

MATTER 7: TRANSPORT

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>7.67 That Strategy Policy 5 be deleted and replaced by the following:</p> <p>STRATEGY POLICY 5: TRANSPORT OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES</p> <p>Integrated and sustainable travel and transport provision will be made in order to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) improve road safety and the environment and contribute to improving the quality of life; (b) minimise the need to travel; (c) maximise people's accessibility to facilities, services, opportunities and resources; and (d) support the local economy. <p>Provision for and the promotion of walking, cycling and public transport will generally be given greater priority than provision for private transport.</p> <p>Travel demand management measures will be introduced wherever appropriate in order to help meet the objectives of this policy.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.2 to 7.10). This includes an adjustment to the policy to give walking, cycling and public transport equal priority which was conceded at the EIP and accepted in principle.</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>7.68 That the explanatory memorandum to Strategy Policy 5 should clarify the scope of travel demand management measures, including the use of company and other travel plans.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.10)</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>7.69 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 1 be deleted and replaced by the following:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 1: 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, including the formulation and implementation of travel plans. If, despite the above measures, the remaining traffic generated by the development, together with that from existing and committed development would:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) impair road safety; (b) have an unacceptable effect on the environment; or (c) exceed the capacity available in the local highway system, <p>further adequate and environmentally acceptable road improvements should be undertaken, at the developer's expense, to mitigate the impact of the development.</p>	<p>Accept 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>7.70 That paragraph 5.16 of the explanatory memorandum be amended to make reference to the location and design of dedicated cycle lanes taking into account any potential for conflict with other modes of travel.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.11).</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>7.71 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 4 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 4: BUSES</p> <p>New development should generally be located within convenient walking distance of a bus stop or terminus, complying with standards for maximum walking distances laid down in local plans.</p> <p>When identifying new sites for development, the location should be such that it will support commercially operated bus services of an adequate frequency to provide a realistic alternative to 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>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.13 to 7.17) subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ A maximum walking distance has been utilised but with more detailed guidance required in the Explanatory Memorandum. ▪ The issue of through routes is significant and guidance will be provided in the Explanatory Memorandum. ▪ 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).
<p>7.72 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 5 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 5: DEVELOPMENT OF RAIL PASSENGER SERVICES</p> <p>Support will be given in local plans, through the allocation of land and the resolution of related land</p>	<p>Do not accept recommendations for the inclusion of rail projects or infrastructure improvements in the policy (paragraphs 7.21 to 7.28). These should be restricted to reference within the Explanatory Memorandum.</p> <p>For continuity reasons and to be a positive feature of the Plan, the Ivanhoe Line is recommended by the Panel to be specifically referred to in Accessibility and Transport Policy 5. The Panel also</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>use issues, to the promotion of the following rail projects or infrastructure improvements:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) The Ivanhoe Rail Line Stage II ; (ii) New stations at Kibworth, Blaby, East Goscote and Ketton; (iii) Where relevant, other service and infrastructure proposals. 	<p>recommends that proposals for rail stations at Ketton, Blaby, East Goscote and Kibworth, as well as other service and infrastructure proposals, are included in this policy.</p> <p>This proposal has implications with respect to the certainty of the implementation of rail passenger services. Paragraph 5.17 of Planning Policy Guidance Note 12 (PPG12) advises that authorities should only include proposals in development plans that are firm and have a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the plan period. If there is uncertainty as to whether an individual scheme is to be undertaken but there is a inclination that it should be safeguarded then it would be more appropriate to restrict reference to the Explanatory Memorandum.</p>
<p>7.73 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 6 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 6: FREIGHT</p> <p>The potential of rail or waterway connections will be fully explored for any development which generates significant freight movements. If rail or waterway movements are not possible, provision for this development should be made in locations where access to the principal road network is via roads suitable to take the predicted heavy goods vehicle traffic.</p> <p>Land with potential for rail or waterway freight</p>	<p>Accept 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 it was conceded at the EIP that an amendment to the policy should be made to ensure that development will only be permitted if it does not cause an unacceptable effect.</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>connections should be identified in local plans and protected from other development. Development will only be permitted if the development or associated activities do not have an unacceptable effect on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) residential amenity; (b) the general appearance and character of the countryside and (c) the biodiversity of the waterway corridor, particularly where a Site of Special Scientific Interest has been designated. <p>Rail or waterway based proposals that do not satisfy the above criteria may be permitted if there is an overriding sustainability benefit, provided that the main justification for the development is the need for rail or waterway access for the movement of goods or raw materials.</p>	
<p>7.74 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 7 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 7: PARKING PROVISION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>Accept 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 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</p>

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>Parking provision above the maximum will only be permitted where the applicant can demonstrate by a Transport Assessment or other appropriate evidence that a higher level of parking is needed.</p> <p>Sufficient secure cycle and motorcycle parking will be required to accommodate the anticipated demand, including modal split targets, where appropriate.</p>	<p>'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>
<p>7.75 That paragraphs 5.37 and 5.39 of the explanatory memorandum be redrafted to better reflect PPG3 guidance on car parking provision for new residential development.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.38).</p> <p>The Panel comments on the lack of clarity are accepted, although the application of 'maximum' standards to residential development within the City of Leicester have worked successfully over a number of years and is considered to be more meaningful than applying an 'average' of no more than 1.5 spaces per dwelling as in the spirit of PPG3. However, it is recognised that this more flexible approach could apply in other more rural locations were there is little alternative to the car.</p>
<p>7.76 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 8 be amended by the omission of the word 'visual' in criterion (b).</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.39).</p>
<p>7.77 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 10 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 10: NEW ROADS, ROAD IMPROVEMENTS & TRAFFIC MANAGEMENT</p>	<p>Accept 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 schemes. PPG 12 makes it clear that a specific transport proposal</p>

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>Where justified as part of an integrated and sustainable transport solution, bypasses and other new roads will 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 investment.</p> <p>Alterations to existing roads and traffic management schemes will be carried out to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) improve the local environment; (b) encourage walking and cycling; (c) provide better operating conditions for public transport; and (d) improve road safety. <p>The following road schemes will be implemented during the Plan period:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (i) A511 (A50) Ashby Bypass Stage 2; (ii) A47 Earl Shilton Bypass; (iii) A606 Oakham-Langham Bypass (completion); (iv) A607 Rearsby Bypass; and (v) A6 Loughborough Inner Relief Road. 	<p>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 Explanatory Memorandum.</p>
<p>7.78 That the terms of reference of paragraph 5.52 of the explanatory memorandum in relation to schemes costing over £5 million be amended accordingly.</p>	<p>Do not accept recommendations for an amendment to the qualifying reference to schemes costing over £5 million (paragraphs 7.46 to 7.47).</p> <p>The Government's definition of major transport schemes, as used</p>

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
	in the LTP process, is to provide clarity and certainty and accordingly only schemes costing more than £5 million are regarded as being significant enough to warrant inclusion in the Structure Plan.
<p>7.79 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 11 be amended by the insertion of the words 'in local plans' after 'identified' in the first sentence of the policy.</p>	Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.48).
<p>7.80 That no reference be made to the following in the Structure Plan or explanatory memorandum: (i) a bypass for Caldecott, and (ii) the potential for new rail stations at Croft, Elmesthorpe and Thurmaston.</p>	Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.49 to 7.50 and 7.29)
<p>7.81 That in relation to the Melton Mowbray Southern and Western Bypass, paragraph 5.53 of the explanatory memorandum be amended to make it clear that the implementation of the road with funding associated with the development project at the former Melton Airfield is dependent upon the grant of planning permission for that project.</p>	Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.54 to 7.56)
<p>7.82 That reference be made in the explanatory memorandum to possible alterations to the M1, subject to the outcome of the multi-modal study of north/south movements in the East Midlands.</p>	Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.57).
<p>7.83 That consideration be given to an appropriate reference in the explanatory memorandum to the</p>	Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.58).

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>integration of bus and rail services and facilities in the Leicester City Centre.</p>	
<p>7.84 That the transport schemes mentioned in paragraph 3.42 of the Structure Plan Authorities' Written Statement to Matter 7 be added to that part of the explanatory memorandum supporting Accessibility and Transport Policy 11, provided that such schemes comply with the guidance in paragraph 5.17 of PPG12.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.59 to 7.60). It is viewed that the:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A6 Kibworth bypass; • Further Park and Ride and radial route improvements on the edge of Leicester; • Leicester City High Street bypass including a bus interchange; and • Light Rapid Transit (LRT) scheme. <p>will all comply with the guidance within para 5.17 of PPG12, by having a reasonable degree of certainty of proceeding within the plan period and should therefore be listed within the Explanatory Memorandum.</p>
<p>7.85 That the explanatory memorandum supporting Accessibility and Transport Policy 12 be amended to give further guidance on the location and frequency of road related service facilities.</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.61)</p>
<p>7.86 That Accessibility and Transport Policy 13 be amended to read as follows:</p> <p>ACCESSIBILITY AND TRANSPORT POLICY 13: AIRPORTS AND GENERAL AVIATION</p> <p>Provision will be made for the operational needs of the</p>	<p>Accept recommendations for the reasons given in the Panel Report (paragraphs 7.62 to 7.66) subject to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ 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.

Decisions and Reasons

Panel Recommendations	Structure Plan Authorities' Response
<p>East Midlands Airport and for improved surface access to the Airport, subject to an evaluation of the potential benefits of any such development to the Leicestershire and East Midlands economy against the environmental harm associated with the expansion of air transport.</p> <p>The potential economic and other benefits of proposals for expanded facilities for General Aviation, including leisure and small scale business flying, will be balanced against the likely impact on the local environment of any proposals, including in particular, aircraft noise, access traffic and visual intrusion.</p>	
<p>7.87 That the explanatory memorandum to Accessibility and Transport Policy 13 should include an explanation of the term 'operational needs', consistent with the definition in PPG13, Annex B.</p>	<p>Accept recommendation for the reason given in the Panel Report (paragraph 7.63)</p>

\\PTFS1\DATA1\POLICYRR\JOBS\POLICY\Structure Plan\Proposed Modifications\TRANSPORTmods1.doc