

**Chapter 5: Transport**

<b>Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title</b>	<b>Proposed Modification / New Policy</b>	<b>Reason for Proposed Modification</b>
<p>Strategy Policy 5: Development and the Transport System</p>	<p><del>Strategy Policy 5:</del> <b>Accessibility and Transport Policy 1:</b> Development and the Transport System</p> <p>Developers will be expected to maximise the potential for access to and from new development by walking, cycling and public transport, and to take other appropriate measures to minimise the traffic generated by that development, <b>including the formulation and implementation of travel plans</b>. If, despite the above measures, the remaining traffic generated by the development, together with that from existing and committed development would:</p> <p>(a) impair road safety;</p> <p>(b) have an unacceptable effect on the environment; or</p> <p>(c) exceed the capacity available in the local highway system, further <del>satisfactory</del> <b>adequate</b> and environmentally acceptable road improvements should be undertaken, at the developer's expense, to mitigate the impact of the development.</p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.2 to 7.10).</p> <p>The general provisions of Accessibility and Transport Policy 1 have been transferred to Strategy Policy 5 and those of the latter policy to Accessibility and Transport chapter.</p>
<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 4: Buses</p>	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 4: Buses</p> <p>Development will be acceptable provided that:</p> <p>a) access for buses is provided <del>to an average of no more than 200 metres walking distance and will not exceed 400 metres walking distance of all parts of the development</del> <b>such that all parts of the development are within convenient walking distance of an actual or potential bus stop, with maximum distances as specified in local</b></p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.13 to 7.17) subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A maximum walking distance has been utilised but with more detailed guidance required in the Explanatory Memorandum.</li> </ul>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	<p><del><i>plans.</i> ; and</del></p> <p>b) <del>routes for buses through the development, required to provide this level of access, are such to provide direct links with the highway network, by priority access arrangements if necessary, and to maximise the opportunity for efficient links with other bus services in the area.</del></p> <p>In identifying new sites for development, <del>regard</del> <b>preference</b> will be given to the siting of the development in locations <del>most likely to be</del> <b>best</b> able to support <del>commercially operated</del> bus services of an adequate frequency to provide <del>an attractive</del> <b>a realistic</b> alternative to the use of the private car.</p> <p>Measures will be taken, in partnership with the bus companies, to assist the efficiency and quality of the bus services by investment in bus priorities, information systems and improved bus terminals and stops.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The issue of through routes is significant and guidance will be provided in the Explanatory Memorandum.</li> <li>▪ With respect to the second paragraph, it is noted that this is not possible for all development and that the Deposit Draft wording is preferred (with some minor amendments).</li> </ul>
<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 6: Freight</p>	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 6: Freight</p> <p>The <del>possibility</del> <b>potential</b> of rail <b>or waterway</b> connections will be fully explored for any development which generates significant freight movements. If rail <b>or waterway</b> movements <del>is</del> <b>are</b> not possible, provision for this development should be made in locations <del>well served by the strategic</del> <b>where access to the principal road network is via roads suitable to take the predicted heavy goods vehicle traffic.</b></p> <p><b>Land with potential for rail or waterway freight</b></p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.32 to 7.33).</p> <p>The Pre-EIP Change introduced the desirability of transferring freight to waterways in addition to rail. Concerns were noted that it may affect the biodiversity of the waterway corridor and therefore an amendment to the policy has been proposed to ensure that development will only be</p>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	<p><b>connections should be identified in local plans and protected from other development.</b> Development will not be permitted where either <b>providing</b> the development itself or <b>associated</b> its activities <b>do not have an unacceptable</b> effect on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) residential amenity; or</li> <li>b) the <b>general appearance and</b> character of the open countryside; and rural areas.</li> <li>c) <b>the biodiversity of the waterway corridor, particularly where a Site of Special Scientific Interest has been designated.</b></li> </ul> <p>Rail <b>or waterway</b> based proposals <b>that do</b> not in accordance <b>satisfy</b> the above <b>criteria</b> may, under exceptional circumstances, be permitted provided that the <b>main justification for the</b> development is driven by the need for rail <b>or waterway access</b> for the movement of goods <b>or raw materials</b>.</p>	<p>permitted if it does not cause an unacceptable effect.</p>
<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 7: Parking Provision in New Development</p>	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 7: Parking Provision in New Development</p> <p>In identifying the appropriate level of car parking provision for development proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) levels which exceed defined maximum parking standards will not be permitted;</li> <li>b) a lower level of parking than the maximum parking standard may be permitted at the request of the developer; and</li> </ul>	<p>In accordance with Panel recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.34 to 7.38).</p> <p>The conflict of the original Policy with national and regional guidance is recognised and was conceded at the EIP. The revision of the policy to apply maximum standards to certain developments above</p>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	<p><del>e) whether the level of parking should be restricted further to impose restraint on car travel to the development will be considered in particular local circumstances, provided that in no circumstances the provision of parking will be so low that on street parking associated with the development would create a highway safety or amenity problem.</del></p> <p><del>In most instances, commuted sums will be negotiated towards the cost of alternatives where the provision of on-site parking is less than the unrestrained demand. The alternatives are in the following priority order: firstly, pedestrian and cycle facilities; secondly, public transport services; thirdly, park and ride facilities; and fourthly, public car park improvements and provision.</del></p> <p><del>The commuted sums may also be used to implement traffic management measures to overcome the undesirable consequences of on-street parking.</del></p> <p><del>Sufficient secure cycle parking will be provided to accommodate the anticipated demand</del></p> <p><b><i>Maximum standards for car parking relating to developments above defined threshold sizes will be specified that accord with the circumstances and declared objectives of local plan areas.</i></b></p> <p><b><i>Parking provision above the maximum will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate by a</i></b></p>	<p>defined thresholds, rather than all types of development and permitting parking above the maximum in limited circumstances, ensures consistency with PPG13 and RPG8.</p> <p>However, the Councils are still concerned about the unrestricted 'carte blanche' approach to development below the thresholds. There is concern this may undermine the maximum parking levels set out in PPG13 and encourage competition between local authorities, if standards are set locally. Therefore, a reference should be added to the Explanatory Memorandum, encouraging district councils to adopt parking levels for sites below the thresholds that are generally in line or below the maximum parking standards set out in PPG13 and RPG8.</p>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	<p><b><i>Transport Assessment or other appropriate evidence that a higher level of parking is needed.</i></b></p> <p>Sufficient secure cycle <b><i>and motorcycle</i></b> parking will be <b><i>required</i></b> to accommodate the anticipated demand, <b><i>including modal split targets, where appropriate.</i></b></p>	
<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 8: Public Car Parks</p>	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 8: Public Car Parks</p> <p>In the central areas of Leicester, the main towns, district and local centres, further public car parking not associated with new development will be permitted only if it can be clearly demonstrated that:</p> <p>a) a shortage of short stay parking is detracting from the vitality and viability of the centre and that shortage cannot be met in any other way; or</p> <p>b) excessive on-street parking is having an adverse effect on highway safety, and visual-amenity which cannot reasonably be resolved by any other means.</p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.39).</p>
<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 10: New Roads, Road Improvements and Traffic Management</p>	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 10: New Roads, Road Improvements and Traffic Management</p> <p><b><i>Where justified as part of an integrated and sustainable transport solution, Bypasses and other new roads are not required to allow a new development to proceed will only be constructed where the environmental and road safety benefits to the locality bypassed exceed the environmental disbenefits of road construction to a degree which justifies the expenditure</i></b></p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.40 to 7.44) subject to the exclusion of a reference to Loughborough Inner Relief Road (paragraphs 7.45 to 7.47). The Panel indicated that several participants argued that Accessibility and Transport Policy 10 should include reference to individual road</p>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	<p><b>investment.</b></p> <p>Alterations to existing roads and traffic management schemes will be carried out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) improve the local environment;</li> <li>b) encourage walking and cycling;</li> <li>c) provide better operating conditions for public transport; and</li> <li>d) improve road safety.</li> </ul> <p><b>The following road schemes costing more than £5 million and as identified in current LTPs will be implemented during the Plan period:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>(i) A511 (A50) Ashby Bypass Stage 2;</b></li> <li><b>(ii) A47 Earl Shilton Bypass;</b></li> <li><b>(iii) A606 Oakham-Langham Bypass (completion); and</b></li> <li><b>(iv) A607 Rearsby Bypass.</b></li> </ul>	<p>schemes. PPG 12 makes it clear that a specific transport proposal that directly involves the development or use of land should appear as a policy or proposal in the appropriate development plan. For this reason the Panel recommends that the A511 (A50) Ashby Bypass Stage 2, the A47 Earl Shilton Bypass, the completion of the Oakham-Langham Bypass, A607 Rearsby Bypass and the Loughborough Inner Relief Road should be referred to in Accessibility and Transport Policy 10 (Road Improvements and the Management of Traffic).</p> <p>This proposal has implications with respect to road schemes that are firm proposals within the Local Transport Plan (LTP) and that are strategic in nature. The Government's definition of major transport schemes, as used in the LTP process, is used and accordingly only schemes costing more than £5 million are regarded as being significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Structure Plan. It is viewed that (v) A6 Loughborough Inner Relief Road should not be included by virtue of the fact that it does not exceed the £5 million threshold and hence should be restricted to the</p>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
		Explanatory Memorandum.
Accessibility and Transport Policy 11: Transport Routes	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 11: Transport Routes</p> <p>Land reserved for routes for walking, cycling, buses, railways, light rapid transit or highways will be identified <b>in local plans</b> and safeguarded from other development.</p> <p>Development will not be acceptable if it is likely to impair the continuity of disused railway lines which have potential for re-use as routes for walking, cycling, buses, railways or light rapid transit.</p>	In accordance with Panel recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.48).
Accessibility and Transport Policy 13: Airports and General Aviation	<p>Accessibility and Transport Policy 13: Airports and General Aviation</p> <p>Provision will be made for the operational needs of the East Midlands Airport <b>and for improved surface access to the Airport</b>, subject to an evaluation of the potential benefits of any such development to the Leicestershire and East Midlands economy against the environmental <del>disbenefits brought about</del> <b>by harm associated with</b> the expansion of air transport.</p> <p>The establishment or physical expansion of other commercial airports will not be acceptable.</p> <p><b>The potential economic and other benefits of P</b>proposals for expanded facilities for <del>g</del>General <del>a</del>Aviation, including leisure and small scale business flying, will be judged <b>balanced</b></p>	<p>In accordance with Panel Recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.62 to 7.66) subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ the deletion of the reference to commercial airports is not accepted. It is proposed to provide additional clarification in paragraph 5.7 which will include a clear definition of commercial airports.</li> </ul>

Proposed Modifications

Deposit Draft Policy Number and Title	Proposed Modification / New Policy	Reason for Proposed Modification
	against their <i>likely</i> impact on the local environment <i>of any proposals</i> , including in particular, aircraft noise, access traffic and visual intrusion.	

\\PTFS1\DATA1\POLICYRR\JOBS\POLICY\Structure Plan\Proposed Modifications\TRANSPORTmods 2.doc