

Development and Allocations Plan

Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 4

Matter 4: Transport and Accessibility

Issue

Whether the approach of the Plan in terms of transport and infrastructure, including policies relating to pedestrian and cycle movement (Policy DM10), public transport (Policy DM11), parking and servicing (Policy DM12), road hierarchy (Policy DM13) and mitigation and highway management (Policy DM14), is justified, effective and consistent with national policy and in general conformity with the CSUCP.

Questions

For each policy listed below, the Council should set out the basis for the policy approach, what it seeks to achieve, and whether it is positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy. In responding to those matters and any additional questions listed below for specific policies, the Council should identify and address particular concerns raised in representations.

4.1 *Would Policy DM10 require developers to undertake work on land outside their control? How would this be secured?*

Depending on the size, location and nature of the proposed development, the policy may require developers to undertake work on land outside their control.

It is expected that in most cases where development is required to provide pedestrian and cycle connections to the wider network on land outside their control, this land would form part of the public highway. Where works are to be carried out on the existing (publicly maintained) highway it will be necessary to enter into an agreement with Newcastle City Council (NCC) under Section 278 of the Highways Act 1980. Section 278 Agreements Developer Guidance October 2015 provides information of how developers can establish a Section 278 Agreement with the council.

Other mechanisms utilised by the council for securing works on land outside developers control include S106 agreements and Grampian conditions. These may require the developer to undertake works or provide financial contributions towards works.

The principle of requiring works on land outside a developer's control and methods to secure these works are well established within the council. Notwithstanding the above, the policy will only be applied to planning proposals where it is relevant. This will be determined on a case by case basis and any requirements must be fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development. This is consistent with paragraphs 55 and 56 of the NPPF relating to planning conditions and obligations.

PPG Use of planning conditions gives further guidance on when conditions can be used when land is not in the control of the applicant, (Paragraph: 009 Reference ID: 21a-009-20140306) and the council will ensure that conditions will not be used where there are no prospects at all of the action being performed within the required time-limit.

4.2 *Are Policy DM11 and the proposed modification in paragraph 5.2.3 of the supporting text consistent?*

The council has considered this further and propose a revision to the modification for consistency with the DM11. It is suggested that paragraph 5.2.3, sentence 2 is amended to 'Major development must be served...' This ensures that both the policy and the supporting text are both referring to major development.

4.3 *Is Policy DM12 on parking and servicing effective as drafted?*

It is considered that this policy is effective as drafted.

Part 1 of the policy refers to vehicle and cycle parking being safe, secure and useable. Further detail on how these characteristics should be reflected in parking design is contained in the supporting text and developer guidance Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Parking, October 2015 which is signposted in paragraph 5.3.4. Section 7 of the guidance refers to residential and non-residential car parking and Section 10 sets out details of cycle parking.

The second element of part 1 refers to parking satisfying operational requirements. Ensuring parking levels satisfy operational requirements is an established approach and is currently how the council assesses parking requirements. It is considered an effective way of determining the appropriate levels of parking for developments. This is also supported by developer guidance Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Parking, October 2015 which sets out suggested parking levels for cars and cycles in appendix 4 and 5 respectively.

The policy purposely avoids defining detailed specifications for both the design and levels of parking provision. This is to ensure the policy is flexible enough to respond to site specific circumstances. For example, if developers wish to deviate from the parking levels prescribed in the guidance and they are able to demonstrate the operational need through effective modelling undertaken as part of a transport assessment.

Part 2 of the policy requires changing and shower facilities for major non-residential developments. The principle of changing facilities is set out in section 5 of the developer guidance Transport Assessments, Travel Plans and Parking, October 2015 where it identifies changing and shower facilities at workplaces as a measure to promote cycling. The level of facilities will depend on the nature and size of the development and therefore this can be negotiated through the planning process.

Part 3 of the policy refers to adequate servicing and loading facilities. The supporting text in paragraph 5.3.6 is explicit in explaining what is required from developments to ensure they demonstrate adequate facilities have been provided.

4.4 *Are Policy DM12 and its supporting text at paragraph 5.3.5 consistent?*

The council has considered this point further and propose the following modifications to ensure consistency with DM12.

It is suggested that paragraph 5.3.5, sentence 3 is amended to 'These will include providing levels of ~~secure cycle parking~~ safe, secure and useable parking...', and

sentence 5 is amended to 'The provision of appropriate shower and changing facilities for employees in **major non-residential developments** ~~new office developments~~ will promote cycling'.

4.5 *In order to be positively prepared, should freight routes be included in Policy DM13?*

The process of selecting roads to be included in the road hierarchy was based on several factors which included the consideration of freight routes. Although Newcastle City Council has not defined a network of freight routes, the North East Freight Partnership identified freight and abnormal load routes across the Tyne and Wear region and these are endorsed by the council. The freight routes identified within Newcastle are either classed as Primary or Secondary Distributor Roads in the road hierarchy (the majority are Primary roads).

The characteristic of each road type is included in appendix 2 of the Plan. The characteristics of Secondary Distributor Roads are described as carrying significantly lower volumes of traffic with fewer HGV's than either of the above categories.

This definition implies that Strategic and Primary roads are the preferred routes for freight vehicles and this approach is supported by our Traffic Management team. The definition also confirms that Secondary Roads are capable of accommodating freight vehicles. In fact, some freight movement will be required to use Secondary Roads to ensure deliveries can be made to district centres such as Chillingham Road, West Road and Gosforth High Street amongst others.

Although Primary Roads are the preferred routes for freight, it is considered unnecessary to define freight routes as a separate category in the policy because in practice any road identified in the hierarchy is considered suitable for freight vehicles.