

Report of the Director of City Development

Report to: Development Plan Panel

Date: 2nd July 2012

LDF Core Strategy – Publication Draft, Analysis of Consultation Responses: Policy SP11 ‘Transport Infrastructure and Investment Priorities’, Policy T1 ‘Transport Management’ and Policy T2 ‘Accessibility Requirements for New Developments’).

Are specific electoral Wards affected? If relevant, name(s) of Ward(s):	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Are there implications for equality and diversity and cohesion and integration?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Is the decision eligible for Call-In?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? If relevant, Access to Information Procedure Rule number: Appendix number:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Summary of main issues

1. The Core Strategy Publication Draft was subject to 6 weeks public consultation during February – April 2012. Section 3 of this report summarises the issues raised and the Table in Appendix 1 suggests how the City Council should respond. Appendix 2 illustrates how the text of the Core Strategy would need to be altered.
2. Of the wide range of issues raised to the transport policies, SP11, T1 and T2, none are considered to warrant any major changes to the Core Strategy, only one or two minor text changes which are set out in Appendices 1 and 2.

Recommendations

Development Plan Panel is requested to:

- i). Endorse the analysis of the issues raised and any suggested Core Strategy text changes (as detailed in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report) for presentation to Executive Board for approval.

1.0 Purpose of this Report

- 1.1 Within the context of the Core Strategy Initial Report of Consultation (6th June), the purpose of this report is to review consultation responses in relation to SP11 'Transport Infrastructure and Investment Priorities', T1 'Transport Management' and T2 'Accessibility Requirements for New Developments'. Appendix 1 attached, summarises the representations, key issues raised, the City Council's view and proposed action. Appendix 2 illustrates how the text of the Core Strategy would need to be altered..

2.0 Background Information

- 2.1 Following consideration by the Development Plan Panel and Executive Board, a 6 week period of public consultation has been undertaken, commencing on 28th February to 12th April 2012. Consistent with the LDF regulations, this is a targeted stage of consultation, with emphasis upon requesting responses in relation to the "soundness" of the plan. Within this context, the consultation material comprised of a range of documents, which were subsequently made available on line or as paper copies, including:

- Core Strategy Publication Draft (Main Document)
- Sustainability Appraisal (& Non Technical Summary)
- Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening
- Equality Impact Assessment Screening
- Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan
- Draft Core Strategy Monitoring Framework
- Health Topic Paper
- Report of Consultation on Preferred Approach (October – December 2009)

Links were also incorporated to the consultation web pages to the evidence based material, which has been prepared to help inform the emerging document (including the Employment Land Review, Leeds City Centre, Town and Local Centres Study, Housing Growth in Leeds, Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, Strategic Housing Market Assessment and the Leeds open space, sport and recreation assessment.

3.0 Main Issues

- 3.1 There is overall support for the general aspirations of SP11, T1 and T2, with 55 representations received. A number of the representations were multi stranded comments. In total 59 specific topic related comments have been identified and numbered in Appendix 1, of which 35 relate to SP11, 11 to T1, and 13 to T2.
- 3.2 Following the analysis of the consultation responses to SP11, T1 and T2 , insufficient evidence was put forward for a major change to be recommended to any of the above policies. These policies are still considered to be sound, however several minor changes are proposed as result of the consultation. These changes have been outlined in Appendix 2.

- 3.3 In addition to this a number of representors were seeking a greater level of detail on transport policies from the Core Strategy than the strategic level document is designed to provide. These have been signposted to the relevant supporting documents, principally Local Transport Plan 3.
- 3.4 SP11 - 'Transport Infrastructure and Investment Priorities'; consultation responses with regards to this policy were focussed on Public Transport and the Highway.
- Public transport responses from the surrounding district councils centred on rail, namely the electrification of the Harrogate Line and the Tram Train Link to Leeds Bradford International Airport.
 - Detailed representations were received from the Highways Agency with regard to the policies effect on the strategic road network.
- 3.5 T1 - 'Transport Management'; consultation responses with regard to this policy focussed on the Parking SPD and the Park and Ride Strategy.
- T1 was deemed unsound by a number of representors as the Parking Policy defers detailed matters to an SPD.
 - Metro and the Highways Agency provided detailed feedback on the Park and Ride Strategy.
- 3.6 T2 - 'Accessibility Requirements for New Developments'; consultation responses with regard to this policy focussed on developer contributions and the Community Infrastructure Levy and the inflexibility of the Accessibility Standards.
- A number of representations were received regarding the Community Infrastructure Levy and the negotiation of travel improvements through developer contributions. Representors outlined that obligations should be specific to the development.
 - Several representors felt that the Accessibility Standards should be modified to differentiate between main urban and other locations.
 - Concerns raised regarding the inflexibility of the Accessibility Standards with regards to Primary Health, with specific reference to the recent NHS reforms that have removed practice boundaries.

4.0 Corporate Considerations

As noted above, the Core Strategy, forms part of the Local Development Framework and once adopted will form part of the Development Plan for Leeds.

4.1 Consultation and Engagement

- 4.1.1 As outlined in this report, the Core Strategy Publication draft has been subject to a further 6 week period of consultation. This has been undertaken in accordance with the LDF Regulations and the City Council's adopted Statement of Community Involvement (SCI).

4.2 Equality and Diversity / Cohesion and Integration

- 4.2.1 An Equality Impact Assessment Screening was undertaken on the Core Strategy Publication draft, prior to consultation (see Core Strategy Executive Board Report, 10th February 2012). This concluded that equality, diversity, cohesion and integration issues had been embedded as part of the plan's preparation. For information and comment, the Screening assessment has also been made available as part of the supporting material for the Publication draft consultation. Within this overall context, it will be necessary to continue to have regard to equality and diversity issues, as part of the ongoing process of preparing the Core Strategy, including considering representations and next steps.

4.3 Council Policies and City Priorities

- 4.3.1 The Core Strategy, plays a key strategic role in taking forward the spatial and land use elements of the Vision for Leeds and the aspiration to the 'the best city in the UK'. Related to this overarching approach and in meeting a host of social, environmental and economic objectives, where relevant the Core Strategy also seeks to support and advance the implementation of a range of other key City Council and wider partnership documents. These include the Leeds Growth Strategy, the City Priority Plan, the Council Business Plan and the desire to be a 'child friendly city'.

4.4 Resources and value for money

- 4.4.1 The DPD is being prepared within the context of the LDF Regulations, statutory requirements and within existing resources.

4.5 Legal Implications, Access to Information and Call In

- 4.5.1 The DPD is being prepared within the context of the LDF Regulations and statutory requirements. The DPD is a Budgetary and Policy Framework document and as such this report is exempt from call-in by Scrutiny.

4.6 Risk Management

- 4.6.1 The Core Strategy is being prepared within the context of the LDF Regulations and the need to reflect national planning guidance. The preparation of the plan within the context of ongoing national reform to the planning system and in responding to local issues and priorities, is a challenging process. Consequently, at the appropriate time advice is sought from a number of sources, including legal advice and advice from the Planning Advisory Service and the Planning Inspectorate, as a basis to help manage risk and to keep the process moving forward.

5. Conclusions

- 5.1 There is overall support for the general aspirations of SP11, T1 and T2. There are no recommended major changes, however, some minor changes have been recommended to strengthen SP11, T1 and T2 where appropriate.
- 5.2 Ongoing consultation is required with key stakeholders such as the Highways Agency and Metro, to ensure that the impacts of SP11 are mitigated where

necessary. This will be achieved through the scheme development process and the infrastructure delivery plan. Consultation is also needed with neighbouring districts as part of both the Local Transport Plan process and adoption of the Core Strategy.

6. Recommendations

6.1 Development Plan Panel is requested to:

i). Endorse the analysis of the issues raised and any suggested Core Strategy text changes (as detailed in Appendices 1 and 2 to the report) for presentation to Executive Board for approval.

7. Background documents¹

7.1 A substantial number of documents are available representing various stages in preparation of the DPD and the background evidence base and Equalities Impact Assessment Screening. These are all available on the City Council's web site (LDF Core Strategy Pages) web pages or by contacting David Feeney on 247 4539.

¹ The background documents listed in this section are available for inspection on request for a period of four years following the date of the relevant meeting. Accordingly this list does not include documents containing exempt or confidential information, or any published works. Requests to inspect any background documents should be submitted to the report author.

Appendix 1:

Core Strategy Publication Draft - Analysis of Consultation Responses
SP11 'Transport Infrastructure and Investment Priorities'

Representor/Agent	Representor Comments	LCC Initial Response	Action (i.e. 'No change.' to the Publication draft, or 'Proposed Change' to the Publication draft)
Template Developments. Harrogate Borough Council	<u>1.Support</u> <u>1a.General</u> Support overall aspirations of SP11.	Support is welcomed.	No change.
Leeds Bradford International Airport.	Support is given to SP11(ii).	Support is welcomed.	No change.
Templegate Developments.	<u>1b. Park and Ride</u> Support put forward for the park and ride strategy specifically with regards to the Aire Valley.	Support is welcomed.	No change.
Bradford Council Highways	<u>1c. Transport Infrastructure</u> Welcomes the recognition of the importance of infrastructure to serve new development within the areas identified under SP4 specifically the Leeds Bradford Corridor.	Support is welcomed.	No change.
Aspinall Verdi	Support is given to the Leeds City Centre Emerging Transport Strategy Map 11, secondary access routes across the southern part of the city Jack Lane/ Ninevah Road and Water Lane to Whitehall Road.	Support is welcomed.	No change.

Carter Jonas (The Diocese of Ripon and Leeds, The Bramham Park Estate, Lady Elizabeth Hastings Estate Charity, Meadowside Holdings, The Ledston Estate, The Hatfield Estate, AR Briggs and Co.)	Support in principle that transport infrastructure should keep up with and support economic growth. Proposals which increase the capacity of the transport network are supported as are demand management measures.	Support is welcomed.	No change.
Harrogate Borough Council. Highways Agency Metro. Mr Brian Berry Leeds Civic Trust	<p><u>2. SP 11 General</u></p> <p>Appropriate emphasis needs to be given to the importance of public transport movements between Leeds and Harrogate, as well as recognition that the highway has reached capacity. The progression of rail and bus options is vital.</p> <p>Does SP11(iii) include the strategic road network?</p> <p>Policy strengthening required for SP11(iv) to include walking.</p> <p>There is the assumption in SP11 that climate change is man made.</p> <p>The effectiveness of SP11 has been queried, given the details provided in LTP3 and IDP, the whole section unsound.</p>	<p>The importance of the links between Leeds and Harrogate are illustrated in Map 9, and outlined in SP11(i) 'Public transport improvements for bus and rail networks to increase radial route capacity to the city.'</p> <p>Yes. See minor change.</p> <p>Walking is included in SP11(v).</p> <p>Paragraph 5.5.30 outlines the national and local position with regards to climate change and gives details of the Leeds Climate Change Strategy.</p> <p>We consider SP11 to be sound. LTP3 provides the framework for local transport planning and delivery, and considers the transport needs of people, freight and businesses, as well as the impact of the transport system on residents, communities, organisations and the natural environment. It also takes into account relevant national, regional and local policies, priorities,</p>	<p>No change to SP11, but a new section on Duty to Cooperate will be provided in the Core Strategy</p> <p>Minor Change. SP11(iii) to include 'and the strategic road network'</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Leeds Civic Trust	There is no mention of importance of retaining character with regards to highways scheme or analysis of environmental impacts.	<p>strategies and plans, including land use planning.</p> <p>The strategy is designed to improve the four key themes of the journey: Transport Assets (such as the roads, traffic lights and bus stops that make up the network), Travel Choices (helping customers make the most sustainable choice about when and how they travel), Connectivity (providing an integrated, safe, reliable transport journey) and Enhancements (improving the overall system to provide more capacity for journeys in the future).</p> <p>Highway design is too detailed to be covered in the Core Strategy. The Council's 'Street Design Guide' which reflects the national guidance set out in Manual for Streets' outlines our commitment to 'innovative designs that are appropriate for the context character and location of a site'.</p> <p>The environmental impacts associated with transport are outlined in 4.9.7 of the Core Strategy as well as in LTP3, objective 2 and proposal 5.</p>	No change.
<p>Issue</p> <p>British Waterways.</p> <p>Directors Planning.</p>	<p><u>3. A Well Connected District Maps</u></p> <p>The Towpath needs to be annotated to Map 11 to make the Core Strategy sound.</p> <p>The A660 between Leeds and Otley is not included on Map 9</p>	<p>It is not accepted that the omission of the towpath from Map 11 makes the Core Strategy unsound. However the City Centre Transport Strategy is emerging, an updated map including the tow path will be included in future publication drafts.</p> <p>The key diagram (SP11, Map 9) is a tool to give a spatial representation of the Core Strategy's Transport Policy. For the purposes of clarity all radial routes from the city centre have not been included, only those with associated improvements. New Generation Transport is the Major scheme proposal for the A660, this is detailed on this diagram</p>	<p>Minor change. Updated City Centre Transport Strategy Map to be included.</p> <p>No change.</p>
	<u>4. CIL</u>		

Directors Planning.	Infrastructure improvements that are brought forward in association with a development. These matters to be should addressed through a CIL charging schedule.	T2 (iii) refers to developer contributions and the introduction of a Community Infrastructure levy. CIL allocations have not yet been determined. Section 6.25 of the Core Strategy outlines details with regards to planning obligations and the community Infrastructure levy. The Council is currently preparing a CIL which it hopes to have adopted by 2014 at the latest.	No change.
Directors Planning.	<p><u>5. Cycling</u></p> <p>Proposed amendment to SP11(iv) to include other cycle network improvements other than the Leeds Core Cycle Network (LCCN), specifically with regards to links between Otley and Harewood</p>	<p>The LCCN Phase 1 prioritises funding for 17 radial routes to increase accessibility to Leeds City Centre. Phase 2 of this will focus on increasing local connectivity. The Otley to Harewood route is included in Phase 2. This is a longer term aspiration which is currently unfunded. T2(ii) outlines the potential for developer contributions for cycle provision</p>	No change.
Harrogate Borough Council	<p><u>6. Rail</u></p> <p>Appropriate emphasis needs to be given to electrification of the rail link between Harrogate Knaresborough and York, and the associated provision of associated rolling stock.</p> <p>Tram Train (Phase 1 and Phase 2) on the key diagram and map 9 to be combined into one 'Electrification Phase'</p>	<p>The wider issue of electrification has been addressed in the Network RUS Electrification Strategy, published in May 2009, states that 'electrify Leeds to York via Harrogate, and convert Leeds to York via Harrogate service to electric traction'. The provision of additional rolling stock is outlined in the IDP, as well as local rail network electrification schemes of which further feasibility work is required.</p> <p>The supporting documents LTP3 and the Draft Rail Plan7, give further details of Harrogate line improvements. The draft Rail Plan7 includes the aspiration to electrify the line and provide modern trains, as well as the provision of Tram-Train from Leeds to LBIA.</p> <p>The Tram Train phase 1 and phase 2 on the key diagram and map 11 reflects the aspirations of the draft Rail Plan 7.</p>	No change.

Bradford Metropolitan District Council	The key diagram should show the LBIA Tram Train Link utilising Wharfedale line via Shipley.	The draft Rail Plan7, forms part of LTP3 and is the strategy sets out West Yorkshires plans to improve rail travel for customers. The plan confirms that a future tram train link to LBIA would spur from the Harrogate Line.	No change.
Leeds Bradford International Airport.	The key diagram tram train link should be recognised as a long term proposal. In the shorter to medium term, expanding bus routes and frequency, should be the way forward.	The key diagram is a tool to give a spatial representation of the Core Strategy's Transport Policy. Broader timescales for infrastructure schemes are given in the IDP.	No change.
Gareth Brown.	Potential new stations have not been put forward as part of proposed electrification. Suggested new stations include Thorpe Park, Halton Dial, Elland Road, White Rose Centre. Support of Tram Train as the future mass public transport system for the city.	Any consideration of new stations needs to take account of the impact on existing services/capacity, together with the potential demand arising from the station. There are few locations where line capacity can be maintained without costly additional works to provide passing loops for express services. In addition, new stations within the urban area of Leeds would not provide much journey time advantage over buses or NGT.	No change.
Directors Planning.	Request to provide protection of railway lines for Otley station, where there is a long term aspiration to bring a station and railway line back.	At present there is no plan to bring Otley rail station back into use. The draft Rail Plan7, forms part of LTP3, and is the strategy that sets out West Yorkshires plans to improve rail travel for customers. The Pool to Otley disused railway is protected for use as a cycle track. This is detailed in the IDP.	No change.
Leeds Civic Trust.	<u>7. Public Transport</u> Paragraph 9.9.4 refers to 'Growth focused on city and town centres currently well served by Public Transport'. The statement is unsound especially for town centres off peak.	We consider this to be sound.	No change.
Metro.	Policy SP11(vii) includes major strategic and as well as local site mitigation infrastructure. Capacity on public transport network needs to be included as part of an assessment of	SP11(vii) covers both major and minor infrastructure. Bus and rail depots are too detailed to be covered within the Core Strategy, as schemes are developed these details can be	No change.

<p>Mr Cedric Wilks.</p> <p>Mr Brian Berry.</p>	<p>infrastructure requirements, including development sites for new bus and rail depots as well as park and ride sites.</p> <p>Policy strengthening required with regards to SP11(ix) to include transport provision for movements within the Aire Valley.</p> <p>Congestion will continue due to lack of funding for the Tramway. Examples of integrated transport include France and Germany.</p> <p>First Bus price increases have been above the rate of inflation. The use of buses to ease pressure on transport infrastructure need to be in undertaken in conjunction with fare regulation..</p>	<p>included in the IDP.</p> <p>ix) 'within' to be included.</p> <p>SP11(i) Includes public transport investments and improvements in a rapid transit system (New Generation Transport), this supersedes Leeds' aspirations for Supertram. A 'Best and Final' funding bid was submitted in September 2011. Further work is being undertaken on the business case and a final decision is anticipated mid-2012. If this is granted the scheme could be operational by 2019.</p> <p>Within the current deregulated bus market LCC have no control over the provision or cost of bus services. Metro do provide financial support for evening and Sunday services, however, budgets are limited. Metro plans to introduce a Quality Contract Scheme or Partnership that would make Metro responsible for setting routes, fares, timetables and quality standards.</p>	<p>Minor change. ix) 'within' to be included.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p><u>8. Park and Ride</u></p> <p>Concerns have been raised that the impact of Park and Ride on the network has not been thoroughly tested.</p>	<p>Leeds City Council are currently working with the Highways Agency and their consultants to access the impact of the Core Strategy on the Strategic Road Network. This work will provide a more detailed examination of the impacts than has been possible to date. The intention is to reach an agrees position on the impacts and agree appropriate mitigation where necessary.</p>	<p>No change.</p>
<p>Highways Agency</p>	<p><u>9. Highways</u></p> <p>Concerns raised regarding the operation of the M1 and M621, and the interaction with the</p>	<p>Leeds City Council are currently working with the Highways Agency and their consultants to assess</p>	<p>No change.</p>

	<p>primary road network. Concern over the lack of evidence on traffic impacts of the Core Strategy as a whole. The policy is unsound with regard to the axis of proposed development between Wakefield and Allerton Bywater, Rothwell and the Aire Valley and its affects on the M62/M1/M621. The HA will work with LCC and therefore can declare the policy sound in this respect.</p> <p>Map 11. Specific detailed comments on the emerging City Centre Transport Strategy, currently unsound.</p>	<p>the impacts of the proposed Core Strategy on the Strategic Road Network. This work will provide a more detailed examination of the impacts than has been possible to date. The intention is to reach an agreed position on the impacts and to agree appropriate mitigation where necessary.</p>	
Leeds Civic Trust.	<p>Map 9 shows the over emphasis on routes into Leeds City Centre and not in residential areas and town centres</p>	<p>Targeted highway schemes for residential areas and town centres are covered under SP11(iii).</p>	No change.
Mr Stuart Andrew.	<p>Apperley Bridge, Kirkstall Forge, and the Horsforth and Rodley roundabout schemes will only help with population growth. Given the proposed population growth in the plan, more needs to be done to outline how additional journeys will be coped with.</p>	<p>Accessibility is a key consideration when allocating new developments, so that the use of existing public transport corridors will be maximised where appropriate. The IDP provides more detail of the interventions.</p> <p>Individual developments will also be required to deliver infrastructure improvements in their immediate locality where appropriate. It is not practical to identify such interventions within the Core Strategy or Infrastructure Delivery Plan.</p> <p>In addition to this travel planning/smarter choices are likely to play a significant role in order to accommodate the level of growth envisaged in the Core Strategy.</p>	No change.
Directors Planning.	<p>It is expected that highways schemes, include the Otley link road and possibly a second</p>	<p>The East of Otley Relief Road Scheme is detailed in the IDP, and will be added to the Key Diagram.</p>	No change.

<p>ELE Northern Quadrant Consortium.</p> <p>Aspinall Verdi</p>	<p>bridge.</p> <p>Orbital Relief Road associated with ELE, appears in the Key Diagram but is not mentioned in SP11.</p> <p>Leeds City Centre Emerging Transport Strategy, Map 11, we would like to see a similar secondary access route around the back of pottery fields, bringing crown point retail park into the city. The proposal for a River Aire crossing between Criterion Place and the proposed city park should to be marked on Map 11.</p>	<p>The route is protected for a new road link between A659 and A660. Outline costs are not available, as it is likely that this scheme will be brought forward in the longer term or with associated developer funding.</p> <p>SP11(iii) highlights the importance of alleviating congestion and assisting improved connectivity for local and strategic orbital movements. The IDP includes details on East Leeds Orbital Road as part of the East Leeds Extension.</p> <p>A revised map is to be included showing a draft circulation system. The inclusion of a footbridge is too detailed for this map.</p>	<p>Minor change. East Leeds Orbital road to be added to Key Diagram.</p> <p>Minor change. Updated City Centre Transport Strategy Map to be included.</p>
<p>Leeds Civic Trust.</p> <p>Mr Brian Berry.</p> <p>Mr Keith Sharkey</p>	<p><u>10. Demand Management</u></p> <p>There is no reference to demand management, and/ or greater control of parking.</p> <p>The Transportation Strategy needs to look at parking spaces and widening roads that experience a lot of congestion at peak times</p> <p>Lack of commitment to address transport infrastructure and congestion by locality.</p>	<p>Demand management and parking control is covered in Policy T1 and cross referenced in SP11.</p> <p>The Councils Parking Strategy is outlined in T2. The Parking SPD will provide further details of this strategy.</p> <p>Road widening is not always a desired or viable option in terms of reducing congestion. SP11(iii) provides for targeted highway schemes to reduce congestion.</p> <p>SP11 is intended to give an overview of spatial priorities across the district. The IDP gives details of schemes both district wide and by area.</p>	<p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p> <p>No change.</p>

Policy No. T1 'Transport Management'

Representor/Agent	Representor Comments	LCC Initial Response	Action (i.e. ' <u>no change</u> ' to the Publication draft, or ' <u>Proposed Change</u> ' to the Publication draft)
<p>Morley Town Council.</p> <p>Carter Jonas, Meadow Holdings LTD, The Hatfield Estate, AR briggs and Co, The Diocese of Ripon and Leeds, The Bramham Park Estate, The Ledston Estate, Lady Elizabeth Hastings Estate.</p> <p>White Young Green Planning, Leeds Trinity University.</p> <p>Highways Agency.</p>	<p><u>1. Support</u></p> <p>Support for the Parking Strategy T1 (iii).</p> <p>Safe and efficient movement of people, goods and services, is fundamental to the sustained economic growth and wellbeing , measures which enhance and increase the capacity of local transport infrastructure are supported.</p> <p>Support is given to the principle of the Council providing support to encourage and incentivise sustainable travel choices.</p> <p>Supports is given to the proposed policy and will make practical contributions to the Influencing travel behaviour.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Support is welcomed.</p>	<p>No Change.</p> <p>No Change.</p> <p>No Change.</p> <p>No Change.</p>
	<p><u>2. Parking Policies</u></p> <p><u>2a. Parking SPD</u></p>		

Home Builders Federation, White Young Green Planning.	This policy is unsound as it defers detailed matters that may have cost implications to a Parking SPD.	Parking standards are too detailed to be contained within the Core Strategy. The parking standards will be expressed in the SPD as a maxima. The parking SPD is due for consultation in Autumn 2012, and will be published concurrently with the Core Strategy submission	No Change
Highways Agency, Metro.	<u>2b. Consultation Request</u> Request for consultation on Parking SPD	The Parking SPD is due to go out to formal consultation in Autumn 2012.	No Change
Mr Raymond Brooke.	<u>2c. Car parking concerns in locality</u> Car parking concerns in Garforth.	T1 sets out the broad strategy for parking policies across the city, with further details to be outlined in the Parking SPD. The Town and District Car Parking Strategies form part of this SPD. The Garforth Parking Strategy was approved in May 2012, and now forms a framework for future management of parking in the town centre.	No Change.
Metro.	<u>3. Park and Ride</u> Policy strengthening required with regards to Park and Ride iii(b). The policy should include the requirement for bus priority measures and consideration of revenue support implications.	It is not the role of the Core Strategy to specify in detail the components of specific interventions. It provides a broad policy which includes the measures to be taken forward. Specific scheme development will be undertaken in cooperation with Metro.	No change.
Metro.	<u>4. Demand Management</u> This policy does not have any reference to demand management as referenced in the LTP3. The Transport for Leeds work as outlined in the LTP should be incorporated.	While the actual phrase 'demand management' is not used, policy T1 contains the elements that are normally referred to as demand management. A cross reference to the LTP3 will be included.	Minor change - cross reference to LTP3 Proposal 11.
Mr Cedric Wilks.	A65 Guiseley requires traffic management due to traffic problems.	There is not a specific highway scheme intervention listed for the A65 within Guiseley. However improvements within the Northwest Area of Leeds include, A65 Quality Bus Scheme, Horsforth Roundabout Improvements, within the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. T2 also highlights the importance of Information, Sustainable Travel Proposals and Parking Policies in managing congestion.	No change
	<u>5. Rail</u>		

Banks Development.	Support for the proposal to site railway stations within Leeds, with the recommendation that consideration also be given to the reintroduction at Mickletown.	<p>SP11 refers to support for new rail stations where appropriate. Any consideration of new stations needs to take account of the impact on existing services/capacity, together with the potential demand arising from the station. There are few locations where line capacity can be maintained without costly additional works to provide passing loops for express services. In addition, new stations within the urban area of Leeds would not provide much journey time advantage over buses or NGT.</p> <p>Draft Rail Plan7, forms part of LTP3 and is the strategy sets out West Yorkshire's plans to improve rail travel for customers and what we want to achieve. The reintroduction of a railway station at Mickeltown is not being considered as part of this plan.</p>	No change.
--------------------	---	---	------------

Policy No. T2 Accessibility Requirements for New Developments'

Representor/Agent	Representor Comments	LCC Initial Response	Action (i.e. ' <u>no change</u> ' to the Publication draft, or ' <u>Proposed Change</u> ' to the Publication draft)
<p>British Waterways, Mr Raymond Brook, Hammerson UK.</p> <p>Carter Jonas, The Bramham Park Estate, Lady Elizabeth Hastings Estate Charity, The Hatfeild Estate, Meadowside Holdings Ltd, The Diocese of Ripon and</p>	<p><u>1. Support</u></p> <p>General support for Policy T2.</p> <p>Support the principle that development proposals should come forward in locations which are accessible or can be made accessible by a choice of transport modes.</p>	<p>Support is welcomed.</p> <p>Support is welcomed.</p>	<p>No Change.</p> <p>No Change.</p>

Leeds, The Ledston Estate, AR Briggs and Co.			
Highways Agency, Metro.	<p><u>2. Developer Contributions – Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). T2(ii)</u></p> <p>Stakeholders should be partner to any future discussion on CIL and the allocation of CIL funds.</p>	<p>Section 6.25 of the Core Strategy outlines details with regards to planning obligations and the community Infrastructure levy. The Council is currently preparing a CIL which it hopes to have adopted by 2014 at the latest. The timescales for the adoption of CIL are not yet available but it is anticipated that consultation will take place with key partners as part of this process.</p>	No Change.
Home Builders Federation.	<p>Concern raised regarding the mandatory provision for travel Improvements through developer contributions from major developments.</p>	<p>Details of planning obligations and CIL process are as above. The criterion for development contributions are not mandatory. T2(ii) does not refers to major development but to developments in general. Policy T2 (ii) states that developer contributions may be required and will be secured where appropriate through section 106 agreements/ and or CIL'.</p>	No Change.
British Library.	<p>Concern raised regarding the negotiation of travel improvements through developer contributions, and that obligations are specific to the proposal in question.</p>	<p>CIL allocations have not been determined. Details of planning obligations and CIL process are as above</p>	No Change.
British Waterways.	<p>Where appropriate planning obligations secured from the development of sites within the canal corridor should be framed positively to benefit canal infrastructure.</p>	<p>T2 (ii) refers to improvements to transport provision.</p>	No Change.
Harrow Estates Via White Young Green planning.	<p><u>3. Accessibility Standards</u></p> <p><u>3a. Inflexibility/ Settlement Hierarchy</u> Paragraph 5.4.3 states that Accessibility Standards have been based on a RSS base. However they take no account of the settlement hierarchy. More onerous standards applied in the MUA should reduce to more appropriate standards for smaller settlements. The standards lack flexibility.</p>	<p>The Accessibility Standards have been developed to define the minimum standards that a new development will need to meet. The standards are set to ensure that all new developments occur in sustainable locations which are accessible to a range of key destinations.</p>	No Change

Hammerson UK.	The policy should allow flexibility for developments which accord with the principle with the Spatial Development Strategy and Spatial Policies. T2 should allow for exceptions to the criteria on a case by case basis.	As above.	No Change
McGregor Brothers Ltd.	Concerns raised regarding the inflexibility of the Accessibility Standards with regards to Primary Health, with specific reference to the recent NHS reforms that have removed practice boundaries.	It is accepted that patients may use public transport to access primary health care facilities. The accessibility standards will be modified to include 'within a 20 minute walk or a 5 minute walk to a bus stop offering a direct service at a 15 min frequency'.	Minor change 'or a 5 minute walk to a bus stop offering a direct service at a 15 min frequency'
Highways Agency.	<u>3b. Travel to Work Time</u> Travel to work time in the accessibility standards is ambitious, 30 mins for the main urban area (MUA) and 40 mins to employment in major settlements. Bus timetable indicate that journeys from some outer parts of the MUA into the city centre are in excess of 40 mins.	The travel to work times in the accessibility standards for the MUA and extensions to it refer to 'the population within a 30 min journey time to employment.' This stated journey time is not to the city centre, but to employment areas within the MUA.	No Change.
Metro.	<u>3c. LTP3 Alignment</u> The Accessibility Standards need to be aligned more closely with LTP3 and the use of Public Transport Accessibility Levels (PTAL) as well as accession assessments.	The Accessibility Standards have been developed to define the minimum standards that a new development will need to meet in order to ensure that development occurs in sustainable locations. PTAL is not sufficiently developed to replace the accessibility standards at this current time. It is also less transparent which is a significant drawback.	No Change.
Leeds Residential Property Forum	<u>4. T2(v) Parking Provision</u> Concern regarding the inclusion of this provision. Car parking standards should be expressed as a maxima not minima and should not discourage HMO accommodation.	Parking Standards will be expressed in the Parking SPD as a maxima. The Parking SPD is due for public consultation shortly, and will be published concurrently with the Core Strategy consultation responses.	No change.
Mr Raymond Brooke.	<u>5. Maintenance of Cyclepaths and Footways</u> Concerns regarding funding for ongoing maintenance as a result of provision from T2.	Maintenance is not covered in the Core Strategy. The LTP3 sets out further details with regards to maintenance of Cyclepaths and Footways.	No Change.

Appendix 2:

SPATIAL POLICY 11: TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENT PRIORITIES

The delivery of an integrated transport strategy for Leeds will be supported, which includes a range of infrastructure improvements and other interventions in accordance with the objectives of West Yorkshire Local Transport Plan 3 and the Leeds City Region Transport Strategy (2009). The Infrastructure Delivery Plan and the Key Diagram give further details of the scope of these improvements/interventions. These infrastructure improvements/interventions are also supported by the demand management measures outlined in Policy T1.

Spatial Priorities

- (i) Public transport improvements for the bus and rail networks (including supporting the role of Leeds City Station, enhancing Leeds' role as a regional transport hub, and new rail stations where appropriate) and investment in a rapid transit system to increase radial route capacity to the city and town centres and to improve reliability together with investment in the provision of Park and Ride facilities;
- (ii) Surface access improvements to support growth of Leeds Bradford International Airport (see also Spatial Policy 12);
- (iii) Targeted highway schemes to alleviate congestion and assist improved connectivity for local and strategic orbital movements, *and the strategic road network*;
- (iv) Expansion of the Leeds Core Cycle Network to improve local connectivity;
- (v) Improved facilities for pedestrians to promote safety and accessibility, particularly connectivity between the 'Rim' and the City Centre;
- (vi) Measures to deliver safer roads;
- (vii) The provision of infrastructure to serve new development (including within regeneration areas defined in Spatial Policy 4 and urban extensions);
- (viii) Supporting the development of infrastructure for new low carbon technologies;
- (ix) Transport improvements to connect to and from *and within* the Aire Valley Leeds development area (see Spatial Policy 5);
- (x) Supporting High Speed Rail as a longer term intervention to serve Leeds and the wider City Region by providing a substantial enhancement to inter-city connectivity.
- (xi) Provision for people with impaired mobility to improve accessibility

Routes designated in the emerging transport strategy or programmed works will be protected from development. Current proposals are identified on the Key Diagram, the Leeds Transport Strategy map (Map 9) and saved UDP Policies.

POLICY T1: TRANSPORT MANAGEMENT

To complement the provision of new infrastructure *and Proposal 11 of the Local Transport Plan*, the Council will support the following management priorities:

- (i) Develop and provide tailored, interactive, readily available information and support that encourages and incentivises more sustainable travel choices on a regular basis.
- (ii) Sustainable travel proposals including travel planning measures for employers and schools. Further details are provided in the Travel Plan SPD and the Sustainable Education Travel Strategy.
- (iii) Parking policies controlling the use and supply of car parking across the city:
 - a) To ensure adequate parking for shoppers and visitors to support the health and vitality of the city and town centres.
 - b) Delivering strategic park and ride for the city which supports the City Centre vision and provides greater traveller choice.
 - c) To support wider transport strategy objectives for sustainable travel and to minimise congestion during peak periods.
 - d) Limiting the supply of commuter parking in areas of high public transport accessibility, such as the City Centre.

Further details will be provided in the Parking Policy SPD.

POLICY T2: ACCESSIBILITY REQUIREMENTS AND NEW DEVELOPMENT

New development should be located in accessible locations that are adequately served by existing or programmed highways, by public transport and with safe and secure access for pedestrians, cyclists and people with impaired mobility:

- (i) In locations where development is otherwise considered acceptable new infrastructure may be required on/off site to ensure that there is adequate provision for access from the highway network, by public transport and for cyclists, pedestrians and people with impaired mobility, which will not create or materially add to problems of safety, environment or efficiency on the highway network.
- (ii) Developer contributions may be required for, or towards, improvements to the off site highway and the strategic road network, and to pedestrian, cycle, and public transport provision. These will be secured where appropriate through Section 106 Agreements and/or the Community Infrastructure Levy, and by planning conditions.
- (iii) Significant trip generating sites will need to provide Transport Assessments/ Transport Statements in accordance with national guidance.
- (iv) Travel plans will be required to accompany planning applications in accordance with national thresholds and the Travel Plans SPD.
- (v) Parking provision will be required for cars, motorcycles and cycles in accordance with current guidelines.

See Appendix 2 for the specific accessibility standards to be used across Leeds.

ACCESSIBILITY STANDARDS

The Tables below show the accessibility standards for the principal development types in relation to the whole of the Core Strategy, and in particular to Policy T2, 'Accessibility Requirements and New Development'.

Table 1 - Accessibility Standards and Indicators for Employment and Social Infrastructure Uses

	Employment	Primary Health / Education	Secondary Health / Education	Leisure and Retail
Leeds Main Urban Area, major settlements, extensions to the Leeds MUA, and extensions to major settlements	Accessibility Standards			
	Offices to be located within 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange. Industrial and distribution / warehousing development to be located within 10 min walk of a bus stop.	Located within a 5 min walk of bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency*.	Located within 5 min walk of a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange. In major settlement extensions, within 5 min walk of a bus stop / 10 min walk to a rail station and should ensure that arrival and departure of public transport services coincide with visiting hours / start and finish times.	Within 5 min walk of a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange.
	Accessibility Indicators			
	In MUA and extensions to it, population within 30 min journey time. In extensions to major settlements, population within 40 min journey time.	In MUA, population within 20 min journey time. In extensions, population within 30 min journey time plus population within 20 min walk in major settlement extensions.	In MUA, population within 40 min journey time. In extensions, population within 60 min journey time.	Population within 30 min journey time.
Smaller settlements	Accessibility Standards			

and other rural areas	Within 5 min walk of a bus stop/ 10 min walk of a rail station. Ensure that arrival and departure of services coincide with work start and finish times.	Located within 10 min walk of a bus stop/ rail station. Ensure that arrival and departure of services coincide with appointments / start and finish times of schools.	Located within 10 min walk of a bus stop/ rail station. Ensure that arrival and departure of services coincide with visiting hours / start and finish times.	Located within 5 min walk of a bus stop offering 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange.
	Accessibility Indicators			
	Population within 30 min journey time	Population within 40 min journey time.	Population within 60 min journey time.	Population within 30 min journey time.

Table 2 - Accessibility Standards for Housing Developments in Leeds (5 dwellings or more)

	To Local Services	To Employment	To Primary Health / Education	To Secondary Education	To Town Centres/ City Centre
5 or more dwellings in all areas of Leeds District	Accessibility Standards				
	In MUA and extensions to it, within a 10 min walk. Elsewhere, within 15 min walk.	Within 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange.	Within a 20 min walk <i>or a 5 minute walk to a bus stop offering a direct service at a 15 min frequency.</i>	Within a 30 min direct walk or 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a 15 min service frequency* to a major public transport interchange.	Within a 5 min walk to a bus stop offering a direct 15 min frequency service*.
	Accessibility Indicators				
	In MUA and extensions to it, number/ size of facilities within 10 min walk. Elsewhere, within 15 min walk.	In MUA and extensions to it, number/size of facilities within 30 min journey time. Elsewhere, within 40 min journey time.	Number/size of facilities within 20 min walk.	Number/size of facilities within 30 min journey time.	Number/size of facilities within 30 min journey time.

Notes: Local services are defined as: small convenience shops, grocers, post offices, newsagents etc., Major public transport interchanges are defined as: the city centres of Leeds, Bradford and Wakefield, Walk times are based on a speed of 3 mph., All bus and rail frequencies relate to weekday daytime service levels.

* Or, where appropriate, 10 min walk to a rail station offering a 30 min frequency service.