

## Appendix I: Appraisal of Movement and Transportation

<b>Significant Positive Effect</b>	<b>+ +</b>	Likely to have a significant positive effects
<b>Minor Positive Effect</b>	<b>+</b>	Likely to have a positive effects
<b>Neutral</b>	<b>0</b>	Neutral
<b>Minor Negative Effect</b>	<b>-</b>	Likely to have negative effects
<b>Significant Negative Effect</b>	<b>- -</b>	Likely to have significant negative effects
<b>Uncertain</b>	<b>?</b>	Uncertain
<b>No Relationship</b>	<b>NA</b>	Not applicable/No relationship

NB: where more than one colour/symbol is presented in a box it indicates that the appraisal has identified both positive and negative effects. Where a box is coloured but also contains a '?', this indicates uncertainty over whether the effect could be a minor or significant effect although a professional judgement is expressed in the colour used. A conclusion of uncertainty arises where there is insufficient evidence for expert judgement to conclude an effect.

## Issue MT1 - How can we maximise active travel in the district?

Issue MT1 - How can we maximise active travel in the district?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
MT 1A	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+
MT 1B	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	++	++

**Commentary:**

**Likely significant effects**

Option MT1A involves the new Local Plan continuing with the current approach of ensuring the development safeguards existing pedestrian and cycle routes. Under Option MT1B the Local Plan would require all new developments to demonstrate how they will maximise opportunities for walking and cycling. Option MT1B would help to ensure that the Local Plan is compliant with the NPPF, which seeks to ensure that opportunities for walking and cycling are identified and pursued (NPPF102), provide for high quality walking and cycling networks and supporting facilities such as cycle parking (NPPF104) and contribute to healthy communities (NPPF91). All factors acknowledged in the Options Paper. Both options could have minor positive effects on SAO1, SAO2, SAO9, SAO11 and SAO12. Neutral effects are identified in relation to SAO3 to SAO8 inclusive and SAO10 for both options.

The measures proposed under MT 1B could have significant positive effects in relation to SAO13 and SAO14 as it would help promote and encourage sustainable transport and promote safe, healthy and inclusive communities.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan to ensure that developments also provide adequate facilities for those travelling to work by cycle/foot, e.g. changing facilities and drying racks/cabinets for clothes.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- None identified.

## Issue MT2 - How do we enable greater use of public transport in the District?

Issue MT2 - How do we enable greater use of public transport in the District?														
Enabling greater use of road based public transport in the district														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
MT 2A	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+
MT 2B	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	?	+	+	++	++

**Commentary:**  
**Likely significant effects**  
 Option MT2A would continue the existing approach to bus infrastructure, by protecting safeguarded routes for improvements to the bus network from development which might affect their delivery. Under Option MT2B all major developments would be required to demonstrate how they will maximise access to the existing local bus network. Developments which generate the need for new highway layouts should include the provision of adequate bus infrastructure. Where a new highway layout is not created then the development should introduce new infrastructure, or enhance existing infrastructure, at appropriate locations on the current public transport network, if this is required to create suitable access arrangements. This should include examining opportunities to provide bus priority measures such as bus only streets and bus lanes. Developers will be expected to pay commuted sums to cover future maintenance of infrastructure. New developments may need to make improvements to existing bus routes to maximise opportunities from their development. This could involve pump priming additional bus services.

Both options could have minor positive effects on SAO1, SAO2, SAO9, SAO11 and SAO12. Neutral effects are identified in relation to SAO3 to SAO8 inclusive for both options and SAO10 for MT2A. Uncertain effects are identified in relation to MT 2B and SAO10 in the absence of a whole plan viability assessment to confirm what the impact of the requirements would be in relation to the delivery of new housing, including affordable housing since the requirements for payment of commuted sums might impact on viability or the ability of schemes to provide affordable housing. Significant positive effects are identified for option MT 2B in relation to SAO13 and SAO14 as it could help promote and encourage sustainable transport and promote safe, healthy and inclusive communities.

**Mitigation**

- None identified.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- Uncertainties around the impact of the requirements identified under MT 2B on the viability of development.

Issue MT2 - How do we enable greater use of public transport in the District?														
Enabling greater use of rail transport in the district														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
MT 2C	+/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	+	+
MT 2D	++/?	+/?	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	+	++	++
<p><b>Commentary:</b></p> <p><b>Likely significant effects</b></p> <p>Option MT2C would continue the existing approach to rail infrastructure, by protecting locations for improvements to the rail network from development which might affect their delivery. Option MT2D would require all proposals for “major” development - including proposals for 10 or more homes, more than 1,000sqm of floorspace or on sites of more than 0.5 hectares – to demonstrate how access to the rail network would be achieved. The Transport Assessment or Transport Statement accompanying a planning application would be the appropriate mechanism for considering the relationship between a development and rail network. This requirement is already implicit in National Planning Policy Guidance (Paragraph: 014 Reference ID: 42-014-20140306), which requires Transport Assessments/Statements to consider public transport capacity and measures to promote sustainable travel (which is assumed to include rail). Both options could have minor positive effects on SAO2, SAO9, SAO11 and SAO12. Neutral effects are identified in relation to SAO3 to SAO8 inclusive and SAO10 for both options.</p> <p>Ensuring that developments consider how best to access the rail network (under MT 2D) could have a significant positive effect in relation to SAO1, SAO13 and SAO14 as it could help improve air quality and could help promote and encourage sustainable transport and promote safe, healthy and inclusive communities.</p> <p><b>Mitigation</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>None identified.</li> </ul> <p><b>Assumptions</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The Local Plan would continue to safeguard land for rail infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p><b>Uncertainties</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Uncertainty as to whether or not it would be reasonable for developments to address any shortcomings in waiting facilities identified in the review proposed under MT 2D.</li> </ul>														

## Issue MT3 - How will we enable the rapid transition to zero emissions vehicles?

Issue MT3 - How will we enable the rapid transition to zero emissions vehicles?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
MT 3A	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	+
MT 3B	++	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	+	?	0	+/?	++	++

**Commentary:**

**Likely significant effects**

Option MT3A would seek continuation of the current approach, which typically requires all off-street parking spaces in large, strategic developments to be serviced by “active” EV charging points, and requires secure storage, parking and charging facilities that cater for e-bikes & scooters. Currently the Council also seeks around 10% of parking spaces within commercial developments to be serviced by active EV charging points.

Option MT 3B would require all off-street parking spaces in all developments to be serviced by “active” EV charging points. Where on-street parking is provided, the Council would require 20% active (to include allocated spaces for visitors) and 80% “passive” infrastructure to facilitate the transition to EV over the period of the Local Plan. This approach would also increase requirements for commercial development, so that 20% of parking spaces are serviced by active EV charging points, to include a minimum of 10 rapid charge points for large retail developments, such as supermarkets, where users will typically visit for shorter periods of time. Alongside this, the Council would work with partners to develop strategic measures to promote electric shared transport schemes, to accelerate the rollout of electric/hydrogen buses and to explore the potential for a Clean Air Zone.

Neutral effects are identified in relation to SAO4 to SAO8 and SAO11 inclusive for both options. MT3B could have a significant positive effect in relation to SAO1, SAO2, SAO13 and SAO14. MT3B could result in additional costs for development projects, including charges for connection to the grid, this could impact on the viability of proposals and their ability to provide affordable housing (SAO10) but the impacts are uncertain at this stage.

**Mitigation**

- The Government is anticipated to introduce national standards for charge point provision in England through building regulations so any policy may need caveating or justifying if the level of provision proposed is higher than that in the building regulations.
- The Government has proposed an exemption from the provision of charging points where the grid connection cost would exceed £3,600. Such an exemption may need to be reflected in the Local Plan.
- The Policy could also encourage the provision of ultra fast charging hubs (as provided in Milton Keynes).

**Assumptions**

- None

**Uncertainties**

- The impact of Option MT3B is uncertain in the absence of a whole plan viability assessment.

## Issue MT4 - How should we approach parking standards in the Local Plan?

Issue MT4 - How should we approach parking standards in the Local Plan?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
MT 4A	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	+
MT 4B	?	?	0	0	0	0	0	0	?	0	?	+	?	+
MT 4C	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	+	?	+	?

**Commentary:**

**Likely significant effects**

Option MT4A would see the continuation of existing parking standards. Option MT4B would see a more flexible approach with the removal of parking standards, with decisions made on a case by case basis at the planning application stage. Option MT4C would amend the current parking standards to significantly reduce car parking provision in the most sustainable locations and to enable sufficient provision in suburban provision.

National Planning Practice Guidance notes that maximum parking standards can lead to poor quality development and congested streets, local planning authorities should seek to ensure parking provision is appropriate to the needs of the development and not reduced below a level that could be considered reasonable. Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements should reflect the important role that appropriate parking facilities can play in rejuvenating local shops, high streets and town centres. (Paragraph: 008 Reference ID: 42-008-20140306). It is clearly important that any amendment to parking provision is evidence based.

Option MT4A would see continuation of existing parking standards and neutral effects have been identified on that basis. The provision of standards will contribute to SAO14 but not significantly. Neutral effects are identified in relation to MT4B for a range of objectives, SAO3 to 8 (inclusive and SAO10). Uncertain effects are anticipated in relation SAO1, SAO2, SAO9, SAO11 and SAO13 because the outcomes associated with the approach to parking provision under this option are themselves uncertain. The provision of standards will contribute to SAO14 but not significantly. MT4C could contribute to SAO1 and SAO2 if it results in reductions in car use but the significance of this is uncertain. There are also uncertainties around the impact that reduced levels of parking could have on the city centre and town centres (SAO12) under this option. Reductions in parking provision could lead to on-street parking etc, potentially impacting on SAO14., although the option paper notes the importance of providing sufficient parking in suburban areas.

**Mitigation**

- Local Plan to factor in the balance between short term and long term parking in city and town centres in assessing future provision.

**Assumptions**

- None identified.

**Uncertainties**

- Uncertainty around the level of car parking provision provided under MT4B and the reduction proposed to existing parking standards under MT4C.

## Issue MT5 - How should we approach transport assessments, transport statements and travel plans?

Issue MT5 - How should we approach transport assessments, transport statements and travel plans?														
SA Objective	SAO1	SAO2	SAO3	SAO4	SAO5	SAO6	SAO7	SAO8	SAO9	SAO10	SAO11	SAO12	SAO13	SAO14
Option														
MT 5A	+	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	+	+	+
MT 5B	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	++	++	++
MT 5C	++	+	0	0	0	0	0	0	+	0	0	++	++	++

**Commentary:**

**Likely significant effects**

The current approach to transport assessment requires transport assessments and travel plans on a case-by-case basis where it is considered a proposal will have significant transport implications. Assessments should show how multi-modal access options will be achieved and how transport infrastructure arising from the expected demand will be provided. Travel plans currently provide detailed information on how the mitigation will be implemented and focus on sustainable transport options. Option MT5A would continue this approach.

Option MT5B would require all for “major” development - including proposals for 10 or more homes, more than 1,000sqm of floorspace or on sites of more than 0.5 hectares - to submit transport assessments and travel plans. This approach would standardise the criteria for when assessments would be required to improve coverage and consistency of the policy.

Option MT5C would build on Option MT5B, ensuring that all major developments undertook the assessment and travel plan, but increasing the scope of the requirements to other types of development which may not be classified as “major” but could nonetheless have significant impacts on the transport network. The Options paper identifies the range of proposals that might be relevant. This option would also expand the current approach to require “minor” developments - including proposals between 1 and 9 homes, less than 1,000sqm or on sites of less than 0.5 hectares - to submit a transport statement, a simplified version of a transport assessment, to demonstrate how sustainable transport opportunities have been integrated into proposals.

Given the nature of the options under consideration, neutral effects are identified for a range of SA objectives – SAO3 to SAO8 inclusive, SAO10 and SAO11. MT5A could have minor positive effect on all other objectives, as measures to ensure that the impacts of the development on the transport network/infrastructure, safety and opportunities for walking and cycling are considered. Significant positive effects are identified in relation to MT5B and MT5C in relation to SAO1 and SAO12 to 14 inclusive on the basis that measures to reduce congestion and consider road safety across a wider range of developments could contribute to these objectives.

**Mitigation**

- None identified

**Assumptions**

- None identified

**Uncertainties**

- None identified