

Consultation Statement: Parking Standards Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

June 2026

Introduction

1. The Council adopted the Parking Standards SPD in June 2018. The Parking Standards SPD was subject to a partial statutory public consultation on minor matters between 23rd April 2025 – 11th June 2025. These minor changes were necessary as they related to a ruling by the Local Government Ombudsman.
2. This statement details the consultation on this document and lists the responses received during the consultation.

Background to the changes in the SPD

3. The changes to the Vehicle Parking Standards were:
 - to add 2 columns to each of the tables on pages 43 and 44 headed "No. of cars parking outside of PHB bays" and "Total parking stress %"; and
 - to change the parking space size referred to in the last paragraphs on pages 43 and 44 to 6m from 5m.
4. The changes to the Vehicle Parking Standards related to the methodology for undertaking parking surveys. This will not alter the way in which the policy has been implemented. Rather, it provides clarity on the way that the policy has always been implemented.

Partial Public consultation on the SPD

5. The Council undertook partial consultation on Parking Standards SPD for six weeks between 23rd April 2025 – 11th June 2025 as per the requirements set out in the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).
6. Notification of this consultation was sent to everyone who had signed up to the Council's Local Plan email updates and individuals and organisations on the Local Plan consultation database. This included statutory consultees, residents and developers.
7. The documents were available online via links on the Council webpage. Paper copies were also available to view at Leamington Town Hall, Warwick District Council Offices at that time which were at Riverside House in Leamington, Brunswick Healthy Living Centre and the main libraries including Kenilworth, Leamington Spa, Warwick, Lillington and Whitnash.

8. The Council encouraged people to respond electronically using the consultation portal [Warwick District Council - Changes to Parking Standards SPD](#) Representations were also accepted via email and by letter.

Responses to Parking Standards SPD

9. There were 46 responses received, of which 6 were categorised as supporting the proposals including the WCC Highways Authority supporting all of the proposed changes; 5 indicated that they had no comment to make; 35 provided further suggestions on changes to the document; and none were categorised as objecting to the proposals.
10. Of those responses making comments on the proposals, they essentially comprised 8 specific comments/suggested changes, many of them being repeated by multiple commentators.

Table 1: Summary of responses to Parking Standards Consultation

Respondent Name (Organisation)	Part of SPD	Representation	Council Response
Robin Richmond (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Baginton Parish Council (Parish / Town Council)	Table on p43	We welcome that WDC are applying practical and realistic considerations to car size and car number ownership when defining practical off-road parking requirements for new build properties.	Support: Noted

		As a small rural village that suffers from a lack of off-road parking, we are minded to SUPPORT any Policy revisions that look towards alleviating both current and future parking issues with new-build housing.	
Historic England (Statutory Consultee)	Table on p43	No comments	No Comments: Noted
Judy Steele (Individual)	Table on p43	No comments	No Comments: Noted
Natural England (Statutory Consultee)	Table on p43	No comments	No Comments: Noted
Kenilworth Town Council (Parish / Town Council)	Table on p43	No comments	No Comments: Noted
Coal Authority (Statutory Consultee)	Table on p43	No comments	No Comments: Noted
Warwick Town Council (Parish / Town Council)	Table on p43	Support the proposed changes.	Support: Noted
Warwickshire County Council Planning (Local Authority)	Table on p43	Agree that including the number of cars parked outside of the permit holder bays would reflect the impact of total demand	Support: Noted
Sally Davies (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

Penelope Smith (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bernard Davies (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Gordon Fyfe (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	
Kate Richmond (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Neil Moore (Individual)	Table on p43	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is a must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Joseph Dimambro-Denson (Individual)	Last para. p43	The plan should specify the type of crossover kerb used. To improve experiences for people using mobility aids and to reinforce pedestrian right of way over these vehicle routes the local plan should specify use of Dutch style entrance kerbs or something of a similar nature.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

Stuart Mace (Individual)	Last para. p43	The width of vehicles should be considered as much as their length. Modern cars - in particular EVS - are much wider than in the past, something which is not taken in to consideration for design.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here and the Highways Authority's support for the specific changes proposed here are also relevant.
Robin Richmond (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Warwickshire County Council Planning (Local Authority)	Last para. p43	Agree the distance between crossovers should be measured in units of 6m, as that is the average length of a passenger car	Support: Noted
Penelope Smith (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bernard Davies (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

Gordon Fyfe (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Kate Richmond (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Neil Moore (Individual)	Last para. p43	• Delete the last paragraph on page 43 • Make a small change to the preceding paragraph to be consistent with the policy (and strategic) intent	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Robin Richmond (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

Warwickshire County Council Planning (Local Authority)	Table on p44	Agree that including the number of cars parked outside of the unrestricted length of road would reflect the impact of total demand	Support: Noted.
Sally Davies (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Penelope Smith (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bernard Davies (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

Gordon Fyfe (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Kate Richmond (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance. Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Neil Moore (Individual)	Table on p44	Amend the table in a simpler way, including a correct calculation of the true availability, or not, of spaces which will assist Officers to monitor compliance.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		Inclusion of the Demand (over)/under Capacity is must	
Joseph Dimambro-Denson (Individual)	Last para. p44	Parallel parking bays should be split every 2 spaces by a buildout with bollards or a street tree to break up the parking, so that if it's mostly empty the road doesn't just become wider like a racetrack and encourage cars to speed.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Paul Watkins (Individual)	Last para. p44	Parking bays should be wider and longer than at present. To my knowledge the size has not changed in years from when people drove Morris Minors and the like. When spaces are taken by the current large SUV's it's impossible to park next to and be able to exit the vehicle. Sainsbury's in Kenilworth have overcome this by adding a further hatched line to each space and this works very well. I would like to see this increase as a policy and for it to be retrospectively applied when bays are remarked.	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed and the Highways Authority's support for the specific changes proposed here are also relevant.
Robin Richmond (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows:	Comment: These comments are noted and will be

		Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Warwickshire County Council Planning (Local Authority)	Last para. p44	Agree to change to 6m	Support: Noted.
Sally Davies (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	
Penelope Smith (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Bernard Davies (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	
Gordon Fyfe (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		calculation must be used to determine parking stress	
Bruno Eurich (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.
Kate Richmond (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.

		interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	
Neil Moore (Individual)	Last para. p44	Change the last paragraph on page 44 as follows: Note that occupancy levels of over 100% are possible in PHB bays/ unrestricted street lengths. This is because small cars may need less space than 6m to park, meaning that additional cars can be accommodated. However, this should not be interpreted as an increase in capacity since it may not occur regularly, or at all due to the increasing size of cars. The total number of cars parked in the street and the authorised capacity calculation must be used to determine parking stress	Comment: These comments are noted and will be retained for future reference. They do, however go beyond the scope of the changes proposed here.