



Lancaster Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan Examination in Public: Hearing Statement

Matter 4: Transport

On behalf of Taylor Wimpey UK Limited
September 2022

CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION.....	1
2	TRANSPORT	2

Prepared By: Paul Nellist

Aster Planning LLP, Mynshulls House, 14 Cateaton Street, Manchester, M3 1SQ

Version Final

Date: September 2022

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 Asteer Planning LLP ('Asteer') has been instructed by Taylor Wimpey UK Limited ('Taylor Wimpey') to prepare this Hearing Statement in relation to the Lancaster Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan ('CCLPR') Examination in Public ('EiP') and the Matters, Issues and Questions ('MIQs') posed by the Inspector.
- 1.2 Taylor Wimpey has submitted representations to each stage of consultation on the Climate Emergency Review of the Local Plan. This statement, like the representations submitted to date, is made in the context of Taylor Wimpey's interest in the North Lancaster Strategic Site, which is allocated for residential-led development in the Lancaster Local Plan (Strategic Policies and Land Allocations DPD - adopted July 2020) under Policy SG9.
- 1.3 This Statement responds directly to the Inspector's MIQs in relation to Matter 4 'Transport'.
- 1.4 Taylor Wimpey is also part of a consortium of housebuilders/developers who have engaged Cushman and Wakefield ('C&W') to prepare a separate hearing statement relating to Matter 8. This statement refers, where necessary to C&W's Matter 8 hearing statement.
- 1.5 Separate statements have been prepared in respect of the following matters and should be read in conjunction with this Statement:
 - **Matter 3** 'Sustainable Design, Energy Efficiency and Renewable Energy';
 - **Matter 6** 'Water Management';
 - **Matter 7** 'Green and Blue Infrastructure'; and
 - **Matter 8** 'Viability and Finance'.

2 TRANSPORT

Q4.1 - Is Policy T2 as drafted sufficiently flexible to allow for different circumstances?

- 2.1 The proposed amendments to the policy sub-text ('New paragraph 11') state that:
- 2.2 "Cycle and walking paths should, wherever possible, be segregated. This should be done in accordance with the guidance set out within LTN1/20 (Section 6). In the first instance this is segregation from general traffic and secondly LTN 1/20 promotes segregation between cyclists and walkers in order to minimise conflict between users. At locations with slower cycle speeds, shared spaces may be appropriate. Cycle and walking paths should, where applicable, also be designed and improved to ensure they are usable by all, including those with disabilities. (See Section 6 of LTN 1/20). Similarly, supporting infrastructure such as signalised crossings should be appropriately designed for those with physical impairments."
- 2.3 Taylor Wimpey supports the phrase "wherever possible" in this context as it acknowledges that segregated cycle and walking paths cannot be provided in all instances. However, Taylor Wimpey would not support an indiscriminate policy requirement to provide segregated cycle and walking paths. Any measures regarding cycling and walking should be agreed on an application-by-application basis.
- 2.4 In response to Taylor Wimpey's Regulation 18 representations, the City Council stated that:
- 2.5 *"The DfTs intention is for Local Authorities to adopt LTN1/20 as standards. We can adopt the cycle parking standards but on highways related elements we anticipate their adoption by the Highways Authority. Policy T2 only has ref to LTN1/20 in terms of supporting people with disabilities. No change required."*
- 2.6 Taylor Wimpey has provided further comments on the status of LTN1/20 in response to Q4.17 below relating to Policy DM61. The same comments apply to Policy T2.

Q4.4 - Are the requirements of Policy T4 in respect of provision of new services and enhancement of existing services deliverable?

- 2.7 As proposed, Policy T4 requires that,

"Where there are deficiencies in existing services, developers will be required to fund the provision of such new services or enhanced existing services, as necessary".

- 2.8 However, it is not possible in all cases of a current deficiency, to provide new or enhanced services. This often requires public transport operators to be supportive of, and willing/able to provide additional services. In our experience, a lack of willingness/ability from such providers renders new services unimplementable, even with willing developers, local planning authorities and highways authorities. Consequently, Taylor Wimpey considers that Policy T4, as currently worded, is **not effective**.
- 2.9 It is Taylor Wimpey's view that a bespoke package of sustainable measures should be developed on a site-by-site basis, rather than setting out a 'one-size-fits-all' approach, and that the wording of the policy should omit reference to the specific requirements of public transport provision.

Q4.8 - Is the definition of a 400m walking distance soundly based in Policy T4?

- 2.10 The supporting text ('New paragraph 14') of Policy T4 sets out that public transport services should be within a reasonable safe walking distance and that "a reasonable, safe walking distance is considered to be 400m". The IHT document 'Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments' refers to maximum walking distances but confirms that, regarding bus stop locations, "direct and simple bus routes are more important than walking distances a little more than 400m". Furthermore, paragraph 6.22 of the IHT Guidelines advises that the optimum spacing of bus stops in urban areas should normally be in the range 300-400m, but advises further that "wider spacing between stops will normally acceptable in rural or semi-rural areas." Therefore, there are instances where distances in excess of 400m should be considered acceptable and it is recommended that explicit reference to 400m within the wording is omitted.

4.12 Are the policies and supporting text of the Plans consistent in how accessibility is referred to?

- 2.11 The term 'accessibility', appears to be used inconsistently in places within the policies and supporting text of the Plans. For example, Policy DM2 refers to 'Space and Accessibility', but is really just concerned with space standards. There are also a few instances where accessibility is clearly used to mean 'access by sustainable modes', (e.g. within the new Paragraph inserted after 14.21). The Council should review the plans for consistency. For example, where the CCLPR refers to sustainable modes of transport, it should be explicit in this rather than simply using 'accessibility', which can in certain circumstances include access by vehicles'.

Q4.13 - Does Policy DM31's supporting text represent a reasonable approach to addressing air pollution? Should references to the Environment Bill in the supporting text to Policy DM31 refer to the Act?

- 2.12 Taylor Wimpey acknowledges the amendments proposed to the supporting text of Policy DM31 ('New Paragraph 34' and 'New Paragraph 35'). The Lancaster District Air Quality Action Plan ('LDAQAP') has not yet been published so it is difficult to assess whether Policy DM31 and its subtext (particular the policy wording that states 'Proposals should contribute towards delivering the actions detailed within the Lancaster District Air Quality Action Plan, once in place') represent a reasonable approach to addressing air pollution.
- 2.13 In this context, Policy DM31 should include a robust and flexible mechanism whereby these additional requirements and/or other requirements (such as affordable housing or other developer contributions) can be relaxed if viability is threatened. In this context, Taylor Wimpey acknowledges Policy DM58, which includes a proposed mechanism for relaxing requirements where viability is threatened. However, for clarity and consistency, there should be specific reference to the relaxing of requirements on viability grounds either in Policy DM31 or its sub-text.
- 2.14 Regarding the proposed 'New Paragraph 35' in the supporting text to Policy DM31, Taylor Wimpey notes the inclusion of the consideration of the WHO Air Quality Standards alongside the national guidelines. At present, the WHO guidelines are not considered within the Air Quality Standards Regulations (2016) and are not UK and EU legislation. As such, it is Taylor Wimpey's understanding that Air Quality objectives outlined within Air Quality Standards Regulations (2016) for NO₂, PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5} will apply, until there are any legislative changes.

Q4.17 - What status does Local Transport Note 1/20 have? Will there be flexibility in applying this document?

- 2.15 Taylor Wimpey notes that reference to LTN 1/20 has now been included within Policy DM61.
- 2.16 It is Taylor Wimpey's understanding that LTN1/20 is very much set up as guidance and best practice rather than true standards. Therefore, there should be flexibility in applying this, particularly considering the topographical constraints of sites such as the North Lancaster Strategic Site. Any measures regarding cycling and walking should be agreed on an application-by-application basis.

- 2.17 However, it is understood that LTN 1/20 includes guidance, as opposed to standards. Therefore, Taylor Wimpey seeks confirmation from the Council that there would be flexibility in applying this.

Q4.20 - Is Policy DM62 positively prepared, justified, effective, and consistent with national policy?

- 2.18 Taylor Wimpey notes that reference to LTN 1/20 has now been included within Policy DM62. As set out in Taylor Wimpey's response to Question 4.20 above, Taylor Wimpey seeks confirmation from the Council that there will be flexibility in applying this, particularly considering the topographical constraints of sites such as the North Lancaster Strategic Site. Without such flexibility, the Policy is at risk of **not being effective**.
- 2.19 Taylor Wimpey has no significant objection to the proposed amendments to Policy DM62. However, where additional policy requirements introduced by the Climate Change Emergency Review of the Local Plan seeks to introduce additional policy requirements that could threaten the viability and/or delivery of housing, there must be a robust and flexible mechanism whereby these additional requirements and/or other requirements (such as affordable housing or other developer contributions) can be relaxed if viability is threatened.
- 2.20 In this context, Taylor Wimpey acknowledges Policy DM58, which includes a proposed mechanism for relaxing requirements where viability is threatened. However, for clarity and consistency, there should be a specific reference to the relaxing of requirements on viability grounds either in Policy DM62 or its sub-text. Without such flexibility, the Policy is at risk of **not being effective**.
- 2.21 Taylor Wimpey notes the text regarding 'Electric Vehicle Charging Points' that has been added to Policy DM62. Taylor Wimpey has no objection to the requirements stated. However, Taylor Wimpey seeks clarification from the Council as to the specification that will be required for charging points as this could have an impact on viability or electricity network capability.

Q4.21 - Does Policy DM62's coverage of electric vehicle charging overlap with Part S of Building Regulations?

- 2.22 There does appear to be some overlap between Policy DM62 and the Building Regulations. The Council will need to make sure that what is being proposed in the Policy is consistent with the Building Regulations.

Q4.22 - Is there sufficient certainty about which applications the electric vehicle requirements in Policy DM62 would be applied to?

- 2.23 There is not sufficient certainty about which applications the electric vehicle requirements in Policy DM62 would be applied to. Whilst point 1 clearly applies to residential development, Point 2 refers to *'20% of communal parking spaces to be provided with standalone chargers. Ducting/cabling/supply capacity must also be provided/ensured for all parking spaces'*. It is not clear to which type of developments this applies and the Policy wording should clarify this.

Q4.25 - Are the requirements for covered and secure cycle parking in Appendix E of the Part 2 Plan reasonable?

- 2.24 Appendix E of the Part 2 plan requires covered and secure cycle parking spaces, which appears somewhat inconsistent with Table 11-1 on page 134 of LTN 1/20 (referred to in several places within the CCLPR) which refers to 'secure and ideally covered' spaces.

Q4.26 - Is Policy DM64 effective?

- 2.25 Taylor Wimpey notes that the final paragraph of Policy DM64, as adopted and proposed, states that:

"Schemes that seek to address the above issues will form important elements of the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) and will be critical to the delivery of major development sites. These are addressed in more detail within Policies SG3, SG8 and SG10 of this DPD."

- 2.26 In this context, Taylor Wimpey notes that Policy SG10 relates to the North Lancaster Strategic Site and its Infrastructure Requirements. Whilst no amendments are proposed to Policy SG10 in the CCLPR, the Council's CCLPRVA produced by 3D and the Council's updated Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Schedule ('IDS') have implications for the associated costs of infrastructure required by Policy SG10. Further comments on this are provided in Taylor Wimpey's Matter 8 hearing statement.