standards for New Developments SPD	9	10
Objects to the Parking Standards for New Developments SPD	10	12
Left a comment that didn't necessarily support or object to the SPD	66	78
<b>Total</b>	<b>85</b>	<b>100</b>

### 3.6 What subject areas were mentioned?

Respondents covered a range of subject areas. These are shown in the table below. Commentary on the detail of these comments and our response to them is provided in section 4.

**Table 7: Summary of subject areas mentioned.**

Section of SPD	Section title of SPD	Number of comments	%*
3.0	Cycle parking in residential developments	25	10
4.0	Car parking standards in residential developments	96	37
5.0	Parking for powered two-wheelers in residential developments	1	0.4
6.0	Cycle parking at non-residential developments	12	5
7.0	Operational parking standards	7	3
8.0	Disabled parking at non-residential developments	5	2
9.0	Powered two-wheeler parking at non-residential developments	2	0.8
Appendices	Proposed layouts / dimensions	44	17
N/A	Highlighting local issues / examples	28	11
N/A	Relevant to other documents	1	0.4
N/A	Other	37	14
	<b>Total</b>	<b>258</b>	<b>100</b>

\*Rounded to one decimal place



## 4.0 Comments by subject area

This section works through the comments received relating to each section of the document. It describes the comments received and provides a summary of our response to the comments, and where appropriate any proposed amendments.

### 4.1 Cycle parking in residential developments (section 3.0 of the SPD)

Twenty-five of the respondents mentioned cycle parking in residential developments. Several representations gave general support to the cycle parking standards, which came from a variety of sources. Alongside the general comments, some specific points or requests for clarification were made, which focused on sections of the proposed cycle parking standards. There was a clear split in the comments with residents being concerned about security, and the protection of the space for its defined purpose. Housebuilders considered that the standards were too high, and the proposed layouts were restrictive. The main themes and our responses to them are summarised below.

#### 4.1.1 Number of cycle parking spaces per property (section 3.0 of the SPD)

Two comments were received from housebuilders who felt that the parking standards were too high, specifically for 4 and 5-bedroom properties and accommodation aimed at older people. One parish council stated that rural parishes may not need as much cycle parking as urban locations.

#### CBC response

The proposed cycle parking standards are the same as the existing cycle parking standards (1 space per bedroom). It is common for individuals residing in large properties to own multiple cycles, including children's cycles and other cycling related equipment. The requirement for cycle parking spaces to align with the number of bedrooms is not considered unreasonable.

The proposed cycle parking standard for accommodation aimed at older people is 1 space per 20 bedrooms, which is the same as the existing standard. Residents living at developments designed specifically to cater for those with mobility issues are not likely to cycle, however outside of this, there is no direct correlation between age and cycle ownership.

Our investment in local cycle routes will better connect the authority's main towns with the rural hinterlands, making cycling safer and more accessible. Cycling will remain a reasonable alternative for local journeys in rural settlements including, for example, to local schools. The growing availability and popularity of E-bikes has extended the distance residents can reasonably travel by bike to access local services.

#### 4.1.2 Visitor cycle parking (sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the SPD)

Six comments were received relating to visitor cycle parking. Four comments were from housebuilders who were generally against the standards proposed, with two mentioning a possible policy conflict with landscaping provision and one who felt that visitor cycle parking

at residential properties was unnecessary. A comment was received from a resident who was supportive of the standards but asked if there will be any measures to prevent a property owner from repurposing the cycle storage.

### **CBC response**

The proposed visitor cycle parking standards are a relaxation of the existing standards. The existing standard is two visitor cycle parking spaces per house, and 1 per flat. The proposed is one space per house, and 1 space per 20 flats or apartments with a minimum of 2 cycle parking spaces. Whilst the number of visitor cycle parking spaces has been reduced, it is still the authority's view that visitor cycle parking is necessary. We do not see a conflict between good design, landscaping, and accessible cycle parking. Once a property is occupied, we are not able to mandate how the cycle storage is used.

#### **4.1.3 Residents cycle parking at houses (section 3.3 of the SPD)**

Comments received relating to cycle parking at houses mentioned both the type of cycle parking and its location within the property curtilage. Four comments were received from housebuilders opposing the removal of garden sheds as a form of cycle parking. Three comments were received concerning the location of the cycle parking. One housebuilder opposed cycle parking being installed to the front of properties and another sited cycle parking incorporated into the footprint of the building as impractical. One resident commented in support of the improved quality of the cycle parking standards but was concerned that developers would fail to provide the quality required.

### **CBC response**

The reason for removing sheds as a form of cycle parking was to improve the quality and security of cycle parking provision in residential settings, as well as considering the access and convenience. The SPD gives a variety of examples of how cycle parking can be incorporated into the property curtilage in a residential setting with a selection of example layouts included. A developer can choose how cycle parking is incorporated into the property curtilage and doesn't have to replicate one of the examples included in the SPD. Other options will be permitted providing that consideration has been given to the accessibility, security and quality of the cycle parking provided.

#### **4.1.4 Cycle parking for non-standard cycles (section 3.5 of the SPD)**

One housebuilder commented on the impracticability of providing cycle parking in residential settings for non-standard cycles.

### **CBC Response**

Providing cycle parking for non-standard cycles is included in [LTN 1/20 Cycle Infrastructure Design](#); our proposed standard reflects this.

#### **4.1.5 Examples of well-integrated cycle parking at residential developments (section 3.6 of the SPD)**

One housebuilder felt that some of the examples of cycle parking included are not good examples and recommended further narrative to define the context where each of the examples given would or wouldn't be acceptable.

##### **CBC Response**

Each of the examples included has narrative below each image to explain the context in which they would be appropriate. The overall aim is to improve the quality of the cycle parking provided at residential properties; this is reflected in the examples included in the document. The types of cycle parking included are examples; a degree of discretion will be allowed, and other types of cycle parking will be accepted providing that consideration has been given to the accessibility security and quality of the cycle parking.

#### **4.2 Car and Van Ownership in Central Bedfordshire (section 4.0 of the SPD)**

The comments received relating to this section were all in relation to the residential parking layout considerations. 4 comments were received related to landscaping adjacent to parking bays, 2 comments were received related to rear parking courts, 18 comments related to garages, 4 comments related to access for bins, 3 comments related to access for cycles, 3 comments related to communal parking areas and 6 comments related to electric vehicle charge point provision.

##### **4.2.1 Residential parking layout considerations – landscaping adjacent to parking bays (section 4.4 of the SPD)**

Four comments were made by housebuilders about soft landscaping not being permitted adjacent to parking bays. Comments related to soft landscaping being helpful in softening the visual impact of parking along a street, and soft landscaping helping with ecology, amenity, and enjoyment of areas around new construction. Therefore, the developers felt that it should be permitted.

##### **CBC Response**

We want to make sure that parking is accessible for all, used as designed and provided to a high quality. Landscaping is an important part of new developments however we need to make sure that landscaped areas are provided in the right locations so that they do not cause issues with intervisibility, safety and access. The sentence referring to landscaping adjacent to parking bays is aimed at ensuring that people accessing a vehicle parked in a parking space are not forced to walk on landscaped areas or grass when getting into or out of a vehicle. Landscaping near to parking bays that doesn't affect access / egress from a parked vehicle will be permitted.

##### **Proposed amendments**

We will amend the wording to make it clear when landscaped areas adjacent to parking bays will and will not be permitted.

#### **4.2.2 Residential parking layout considerations - garages (section 4.4.1 of the SPD)**

Eighteen comments received related to the proposed change to a single garage no longer counting as a parking space and a double garage counting as one parking space. Seven comments supported a garage not counting as a parking space (4 residents and 3 comments received from town or parish councils), whilst one developer and one resident objected. There were also some specific comments that related to garages coming from a variety of sources. These included whether a garage should be rebranded as an 'outside storage space', what the dimensions should be for single and double garages and one developer mentioned how the standards are likely to see an end to flats built over garages if the garage didn't count as a parking space. Carports were also mentioned and clarity over whether a carport will count as a parking space was sought.

#### **CBC Response**

From the comments received there is general support for removing a single garage as counting as a parking space. This should enable a greater level of flexibility for developers, as a garage won't necessarily have to be full-size or have vehicular access. Whilst a single garage won't count as a parking space a developer may still choose to provide one.

#### **Proposed amendments**

- A section will be added on carports and under croft parking which will both count as a parking space providing that they meet the dimensions of a parking space including access space, and that the posts are not within the access space.
- An additional appendix will be included which shows the suggested layout and minimum dimensions for a double garage.

#### **4.2.3 Residential parking layout considerations – rear parking courts (section 4.4.2 of the SPD)**

Two responses were received relating to rear parking courts. One response was received from a town council who agreed that rear parking courts should be avoided. One response was received from a developer who felt that rear parking courts can be an effective solution to parking when well designed, with a pathway through to the properties with adequate surveillance, which takes cars away from property frontages.

#### **CBC response**

Our experience of rear parking courts is that they are seldom used, especially when on-street parking is available closer to the property's front door than any off-street allocated spaces. This does not achieve the objective of removing cars from the front of properties and in some cases results in hazardous and obstructive parking, including footway parking which causes an inconvenience to pedestrians. The wording in the SPD is as follows:

*Rear parking courts which are further away from the property than on-street parking and aren't overlooked by the vehicle owners are rarely used as intended and are discouraged.*

This allows flexibility and does not mean a complete ban on rear parking courts. However, a developer would need to design a layout that meant that on-street parking was not available closer to the property's front door than the allocated spaces in a rear parking court. A developer would need to consider the residents perceived security of vehicles if the rear parking court isn't overlooked.

### **Proposed amendments**

We will add clarity around when a rear parking court will be permitted.

#### **4.2.4 Residential parking layout considerations – access for bins (section 4.4.3 of the SPD)**

Four comments relating to access for wheelie bins were received. One comment from a town council felt that this was important, commenting that bins left at the front of properties has a negative effect on the street environment. One developer felt that there was no need for such guidance. One resident commented to say that there should be a location where bins can be left on collection day so that they don't block footways. A town council mentioned that their Neighbourhood Plan specifies that all bins should be screened.

#### **CBC response**

Where a resident decides to leave their bins can affect access to parking and cycle parking and how well each are used, therefore we think it is important to include this. It is accepted that on refuse collection days bins can be left on footways but should be done in a way that doesn't block access for pedestrians.

#### **4.2.5 Residential parking layout considerations – access for cycles (section 4.4.4 of the SPD)**

Three comments relating to access for cycles were received. One comment was from a town council who felt that it was important that access for cycles was included. Two comments were received from developers. One felt that the existing standard of a driveway being a minimum width of 3.5 metres should be sufficient. The other felt that the additional one metre width on a driveway to allow access for cycles was excessive and is not an optimum use of space. They commented that cycles could access the cycle parking via alternative ways, such as a side passage or through a house.

#### **CBC response**

The additional width proposed for driveways is not solely for cycle access, it is also for wheelie bin access, disabled access to and from a parked vehicle and to enable a person to fully open a car door when parked on a driveway. Wheeling a cycle through a house is not practical nor does it promote the level of convenience that we want to encourage for cycling.

## **Proposed amendments**

The width of a parking space in a driveway will be reduced to 2.2 metres (instead of the previously proposed 2.5 metres) where a 1-metre-wide access is provided both sides of the parking space. This will see a single car driveway being a width of 4.2 metres as opposed to the proposed 4.5 metres. The existing standard is 3.5 metres.

### **4.2.6 Residential parking layout considerations – communal parking areas (section 4.4.5 of the SPD)**

Two comments concerning communal parking areas for flatted developments were received. Both comments related to the allocation of parking spaces in communal parking areas. The proposed standard is for a recommended minimum of one parking space to be allocated to each property. One of the comments (from a resident) felt that all parking spaces should be allocated to specific properties. One comment (from a housing management company) felt that this wouldn't enable the maximum use of parking spaces where a resident didn't own a car.

#### **CBC Response**

Allocating at least one parking space to each flat or apartment was included to enable a potential resident to make an informed decision about if the parking provided would meet their needs, whilst also preventing other residents from parking multiple vehicles. A local agreement could be reached amongst residents if required where one had more vehicles than another.

### **4.2.7 Residential parking layout considerations – electric vehicle charge point provision (section 4.4.6 of the SPD)**

Six comments were received relating to electric vehicle charge point provision. Four of the comments related to the requirement for EV charge points at residential settings as the uptake of electric vehicles increases. One developer mentioned that electric vehicle charging standards are covered by the Building Regulations, so it is not necessary to be repeated in the SPD. Another developer commented that they would prefer to provide communal charging hubs due to the cost of equipment required.

#### **CBC Response**

Electric vehicle charging provision is covered in our [Electric Vehicle Charging Technical Guidance SPD](#) but is mentioned in this document for consistency, and to ensure that electric vehicle charging provision is planned into a development from the early stages.

## **4.3 Car parking standards for residential developments (section 4.5 of the SPD)**

Several comments were received relating to the proposed number of car parking spaces for residential developments. Many respondents gave their view on if they felt the proposed

number of parking spaces were sufficient, if more should be provided or if less should be provided.

#### **4.3.1 Car parking standards for residential developments (section 4.5 of the SPD)**

There was a clear split between residents wanting more parking spaces and housebuilders wanting the standards to be more flexible, enabling them to provide less parking.

The reasons suggesting that more parking spaces than the proposed standards should be provided included grown up children living at home for longer and having their own vehicle, and multi-generational families living together.

Several respondents were concerned that a 1-bedroom property would have one parking space, with many suggesting that it is common for a couple who both have a car to live together in a one-bedroom property and therefore need 2 parking spaces. Eighteen respondents (all residents) felt that 1 parking space for a 1-bedroom property was not sufficient, whilst 7 respondents (6 residents and 1 parish council) agreed that it is sufficient.

The reasons suggesting that less parking than the proposed standards should be provided were that we should be looking to reduce car ownership to meet our sustainability objectives and therefore fewer parking spaces should be provided. One developer felt that the standards for 1–3-bedroom properties seemed fair but felt that the requirements for 4+ bedroom properties seemed excessive and doesn't match the Census data. Another developer commented that the Council should recognize the need for a bespoke strategic design-led approach to parking, and therefore minimum parking standards shouldn't apply.

The responses are summarised in the table below:

**Table 8: Comments received relating to the proposed number of parking spaces for residential developments.**

Summary of 4.5 Car parking standards for residential developments	Number of comments received	
Would like more parking spaces than the proposed standards	Resident	23
	Developer	0
	Town / Parish Council	1
	Not specified	3
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>27</b>
Agree with the proposed number of parking spaces	Resident	2
	Developer	1
	Town / Parish Council	1
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>4</b>
Would like less parking spaces than the proposed standards	Resident	0
	Developer	6
	Town / Parish Council	0
	<b>Total:</b>	<b>6</b>

### CBC Response

In formulating the proposed parking standards, we have considered several factors that affect the demand for parking in new developments whilst also considering future levels of car ownership.

We have looked closely at the Census data, to understand the existing levels of car ownership in Central Bedfordshire. The 2021 Census data shows that at the time the data was collected 88% of properties in Central Bedfordshire had two or less cars or vans associated with them, with 12% having 3 or more cars or vans.

There are several factors that affect an individual's choice of whether to own a car or not (see pages 18-19 of the SPD), it is therefore difficult to predict what may happen to car ownership levels in the future. Since the 2011 Census there has been an increase in car and van ownership nationally and in Central Bedfordshire. Evidence suggests that reducing the number of parking spaces is unlikely to lead to a reduction in car ownership, instead resulting in parking in unsuitable locations. This is particularly the case for residents that need to commute for work and where there is not a viable form of public transport available to them.



We have therefore been realistic in our approach to the level of parking that should be provided, however this doesn't affect our commitment to tackling climate change. In Central Bedfordshire this can be delivered through promoting cleaner greener fuelled vehicles, encouraging the use of public transport where available and encouraging walking and cycling for shorter journeys. We know that well designed streets uncluttered by private cars lead to increased levels of walking and cycling hence the need to provide adequate parking spaces.

It is not just the number of parking spaces per property that effects on-street parking levels, but also the quality of the spaces that are provided. This includes the location of parking in relation to the property's front door, how easy it is for a car to manoeuvre in or out of a parking space, plus how easy it is for people to get in or out of a car parked within a parking space. The parking standards include a lot of information that seeks to improve the quality of the parking provided, to ensure that each parking space is used as intended and to discourage unnecessary on-street parking.

From a developer's perspective, parking takes up land which adds to the cost of building a property and reduces the number of properties that could be constructed on any given development. The costs associated with additional parking would undoubtedly be passed onto the eventual property purchaser; if parking standards were increased this would increase property prices. In formulating the proposed parking standards, we have been mindful of this and consider that the proposed standards are a balance between ensuring that the parking standards meet most residents needs without significantly taking more land or adding additional cost to a new build property. This is particularly the case for 1-bedroom properties, where if parking provision was increased it would make 1-bedroom properties less affordable for a single person.

Residents are most likely able to understand the impact a lack of off-street parking can have on their local area, including footway parking and obstructive parking. However, it is noted that the responses received from residents were mostly anecdotal; parking standards have changed over time and many existing developments will have been constructed with less generous parking provision than the current standards. This was clear in some of the examples given, where housing developments mentioned were built to previous parking standards.

#### **4.3.2 Visitor parking for residential developments (section 4.5.1 of the SPD)**

A total of nine comments received related to the proposed number of visitor parking spaces (0.25 per property). Seven respondents (residents, town, and parish councils) felt that the number of visitor parking spaces should be increased; the main reason given was that a lack of on-street parking for visitors causes difficulties for emergency service vehicles and refuse collection vehicles to get through and results in obstructive parking on the carriageway.

Two comments were received from developers who felt that the required number of visitor parking spaces would be difficult to accommodate given the requirement for tree planting, green space and for the visitor spaces to be evenly distributed throughout a development.

## **CBC response**

The proposed number of visitor parking spaces of 0.25 per property is the same as the existing standard. A review of some of the newest residential developments in Central Bedfordshire has helped to inform the development of this SPD, including considering the number of visitor parking spaces. The following assumptions have been made:

- Not every resident will have a visitor at the same time.
- Some delivery drivers when stopping for a short amount of time may choose not to park in a designated visitors parking space, if it is safe for them to stop outside the property that they are delivering to.
- Particularly for larger properties that have more parking spaces allocated to them, it may be agreed that a visitor could use a residents parking space if available, especially for longer term visits.
- It is possible that some residents are using the visitor spaces to park their own vehicles because they are closer than their allocated parking or more convenient than their allocated parking. By being more prescriptive in the type of parking for residents this should help to encourage residents to use their allocated parking, leaving visitors spaces available for visitors to use.
- The removal of 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup> parking spaces provided as unallocated parking spaces on-street will free up some kerb space, which could be used for tree planting and landscaping.
- Visitor parking spaces should be evenly distributed throughout a development – this is to ensure that visitor parking spaces are conveniently located for visitors and are used.
- A minimum of two visitor parking spaces should be located together – this is to ensure that larger vehicles such as delivery vehicles, trade vans and disabled people (who need more space) are able to use the visitor parking spaces.

### **4.3.3 3rd and 4th parking spaces at residential developments (section 4.5.2 of the SPD)**

Four comments were received relating to the proposal that for properties that require a 3<sup>rd</sup> (4 bedrooms) or 4<sup>th</sup> parking space (5 bedrooms or more), this could be provided as accessible green space, that a resident may choose to convert to parking later. Two comments were received from town councils who were opposed to the proposal. They felt that residents may choose not to convert the green space to hard standing, instead choosing to park on-street, or parking on the green space without providing a hard standing which would lead to the area becoming unsightly. They also mentioned that they were not in favour of green space being replaced with hard standing as this is not environmentally friendly.

One developer commented to say that they were in favour of the proposal, although felt it should be extended to include social housing, particularly when it would be managed by a housing association. Another developer was against the proposal, as they felt it would in practice reduce the amount of green space if residents chose to convert the land to hardstanding.

## **CBC response**

Under the current standards a third or fourth parking space can be provided as unallocated parking spaces on the public highway, either as a widened section of the carriageway or as a lay-by. These areas are always surfaced.

The option of a developer providing a 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> parking space as accessible green space will see a greater area of permeable land within each applicable property's footprint which otherwise wouldn't be provided. A resident who wishes to surface any additional parking spaces provided as green space can do so without planning permission, providing they use a permeable form of paving. They must apply for planning permission if they choose a non-permeable surface such as non-permeable block paving or tarmac. With 88% of households in Central Bedfordshire having 2 or less vehicles associated with them according to the 2021 Census data, it is likely to be a small number of residents that choose to surface the additional space(s); therefore, the likely outcome will be more areas of green space within residential developments, whilst allowing flexibility for future parking demand.

Any 4 or 5+ bedroom properties constructed for use as social housing are excluded from this standard, meaning that all parking spaces required would need to be surfaced. This is to ensure that budgets for making changes or improvements to social housing are not significantly impacted. If the Council or a housing association decided to purchase a property that was originally intended to be privately sold, they would have to accept that the 3<sup>rd</sup> or 4<sup>th</sup> parking spaces may have been provided as accessible green space.

### **4.3.4 Car parking standards for residential developments in town centre locations, close to railway stations and the guided busway (section 4.6 of the SPD)**

Three comments were received concerning the proposed parking standards aimed at locations that are more accessible with local facilities nearby such as town centres, railway stations and the guided busway. One Town Council did not support the standard, they felt that those that live close to a railway station may not work in a location that enables them to get a train to work. They felt that this would result in more on-street parking in existing communities. A resident commented to say that no evidence is provided as to why the selected locations would result in lower levels of car ownership. A housebuilder asked for clarification on the visitor parking requirements, the maximum distance a public car park should be from the development and if car parks that are privately owned such as local centres and supermarket car parks would count.

## **CBC response**

This parking standard is aimed at infill developments of up to fifteen properties, where it is proposed that less parking is required per property compared to the main parking standard<sup>1</sup>. The locations that have been identified, have good public transport links and / or are within walking distance of local shops and facilities.

The area around Sandy train station was included in this standard because the station has frequent direct services to London as well as other employment areas. The town centre was

---

<sup>1</sup> 1- and 2-bedroom properties require 1 parking space, 3-bedroom properties require 2 parking spaces and 4+ bedroom properties require 3 parking spaces.

excluded because the facilities available within Sandy are less than some of the larger towns in Central Bedfordshire.

The locations proposed within the standard all include public car parks (and often on-street parking) within the 500-metre radius. Housebuilders will not be expected to provide visitor parking or provide evidence of the nearest car park as this has already been factored into the standard.

The standard specifies that a developer may be asked to contribute towards the cost of implementing on-street parking measures (subject to local conditions), to deter future residents from owning more vehicles than the allocated number of parking spaces provided with the property and parking any additional vehicles on-street.

According to the 2021 census data, 11.3% of households in Central Bedfordshire didn't have a car, with 38.6% having one car per household. Whenever a resident decides to move to a new property they must decide if the property meets their needs, this includes the number of parking spaces that are included.

#### **4.3.5 Car parking standards at houses in multiple occupation (section 4.7 of the SPD)**

Two comments were received from residents regarding the proposed lack of visitor parking at houses of multiple occupation, who both felt that visitor parking should be included at all HMOs. One developer felt that providing one parking space per bedroom was excessive and unachievable.

#### **CBC response**

Planning permission is not usually required for HMOs with up to six bedrooms, therefore the parking standards for an HMO with up to 6 bedrooms should be seen as guidance. As HMOs are usually existing properties that are converted to enable multiple individuals to live in single rooms, parking space is often at a premium, therefore the addition of visitor spaces as well as one parking space per bedroom is likely to be unachievable.

#### **Proposed amendments**

- We will include a suggested number of visitor parking spaces of 0.25 per bedroom for HMOs.
- We will add in a sentence to say that where it isn't possible to provide any visitor parking spaces, the parking spaces provided should remain unallocated to enable a visitor to park if a space is available.

#### **4.3.6 Accommodation for older people (section 4.8 of the SPD)**

Four comments received were related to accommodation for older people. Three of the comments asked for a clearer definition of what is meant by 'older people'. One of the comments asked if this includes sheltered housing, assisted living complexes and any other housing aimed specifically for older people. One commenter was concerned that 'older people' could mean over 55s who may still be working and therefore require a vehicle and a parking space.

## **CBC response**

'Older people' is a term used in the [National Planning Policy Framework \(NPPF\)](#). The definition given is:

*People over or approaching retirement age, including the active, newly retired, through to the very frail elderly; and whose housing needs can encompass accessible, adaptable general needs housing through to the full range of retirement and specialised housing for those with support or care needs.*

This parking standard is aimed at sheltered housing, assisted living complexes and any other housing aimed specifically for older people. This is included within the standard on page 28 of the SPD. Nursing and care homes are included in the non-residential parking standards where a lower level of parking is required (see page 48 of the SPD).

McCarthy and Stone (who build and manage retirement complexes throughout the UK) completed a study on their managed properties. The study showed that the average age a resident moved into one of their properties was 76 years, their assumption being that older people don't want or need this type of facility prior to this. The study also noted that car ownership levels decreased as age increased, with just over 30% of residents between the ages of 75-80 owning a car.

Accommodation aimed at over fifty-fives that doesn't include any support may attract people that are still working. In moving into this type of accommodation the resident is buying into a lifestyle and must make sure that the parking meets their needs. It is felt that one parking space per property is adequate, given that the mix of age of residents is likely to mean that not all will be working. Developments with a car club and less parking spaces are likely to attract older residents that are not working and don't require a car on a regular basis.

## **Proposed amendments**

- We will add in an extract from the NPPF which gives a definition for 'older people'.
- We will include a clearer specification of the types of facilities this type of accommodation should include such as a communal lounge, restaurant or café or a staff member.
- We will add a sentence to confirm that when less parking spaces are provided than the number of properties, the parking spaces should remain unallocated.

### **4.3.7 Car-free developments (section 4.9 of the SPD)**

Seven comments were received that relate to car-free developments. Two comments were from residents. The points they raised included that where a car-free development is proposed, sustainable transport routes must be safe and practical to use, and where public transport is relied upon as an alternative to private car ownership the hours of operation must consider shift workers. Two comments were received from town councils. One of the responses was concerned that the 1-mile radius of local facilities provision is unlikely to include a workplace and was therefore unrealistic. The second comment felt that a standard shouldn't be set for the whole of Central Bedfordshire, as different towns have different characteristics which affects the level of parking demand. Three comments were received from developers, all of which wanted the proposed car-free standards to be less restrictive.

### **CBC response**

The type of facilities provided as part of a residential development would be considered when an application for a car-free development was received but is outside the scope of this document.

A potential resident is responsible for deciding if a property is suitable to meet their needs. According to the 2021 Census 13.2% of residents in Central Bedfordshire didn't own a vehicle, and 36.2% of residents who are sixteen or over were not economically active. This included residents that are retired, students, those that are unemployed, those looking after families and those that are sick or disabled. 63.8% of the population are in employment (this will include some residents that work from home). This gives scope for residents that don't have to do a daily commute and require a vehicle to consider going car free.

Local circumstances will be considered through the planning process; it isn't possible to have different parking standards for different towns as even within a town, one area may have different parking demand to another.

The parking standards are prescriptive in identifying when a car-free development would be permitted with good reason – to ensure that the outcome is a car-free development where residents have viable options to travel in different ways to a private vehicle. A car-free development where alternative travel options to a private car have not been considered is unlikely to lead to a car-free development and could have significant negative consequences for the surrounding area.

### **4.3.8 Disabled parking in residential developments (section 4.10 of the SPD)**

Four comments related to disabled parking in residential developments were received. 3 comments received from residents were in support of the standards. One comment received from a parish council suggested that for flats and apartments all parking spaces should be designed to disabled parking bay dimensions and not just one space per property allocated to properties on the ground floor.

### **CBC response**

According to the DfT 3.5% of the population in Central Bedfordshire had a blue badge on 31st March 2021 which equates to around 10,000 people. Providing ground floor flats and apartments with larger parking spaces that accommodate the needs of a disabled person will substantially increase the number of potential properties available for a disabled person to live in. 1<sup>st</sup>, 2<sup>nd</sup> and higher floor flats would require a disabled person to rely on a lift for access to their property which should not be used in the event of a fire. As all the properties located on the ground floor could accommodate the needs of a disabled person it was considered that this should be sufficient provision.

### **4.3.9 Parking for powered two-wheelers at residential developments (section 5.0 of the SPD)**

Two comments were received from residents that related to the provision of motorcycle parking at residential properties. One resident felt that every property should have space

for one motorcycle to be parked and the other was concerned about motorcycles being parked on footways which causes a trip hazard.

### **CBC response**

Appendix 36 (see page 93 of the SPD) shows a proposed layout for motorcycle parking. We have not made it mandatory to provide motorcycle parking at every property as there are a relatively low number of motorcycles registered in Central Bedfordshire (6,900 which makes up 3.5% of all vehicles).

## **4.4 Cycle parking at non-residential developments (section 6.0 of the SPD)**

A total of eleven comments were received that mentioned cycle parking at non-residential developments. The comments covered a variety of subject areas.

### **Safety and security**

Some of the comments related to the safety and security of cycle parking. A resident felt that in relation to theft prevention all cycle stands must be Sheffield stands rather than this just being a preference. A public body commented on the proposed location(s) for cycle parking with respect to personal safety.

### **CBC response**

Sheffield stands are included as a preference as in specific locations other forms of cycle parking may be more appropriate, such as cycle hangars or cycle lockers. This wasn't meant so that a lesser standard of cycle parking would be acceptable, such as the type of cycle parking that doesn't allow a cyclist to lock the frame of their cycle in any way. We will review the wording to ensure that this is clear. Personal safety has been considered, with some of the requirements listed to ensure personal safety whilst using cycle stands are mentioned in sections 6.1 and 6.2.

### **Amount of parking**

A resident considered that the proposed number of cycle parking spaces for non-residential developments was too low and felt that empty cycle spaces was an advert for encouraging people to cycle. The respondent felt that the standard should be increased to suit future levels of cycle parking and not just the current level.

### **CBC response**

The number of cycle parking spaces required for each type of non-residential development are in line with [LTN 1/20](#).

### **Type of parking & layout**

A resident felt that all cycle parking should be covered, including short term. A resident suggested that we should include narrative that ensures that there is sufficient space for cycles to be secured at the designated cycle parking, whilst still allowing sufficient space for pedestrians to pass.

### **CBC response**

We are of the view that providing covered cycle parking for short stay visits may be at the detriment of accessibility, particularly when a single stand is specified.

### **Scooters and e-scooters**

A resident felt that scooter parking should be included at secondary schools, sixth forms, colleges and at facilities that offer higher and further education, including parking for e-scooters (once they are legal to use on the public highway).

### **CBC response**

Central Bedfordshire is not an area that is taking part in an e-scooter trial. E-scooters are currently illegal on the public highway outside of trial areas. Having checked the Hands Up data which records how pupils get to school for each school in Central Bedfordshire, of secondary aged pupils only 1 or 2 per school tend to scoot. Scooters can also be left in cycle parking areas.

### **Non-standard cycles**

Another resident wanted to know if the 5% allocation for non-standard cycles is the minimum standard, maximum or an exact figure.

### **CBC response**

Requiring 5% of cycle parking to be suitable for use by non-standard cycles is a standard which is included in [LTN 1/20](#).

### **Proposed amendments**

- We will review the wording of Sheffield cycle stands being a preference.
- We will amend the cycle parking layouts in the appendices to show an adjacent footway for context.
- We will add detail to the wording of non-standard cycles, to say that 5% of cycle parking should be suitable for non-standard cycles with a minimum of one space provided. 5% should be rounded up to the nearest whole number.

## **4.5 Operational parking standards (section 7.0 of the SPD)**

Six comments were received which related to the operational parking standards. Half of these related to minor issues, one related to e-scooter and scooter parking, one related to a need for more disabled parking at medical facilities, and the final related to the need for larger spaces for maintenance vehicles in residential areas.

### **CBC response**

- Central Bedfordshire is not an area that is taking part in an e-scooter trial. E-scooters are currently illegal on the public highway outside of trial areas. A standard is included for scooters at primary schools (for pupils aged 4-11).
- Visitor parking spaces are specified to be located as a pair as a minimum to enable larger vehicles to be able to use them.



## Proposed amendments

- We will add in 'medical facilities' to the first bullet point on p53.
- We will add a note on page 49 within the parking standards table adjacent to 'medical facilities' to clarify that more disabled parking than the disabled parking standards may be required at medical facilities.

## 4.6 Disabled parking at non-residential developments (section 8.0 of the SPD)

Two responses were received in relation to disabled parking provision at non-residential developments. A resident wanted clarification on whether a disabled parking space can only be used by someone with a blue badge. A developer felt that the ratios proposed for disabled parking spaces should not be arbitrarily set and asked for further justification for the standards.

### CBC response

Disabled parking spaces can only be used by those who hold a valid disabled person's blue badge. The blue badge scheme is nationally recognised, more information can be found [here](#). The ratio of disabled parking spaces to standard parking spaces is based on the British Parking Association's standard [Parking Know How Bay Size](#) and [Inclusive Mobility](#) (DfT). These are both nationally recognised standards.

## 4.7 Appendices

A total of sixteen comments were received in relation to the information contained within the appendices. A developer commented to say that the layout drawings provided in the appendices were greatly appreciated and will facilitate the delivery of well-designed parking solutions. A developer supported the consistent use of hyperlinks throughout the document between the relevant sections and appendices. However, there were some concerns about some of the detail provided in some of the appendices.

### Layouts

Five developers felt that the example layouts shown in appendices 16-25 (in the draft version) would take up more land and result in a reduction in housing density. They mentioned that the solutions were totally engineered and felt that designers should be able to suggest their own solutions to satisfy the principles. One developer was concerned that wider driveways may encourage residents to try to squeeze more vehicles in than designed which would be against the Council's sustainability principles. Another thought that a proposed wider driveway would take up almost the same width as the housing and upset the rhythm of the street scene. Another developer disliked the additional one metre width proposed for a shared driveway with a neighbour (Appendix 21 in the draft version).

### CBC response

The number of parking spaces required for a residential property has been rationalised, with the proposed standards being broadly in line with the existing 'minimum number of parking spaces' instead of the previous 'suggested number of parking spaces' which requires a

higher number of parking spaces per property. There are a couple of exceptions where the existing parking standards had different standards for different types of housing (requirements for 4-bedroom terraced houses and apartments have been increased from 2 spaces to 3 spaces).

- The existing diagram for driveway parking in the [Design Guide](#) does not include the context of having an obstruction both sides of a parking space such as a boundary wall. This is a common design for single driveways with the outcome being when driveways are built to these dimensions there is a reduction in useable access space.
- The removal of a garage counting as a parking space gives further flexibility and the opportunity for developers to choose not to provide a garage, or to provide a smaller brick-built structure which is aimed as outside storage and could include the space allocated for cycle parking and bin storage. A garage in the existing standards is required to measure 3.3 metres by seven metres.

The proposal to increase the minimum width of a driveway is to enable the driveway space to become more flexible for a variety of reasons. This includes:

- Pedestrian access to vehicles parked on the driveway, particularly for groups of people who require assistance getting in or out of a vehicle and may require a car door to be fully opened, such as disabled people, young children, and older people.
- To enable residents to carry out practical tasks concerning their vehicle such as basic maintenance, washing their vehicle, or loading and unloading larger items.
- The space proposed around a vehicle on a driveway will enable access for cycles to be taken in and out of their designated storage if this is accessed from the driveway, without a parked vehicle on the driveway needing to be moved. Making cycling a practical, easy solution for residents to make for shorter journeys is in line with our sustainability objectives.
- The space proposed around a vehicle on a driveway will also enable access for wheelie bins to be put out and brought in on collection days, without a vehicle parked on the driveway needing to be moved, whilst also allowing some storage space for wheelie bins. This should help to encourage residents not to leave wheelie bins on the footway for longer than is needed, which can create an obstruction for pedestrians.
- This will be the first time that electric vehicle charging points have been included in our parking standards; we have therefore made sure that for a driveway arrangement an EV charge point can be mounted on a wall and space surrounding the parked vehicle(s) enables a resident to plug in or unplug their EV, whilst allowing sufficient width so that a resident is not forced to squeeze past the EV charge point.

The diagrams shown in the appendices are suggested layouts; this is made clear in the SPD under the heading 4.4.7 Parking Bay layouts and dimensions, which lists the general principles that must be followed if a developer chooses to promote an alternative layout. It is unlikely that a resident would choose to park two vehicles adjacent to one another when a 4.5-metre-wide driveway is provided, as this would not leave very much room for people to open a vehicle door to get in or out.

### **Access space**

A developer felt that allowing 1 metre either side of a 2.5-metre-wide parking space in a driveway is excessive and should be reduced. Another suggested that a path to a front door should be 1 metre wide and not the suggested 1.2 metres.

### **CBC response**

The additional 1 metre width for a shared driveway is proposed to ensure that when two vehicles from neighbouring properties are parked adjacent to one another, it is still possible to fully open all car doors for each car parked. Our review of more recent developments in Central Bedfordshire where a lesser driveway width was used resulted in residents choosing not to park vehicles adjacent to one another in a shared driveway due to the limited width, which halved the useable number of parking spaces and resulted in residents using the visitor parking spaces. It is our view that this is not an efficient use of space when the facilities provided cannot feasibly be used.

In relation to the 1.2m width, Section M4(3) of the Building Regulations specifies that a path should be 1.2 metres wide so that it is suitable for a wheelchair user.

### **EV charging**

In terms of EV charging, one housebuilder felt that the 1-metre-wide strip included to enable the installation of electric vehicle charge points out of the footway was excessive and should be reduced (appendix 26 in the draft version). A resident commented that appendices 18-25 (in the draft version) showed a single electric vehicle charge point for two vehicles. They felt that 2 EV charge points should be provided.

### **CBC response**

We consider it necessary to provide 0.5 metres clearance from the electric vehicle charge point to the edge of the parking space. We will remove the 1 metre dimension to allow for variation in the types of electric vehicle charge points that may be installed. A single charge point can have two leads that charge 2 vehicles at the same time.

### **Visitor spaces**

Another housebuilder disagreed with visitor parking spaces being wider than standard at flats and apartments to accommodate disabled blue badge holders (appendix 28 of the draft version).

### **CBC response**

The standard which requires visitor parking spaces to be installed to disabled parking bay dimensions at flats and apartments means that additional disabled parking bays are not required. This is mentioned under the heading 4.10 Disabled parking in residential developments in the third paragraph. This means that in most cases the new standard requires a similar amount of land take compared to the existing standard, where both visitor and disabled parking spaces must be provided.

## **Tandem Parking**

A resident felt that tandem parking (as shown in appendices 20-25 in the draft version) should be removed from the standard as residents would tire of shuffling vehicles and end up parking one vehicle on-street which would then take up a visitor parking space.

## **CBC response**

The parking standards before our existing version allowed three vehicles to be parked in tandem. This was removed in the current standards due to it being impractical for residents. We must consider the land take required to build new properties and therefore the cost vs the practicality of the parking. In the proposed version of the parking standards, we have removed many of the types of parking that are not well used, such as garages and some types of parking courts away from properties. Removing tandem parking for two vehicles and expecting developers to provide parking in other layouts would result in more land take per property and therefore increase the cost and potential affordability for potential residents. A tandem parking layout also enables an electric vehicle charge point to reach both vehicles parked when placed centrally between the two parking spaces.

## **Proposed amendments**

- The width of a parking space in a driveway will be reduced to 2.2 metres (instead of the previously proposed 2.5 metres) where a 1-metre-wide access is provided both sides of the parking space. This will see a single car driveway being a width of 4.2 metres as opposed to the proposed 4.5 metres. The existing standard is 3.5 metres.
- We will remove 1 metre width for the area allocated for electric vehicle charge points to be installed (appendix 26 in the draft version).
- We will review wording of disabled parking bay requirements for flats and apartments (page 30, third paragraph) - disabled parking bays don't need to be provided in addition to wider visitor parking spaces.

## 5.0 Conclusion

It is positive that so many people and organisations took the time to respond to the public consultation. We appreciate the time people invested in developing and submitting their responses. The comments received have all been considered and some amendments will be made to the standards which we hope will improve the document and make it both more useful and effective.

As expected, respondents have considered the proposed Parking Standards for New Developments SPD from their own perspective. This has meant that in some cases the views and comments received were contradictory. When reviewing the comments, we have considered whether the suggestions made can feasibly be incorporated into the standards whilst meeting the following principles:

- Maintain the level of quality we want to promote for parking in Central Bedfordshire.
- Adhere to relevant national standards.
- Ensure that the measures proposed to meet the Council's sustainability objectives are included and not compromised.
- Ensure that properties remain affordable, and land take per property is not disproportionately affected by the proposed changes.

Alongside this, other minor changes will be made to the SPD to address minor inaccuracies, or update data, references and guidance using information that became available after the public consultation commenced. The changes that will be made to the SPD are detailed in appendix 1.

## 6.0 Next steps

Once the changes have been made, the final version of the document will be discussed at the Executive Committee with the recommendation to adopt the document.

## Appendix 1: Changes to be made to the SPD following public consultation

Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
Guidance documents (National guidance)	6	<a href="#">PAS 1899: 2022</a> - Electric vehicles – Accessible Charging – Specification add onto list of guidance documents.	New standard released in October 2022.
Guidance documents (Local guidance)	6	Hyperlink added for Electric Vehicle Charging Technical Guidance for New Development SPD	Document adopted December 2022.
Guidance documents (Local guidance)	6	Hyperlink added for On-street Parking Management Strategy	Document adopted February 2023.
1.0 Introduction (second paragraph)	7	Paragraph added on 'health' with climate change as a reason to encourage active travel.	Information provided by Public Health Shared Service as part of their consultation response.
1.1 Formulation of the standards (table)	7	Car Parking Strategy and Cycle Parking Annexes should be LTP3 and not LATP3.	Error amended.
1.2 Adherence to the standards	8	Example added - developments in accessible locations that are well served by public transport.	Included following internal discussions with Highways Development Management and Planning.
3.0 Cycle parking in residential developments (Table 1)	10	Reference added to section 4.8 'Accommodation for older people' to ensure that it is clear what is meant by 'older people' and the types of accommodation this standard applies to.	Included following consultation feedback.

Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
3.2 Visitor cycle parking at flats and apartments	11	Sentence added to clarify that any types of cycle parking proposed which is not a Sheffield stand must allow for the frame of a cycle to be locked to a fixed object.	Included following consultation feedback.
4.0 Car and van ownership in Central Bedfordshire (4.1.1 Location of work) (4.1.2 Demographics)	18	Update the 2011 Census data with the 2021 Census data.	The 2021 Census data has recently been published therefore the data will be updated.
4.4 Residential parking layout considerations	22	Section combined with previous section 4.4.7 to make it clear that the layouts in the appendices are suggested and to remove repetition. Order of paragraphs in section 4.4 revised.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.4.1 Parking bay layouts and dimensions	22	Reworded to clarify when widening is required on both sides of a parking bay.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.4.2 Residential parking layout considerations - garages	23	Hyperlink included to new appendices (20) – layout and minimum dimensions for a double garage.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.4.3 (new section) Residential parking layout considerations – carports and under croft parking	23	Paragraph added on carports and under croft parking which will count as a parking space providing that they meet the dimensions of a parking space including access space, and that the posts are not within the access space. Subsequent paragraph numbering revised.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.

Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
4.4.4 Residential parking layout considerations – rear parking courts	23	Clarity added around when a rear parking court would be permitted.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.4.8 (new section) Residential parking layout considerations – Landscaping	23	New 'landscaping' section created. Wording amended to make it clear when landscaped areas adjacent to parking bays will and will not be permitted. Subsequent paragraph numbering revised.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.4.9 Residential parking layout considerations – Electric vehicle charging point provision	23	Hyperlink added for Electric Vehicle Charging Technical Guidance for New Development SPD.	Document adopted December 2022.
4.7 Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs) Table 5	27	A suggested number of visitor parking spaces of 0.25 per bedroom for HMOs has been added.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.7 Houses in multiple occupation (HMOs)	27	Sentence added to say that where it isn't possible to provide any visitor parking spaces, the parking spaces provided should remain unallocated to enable a visitor to park if a space is available.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.8 Accommodation for older people	28	Extract included from NPPF – definition of older people, and specification for the types of facilities this type of accommodation must include such as a communal lounge, staffed etc.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
4.8 Accommodation for older people	28	Bullet point added to clarify that parking spaces should remain unallocated where less than 1 space per dwelling is provided.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.



Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
4.10 Disabled parking in residential developments (third paragraph)	30	Wording reviewed for disabled parking bay requirements at flats and apartments to ensure that disabled parking bays don't need to be provided in addition to wider visitor parking spaces.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Cycle parking at non-residential developments (section 6.0 of the SPD)	33	'Safe' added to first sentence.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Short-stay cycle parking (section 6.1) Long-stay cycle parking (section 6.2)	33, 34	Wording reviewed of Sheffield cycle stands being a preference.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Long-stay cycle parking (section 6.2)	33	Sentence added on personal security and the location of cycle parking.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
6.11 Cycle parking standards for non-residential developments	40	Detail added to the wording of non-standard cycles, to say that 5% of cycle parking should be suitable for non-standard cycles with a minimum of one space provided. 5% should be rounded up to the nearest whole number.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
7.0 Operational parking standards	46, 48	Reference removed to the standards being a minimum and more of a starting point for discussions given the wide variety of non-residential developments and different locations.	Internal discussion with Highways Development Management.
7.0 Operational parking standards	47	'that' added on page 47, section 7.1.2, first bullet point.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.

Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
7.0 Operational parking standards	49	Note added on page 49 within the parking standards table adjacent to 'medical facilities' to clarify that more disabled parking spaces to the standards shown on p53 (table 9) should be considered.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
8.0 Disabled parking at non-residential developments	53	'Medical facilities' added to the first bullet point on p53.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
8.1 Accessible electric vehicle charge points	53	New section added to ensure that the needs of disabled people are considered where electric vehicle charge points are provided in non-residential locations.	Amendment following new national guidance on accessible EV charging.
Glossary of terms	58	References to waiting restrictions removed – double and single yellow lines.	Not relevant to this document.
Appendix 3: Cycle parking layouts	61-65	Additional example layouts included with adjacent footways. Each cycle parking layout labelled individually. All subsequent appendices re-numbered.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Appendix 20 (new)	78	New appendix created with a double garage layout and dimensions. All subsequent appendices renumbered.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Appendices 21-30	79-88	Parking space width reduced from 2.5 metres to 2.2 metres.	Change agreed following consultation feedback and internal discussions.

Section of the SPD	Page number	Proposed change	Reason for change
Appendix 31	89	Annotation relating to trees updated.	Internal amendment to align with the Design Guide.
Appendix 31 and 32:	89 and 90	1 metre width dimension removed for area allocated for electric vehicle charge points to be installed.	Change agreed following consultation feedback.
Appendix 32	90	Annotation relating to trees updated.	Internal amendment to align with the Design Guide.
Appendix 35	93	Walkway dimensions increased to enable disabled access. Additional inclusive EV charge point added.	Amendment following new national guidance on accessible EV charging.
Appendix 35	93	Annotation relating to trees updated.	Internal amendment to align with the Design Guide.
Appendix 36	94	Annotation relating to trees updated.	Internal amendment to align with the Design Guide.
Appendix 39	97	Walkway dimensions increased to enable disabled access.	Amendment following new national guidance on accessible EV charging.
General	All	Contents page and hyperlinks updated.	Updates following other amendments listed above.

**Central  
Bedfordshire**

# **Central Bedfordshire in contact**

**Find us online:** [www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](http://www.centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

**Email:** [strategic.transport@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk](mailto:strategic.transport@centralbedfordshire.gov.uk)

**Write to:** Central Bedfordshire Council, Priory House,  
Monks Walk, Chicksands, Shefford, Bedfordshire SG17 5TQ