

Consultation Statement

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012¹ require a local planning authority, before adopting a supplementary planning document ("SPD"), to prepare a statement setting out:-
- the persons it consulted when preparing the SPD;
 - a summary of the main issues raised by those persons; and
 - how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.
- 1.2 The authority is required to make copies of this statement available as part of the process of seeking representations on the draft SPD.

2. The Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document (SPD)

- 2.1 Exeter City Council is preparing its Local Development Framework (LDF) in accordance with the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended) and the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). The LDF is a set of Development Plan Documents (DPDs) and SPDs which provide the spatial strategy for Exeter. Details of the documents and the programme for preparation are set out in the Local Development Scheme (LDS), originally approved by the Council in 2007 and updated in June 2012. This includes the Core Strategy, adopted on 21 February 2012, and a Site Allocations and Development Management DPD which is in the course of preparation.
- 2.2 The NPPF advises that a planning authority may prepare SPDs to help applicants make successful applications or aid infrastructure delivery.
- 2.3 The Exeter Local Plan First Review 1995-2011 was formally adopted by Exeter City Council on 31 March 2005. The Council has 'saved' most of the policies of the Local Plan until the document is replaced by the LDF. Together with the Core Strategy, the saved policies in the Local Plan form the statutory land use planning framework for Exeter City, and contain policies to determine planning applications and proposals for specific land uses.
- 2.4 The LDS introduced a proposed Sustainable Transport SPD, and summarised its role and content as being to clarify and amplify Local Plan policy relating to the provision of sustainable transport. Its scope was described as follows:-
- "Identify sustainable transport as including walking, cycling, bus (including park and ride) rail and car clubs.
 - Identify the types of development to which sustainable transport policy will apply.
 - Demonstrate the need for development to provide sustainable transport infrastructure, encourage its use and/or make contributions.

¹ SI 2012 no. 767, regulation 12: <http://www.legislation.gov.uk/uksi/2012/767/contents/made>.

- Provide detail of what the Council will expect to secure in terms of infrastructure and contributions from qualifying developments.
- Refer to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan and provide detailed arrangements for the provision of infrastructure with reference to the Residential Design Guide SPD and masterplans.
- Identify funding mechanisms and timetable for delivery.
- Refer to and amplify Developers Contributions/Infrastructure Delivery SPD.”

3. The Consultation Process

3.1 The consultation process has been undertaken in two stages:-

- Phase 1 – an informal consultation within Exeter City Council, and with relevant officers at Devon County Council as local highway and transport authority. This included a number of meetings. This exercise informed preparation of a draft which was then approved by the Council’s Executive on 2 October 2012 for public consultation.
- Phase 2 – formal public consultation in accordance with the Regulations, for a period exceeding the four weeks required, and ending on 7 December 2012.

3.2 In addition, as part of the screening process as to whether a Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) was necessary (under the EU SEA Directive and UK SEA Regulations), the statutory “consultation bodies” namely the Environment Agency, Natural England and English Heritage were consulted. Of these, only Natural England offered detailed comments, agreeing with the Council’s conclusion that SEA was not required.

3.3 The table in Appendix 1 sets out the comments received during Phase 1, and the Council’s response.

3.4 As Phase 2 of the consultation, notice was sent to almost 1000 organisations and individuals, most of whom were on the Council’s consultation database, plus a selection of other people and groups with whom the Council has dealings in relation to transport issues.

3.5 24 responses were received, ranging from comments on a single issue, to a more comprehensive response to the document as a whole. Appendix 2 comprises a table of comments received, and the Council’s response, and Appendix 3 is a revised draft showing textual amendments made as a result of the consultation.

3.6 Many of the comments were detailed and constructive, which explains the large number of minor amendments made to the document.

Exeter City Council
12 March 2013

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SPD CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX 1 – PHASE 1 CONSULTATION

Respondents:-

EH = ECC Environmental Health

EQ = ECC Policy (Equalities)

CD = ECC City Development (Planning)

DCC = DCC composite response

TCS = DCC Transport Co-ordination Service

LST = DCC Local Sustainable Transport Team (mainly cycling)

TP = DCC Transport Planning (mainly travel plans)

Park = DCC Parking

Chpt/para (old)	Respondent	Comment	Response
All	EH	All OK	Response welcomed.
All	CD	Structure jumps around – deal with broader issues, then site layout, then on-site provision.	A different structure is being adopted which is explained in section 1.2.
All	CD	Correct references to Residential Design SPD (not Guide)	Done throughout.
All	DCC	Does document contain anything new? If simply pulls existing policy into one place, this could be achieved by web page with links.	Yes it does. For example, the RD SPD has no equivalent policy document applying to non-residential development. However, the revised structure is intended to provide more of a comprehensive checklist of existing and new material.
All	TCS	Need to make clear that “public transport” includes potential demand responsive transport, community	For community transport see 1.3.2, 4.1.3, and 9.2.6. For car clubs see Chapter 11.

		sector, etc.	Other forms of demand responsive transport are unlikely to occur in an urban area such as Exeter.
2	DCC	Scope for removing content (eg. re parking standards) that is repeated in Chapter 4.	Done.
2.1.4	CD	Need to point out that failure to achieve sustainable travel in new development areas will potentially impact on Air Quality Management Area.	Agreed. Now in 3.1.4.
2.1.5, 2.1.6	CD	Refer also to CP15, 16, 17 and 19.	Agreed. See 3.1.5, 3.1.8 and footnotes.
2.2	DCC	Remove references to Local Plan as partly superseded by Core Strategy.	This SPD will pre-date the emerging Site Allocations & Development Management DPD. In the meantime, the majority of the Local Plan is saved and remains current Development Plan policy. References (now in 3.2) have however been slimmed down.
2.2.2	DCC	Sustainable transport hierarchy no longer strictly applicable – some sites may be more appropriate for investment in public transport than, say, cycling.	Agreed. This paragraph removed, and document follows NPPF approach of prioritising sustainable transport modes.
2.2.6	CD	Consider new Govt policy on parking standards.	Agreed. See 6.1.1.
2.3	TCS	Exeter Vision needs to include integrated transport.	This document simply quotes the Vision as it currently exists (now at 3.3). The point is one for consideration as part of a review of the Vision.
2.4.1	CD	Include key requirements of RD SPD.	Bullet points included in 3.5.2. Many other points are cross-referenced throughout the document.
2.7	DCC	LTP section could be strengthened. Refer to Exeter priorities rather than Devon-wide objectives, also	Agreed. See 3.9.

		successes in achieving higher than national average levels of travel by sustainable modes.	
2.8	DCC	Include reference to Bus Strategy.	Agreed. See 3.10.1.
3	DCC	Rename “National Policy & Guidance” and place before Chapter 2. Include reference to Manual for Streets.	Renamed “National Planning Context” and now forms Chapter 2. Reference to Manual for Streets included at 2.4.
3.6.1	CD	Design & Access statements - cross-reference to equivalent provisions in RD SPD.	Agreed. See 2.5.3
4	DCC	Slim down RD SPD content, and remove references to Local Plan.	Repetition of RD SPD reduced. Local Plan still relevant (see response to 2.2).
4.3 and elsewhere	DCC	Public transport needs equal exposure to that given to walking and cycling. More emphasis needed on measures to influence travel behaviour.	Public transport is now covered in Chapters 4, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 12 and is considered to have equal exposure. Chapter 8 on travel plans has been significantly expanded following discussion with DCC’s relevant officer.
4.3.7	LST	Amendments to reflect local factors influencing cycle parking standards.	Agreed. See 5.1.1.
4.3.8 & Table 1	CD	Visitor/customer numbers for retail insufficient.	Survey work has since been carried out, which did not support an increase.
		Student visitor parking requirement not realistic for HMOs.	Table does not include a specific requirement for HMOs.
	LST	Clarify that cycle parking standards are minimum standards. Set context by referring to investment leading to higher levels of cycling.	Agreed. See 5.1.1 and 5.1.3.
		Various comments on specific figures; acknowledged that approach must be evidence-based.	Survey work has since been done, particularly in relation to workplaces and shops. Requirement per FTE has been increased as a result of the data obtained.

	DCC	Cycle parking standards: support use of FTEs but care needed on mixed use sites; need to estimate overall requirement for city centre relative to floorspace proposals in Core Strategy, as a reality check.	The city centre data was the least conclusive, given that it is impossible to verify the destination of cyclists using the parking. See above for how data has enabled requirements to be refined.
4.3.9	CD	Include requirement for staff cycle parking to be within curtilage and/or secure structures (currently in 4.4.2).	Agreed. Staff cycle parking now has its own paragraph, 5.3.1.
4.3.10	CD /LST	Cross-refer to DCC cycle parking design guidance.	Agreed. 5.2.1, 5.3.1 and 5.4.1 all now refer.
4.3.12	DCC	Car parking standards: policy objective is to reduce car use rather than car ownership.	Agreed. See 1.3.3 and 6.1.1.
		Concern that restricting parking spaces causes parking on footways etc.	Agreed. See 6.1.1.
	CD /Park	Consider new Govt policy on parking standards. Current standards should be made “indicative”.	Agreed. See 6.1.1 and 6.2.1.
4.3.16	ECC	Strengthen last sentence on charging points. Section on disabled parking should be cross-ref’d to 4.4.7.	Agreed. See 6.5.1 for charging points. Disabled parking dealt with in 6.2.2, cross referenced to 4.1.1.
4.4.3	CD	Specify cycle parking system to be used.	Agreed. 5.2.1, 5.3.1 and 5.4.1 all refer to DCC design guidance.
4.4.7	CD	Consider size of parking spaces for people with mobility problems	Agreed. 4.11 refers to relevant DfT guidance.
4.5	TP	Include thresholds and other text for travel plan and travel pack. May pay contribution to DCC for latter.	Agreed. See revised Chapter 8, especially 8.1.1 and 8.1.4.
4.7	EQ	Need clearer mention of needs of disabled people other than wheelchair users, eg. visual impairment.	Agreed. 4.1.1 now covers requirements of a wider range of disabilities.
5	DCC	Check wording re road infrastructure against LTP3.	Major infrastructure now in Chapter 12, with links from Chapter 9 where relevant.
5.3	Park	Include text re residents’ parking zones. Cross reference to DCC permit issuing policy.	Agreed. See 6.3.1.

5.3.1.2	TCS	Be more specific about need for Park & Ride on Alphington Road corridor, and replacement for Matford.	Agreed. See 12.2.
5.3.1.4	DCC	Refer to Bus Strategy.	Agreed. See 12.3.2.
5.3.2	DCC	Acknowledge need for road capacity improvements.	Agreed. See 9.2.1.
5.3.5.1	CD /TP	Include reference to financial contributions in respect of residents' parking; also travel pack, taster vouchers.	Agreed. See 6.4.1 and 6.9.1; also 8.1.3, 8.1.4 and 8.4.
5.3.5.4	DCC	Refer to need for good quality, centrally located bus station. TCS elaborates on this.	Agreed. See 12.3.1.
6	DCC	Car Clubs chapter disproportionate in size. Replace with section in Chapter 4, similar to that on Travel Plans.	Document has been divided into more chapters. That on Car Clubs (now Chapter 11) has been reduced in size.
Appx A condition 1	CD	(b) & (c) from Option 2 need equivalents in Option 1.	Agreed. See 10.4.1.
Appx A condition 3	CD	"not prevented" should be included in condition itself, not just reason.	Agreed. See 6.8.2.
Appx A condition 4	TP	Suggests revision to specimen condition	Agreed. See 8.3.2.
Appx A	CD	Suggests additional condition re unallocated parking	Agreed. Included as optional wording in 6.8.1.
Appx A	DCC	Suggests additional condition re provision for buses.	Agreed. See 10.4.2.

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SPD CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX 2 – PHASE 2 CONSULTATION – RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

Chpt/para	Respondent	Comment	Response
1	Transition Exeter	In summary, we agree with the underlying principles, as set out in Section 1 (especially 1.3.2); the emphasis throughout on making walking, cycling, buses convenient and attractive; and requiring greater cycle parking in the city. Transition Exeter's Transport Group welcomes this report and its recognition of the need to move towards more sustainable forms of travel within, to and from the city. (e.g. Planning development around the motorist, to the exclusion of other modes, makes development inaccessible to a significant proportion of the population)	Support welcomed.
		However, we question whether the scale and rapidity of the developments now taking place can be met by minor additions and changes to existing infrastructure. In our view a further 20,000 residents in the area will put immense pressures, especially towards the city centre whose existing highway and street networks will not be able to cope with a rise of 25% road traffic growth.	The strategic housing allocations for Exeter have already been set by the Core Strategy, which was informed by a series of transport studies prepared by DCC. This SPD is designed to help ensure that the transport strategies proposed in those studies are implemented.
		Currently about 45,000 passengers are carried daily by buses in the Exeter area. If a further 10,000 - 12,000 are added to this total, will the kinds of proposals outlined in this paper (e.g. 10.4.2) be adequate to manage this kind of capacity change?	The Exeter Growth Bus Strategy (see para 3.10.1 of the SPD) has been prepared by DCC in discussion with, and with the approval of, Stagecoach as the major operator in and around the city.
		We welcome the ambition for a more radical change in public transport provision which will be required (e.g. a step change in the quality, capacity and environmental performance of public transport, especially between the City Centre and proposed developments adjoining the City to the east in East Devon and to the south west in Teignbridge 3.1.3.). But the	More detail appears in the studies referred to above, in particular the Exeter Growth Bus Strategy and "Enhancing the Public Transport System...".

		detail of what this might mean is missing. Talk a few years ago of a High Quality PT route turned out to be an illusory laser-optic guided bus service, which may operate well on Greenfield sites, but not realistic in the narrow radial corridors in central Exeter, without major alterations to highways. As this step change is so central to much of the Consultation (and other transport policies), we would ask for more detail in these proposals so they can be assessed. Where is the resource base for providing for such aspirations?	
		We see the need for a holistic (integrated) city centre travel strategy, from which a traffic management strategy would be derived, the lack of which has been highlighted by the recent changes to Paris Street and Sidwell Street, and the lack of anticipation and responses to the problems generated by the consequent diversions.	The example of Paris Street / Sidwell Street in fact demonstrates that incremental changes are preferable to the introduction of a geographically wide-ranging package of changes at the same time. As demonstrated by the previous changes to Paris Street, any initial problems can be addressed and resolved relatively quickly.
		We note with regret the absence of any serious discussion on congestion pricing or an analysis of the economic and ecological damage brought about by excess traffic in the streets of historic cities and which undermine moves towards sustainability.	The SPD is based on a presumption, unchallenged by any of the representations received, that promotion of sustainable travel modes is desirable and necessary to serve the growth that Exeter is set to experience. An analysis of the kind proposed by Transition Exeter would not have changed that presumption. If congestion pricing were to be proposed, it would have to be through a higher level of policy than this SPD. The absence of support at government level makes this difficult or impossible for local authorities to achieve on their own.
		One critical issue for us is not to go ahead with new developments until public transport or cycling infrastructure is	Unfortunately this is a feature of the way public transport in this country is financed. Paragraph

		in place, but recent experience in Exeter has been very inconsistent in this approach. We already have significant new housing in areas such as Newcourt and Cranbrook with no bus service in place. In these cases new residents have no alternative but to use cars and these are already adding to air pollution, congestion and carbon emissions in the city. The timing of new stations and services is so important in relation to new developments. One would not expect utilities to wait until people move in to an area, and we would argue that public transport especially should be treated with more seriousness.	10.2.5 is designed to address this as far as possible.
		Finally, this consultation paper does lack detail and yet it is in detailed implemented plans that sustainable transport is made a reality, or not. We welcome the general broad brush approach but effectiveness will have to be judged by results. In particular, whether the plan actually reduces the need to travel, which has to be a primary goal, and whether there is a significant change in travel mode away from individualised driving, is yet to be seen. Submitted a recent study on Traffic Demand Management produced for a modern Chinese city.	We consider the SPD is detailed, for example it provides checklists for applicants, and detailed model conditions. By its own admission (1.1.1), it is based on the premise that development generates a need to travel. Reduction in travel demand depends on many factors outside the scope of this document.
1.3	Low Carbon Task Force	Given the carbon reduction imperative which has been recognised by successive governments, it is surprising that this section makes no reference to the need for sustainable transport to be promoted, to help contain and then reduce the carbon footprint of transport. Transport accounts for 20% of the country's total carbon emissions and the level of emissions has been growing inexorably. The effective promotion of low carbon modes of transport could have a major impact on this.	Agreed. See now 1.3.3.
1.3.3 (now 1.3.4)	BRE Global	Supports comment that sustainable transport solutions are easier and cheaper to achieve if addressed at the	Support welcomed.

		masterplanning stage. Commends BREEAM Communities 2012 to us.	
2	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Planning guidance including Manual for Streets is being reviewed by Lord Taylor. This may impact on this chapter and the document as a whole.	Lord Taylor's recommendations include retaining Manual for Streets for the time being, although in the longer term it is said not to be needed in its current format. This SPD has been written so as to be consistent with the NPPF, which is expressly outside the scope of the review; therefore it is not proposed to delay adoption of this SPD.
2	Low Carbon Task Force	As above, there should be a reference to carbon reduction and to air quality as part of the national policy context. Para 30 of the NPPF states that 'encouragement should be given to solutions which support reductions in greenhouse gas emissions', so a brief reference to this is justified.	Agreed. See now 2.1.2.
3.1.8	Mrs Norton	Concerned about Countess Wear roundabout accommodating traffic from Newcourt.	The SPD is intended to promote the use of sustainable transport, and thereby enable development to take place without exacerbating congestion.
3.1.8	Mr York	Whole document founded on false premise that development must happen to the south west of Exeter. Urban extensions and Cranbrook will increase population of city by nearly 50%, and local authorities have paid insufficient regard to enormous increase in infrastructure required. • Roads into city overloaded and pollution above acceptable limits. • Peamore park and ride and/or extended bus routes won't move sufficient people out of cars; nor will walking and cycling because it is too far. • Marsh Barton station unlikely to happen until 2018; problems with funding, compulsory purchase and timetable space.	The housing land within the Exeter boundary was allocated by the Core Strategy, and it is anticipated that the housing land within Teignbridge will be allocated by that Council's Local Plan. This SPD has to be set in that context. It is intended to promote the use of sustainable transport, and thereby enable development to take place without exacerbating congestion. Park and ride, bus services and the rail station are all components of a package designed to reduce car use in the city, and no single element is expected to provide a complete solution on its own. The road links referred to by

		• Chudleigh, Dawlish and Shillingford Roads must be engineered to discourage traffic. • Need another river crossing, perhaps at St Davids station. • Not sensible to construct housing bisected by A379 in its present form; could by pass by new link from Matford roundabout to M5 at Exminster.	Mr York are not proposed; it is outside the scope of this document to propose them, and Chapter 12 simply summarises proposals which already exist. Engineering solutions to discourage traffic, funded by developer contributions, are supported by paragraph 9.2.1 of the SPD.
3.9.1 to 3.9.3	Exeter Civic Society	Bullet points of Exeter Strategy all acceptable. However, reorganisation of traffic in the centre of Exeter has caused problems which are not solving themselves as well as DCC expected. Monitoring of Cowley Bridge Road, New North Road, Bonhay Road, Blackall Road, York Road, Summerland Street, Sidwell Street and Paris Street must be seen to continue, and some changes may need to be considered. For example, buses should not be expected to negotiate the sharp turns from New North Road into Longbrook St and then into York Road. To enable them and incoming cars to use Blackall Road, widen carriageway by removing pavement on south side between prison and Howell Road.	Support welcomed. Issues caused by previous development are outside the scope of this SPD although they have informed its production. The specific issues mentioned will continue to be monitored and, where appropriate, addressed.
3.9.3	Transition Exeter	LTP3 speaks of the need for 'demand management measures such as workplace parking'. We would agree with this assessment and funding for travel planning, but do not find sufficient detailed information in this document. How and where may workplace charging be introduced? Will income raised be hypothecated (ring-fenced) and how will it be used to subsidise new services and facilities? Can we look too far out-of-town car park charging to be used to the same ends? (which we would also support)	The reference in LTP3 envisages money being reinvested in the transport system. The principal mechanism for charges is likely to be through travel plans, so a reference has been included in 8.1.3. The mechanism is most likely to be used at workplaces, but could potentially apply at other types of development.
3.10	Mr Read	In favour of providing walking routes along desire lines, and safe road crossings for pedestrians. Lists a number of locations where he feels this is not the case at present.	Support welcomed. He has been sent a written reply in relation to his specific examples.

3.11	ECC Environmental Health	Need to explain that the AQAP is under review and the new version should be published in early 2013. In recognition of the fact that goods vehicles produce a higher proportion of total emissions than their proportion in total traffic flow would suggest, the AQAP2 will aim particularly to reduce emissions from these vehicles. May also want to also mention that part of the AQAP2 will be to develop a Low Emissions Strategy for the city.	Agreed. See now 3.11.2.
4.1.1	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Levels can be an issue on development sites in Exeter. Should recognise that there are instances where best practice requirements (for gradients etc) cannot be met and that developers should take reasonable measures taking into account underlying topography, a common sense approach to design of the public realm and the use of reasonable measures to accommodate all people.	Agreed. Included as new paragraph 4.1.3, with cross reference in 4.1.1.
4.1.1	Mrs Lant	First bullet point should refer to the needs of visually impaired people; also 8 th bullet re entrances etc. Steps, railings etc enable visually impaired people to tell where they are; although if badly placed they create obstacles. Edge of steps should include a white line. Customer information systems should be easy for visually impaired people to locate, and include an audio facility.	Agreed. Reference to the needs of visually impaired people included in bullet points 1 (footpaths), 4 (street furniture) and 8 (entrances etc). Bullet point added re customer information systems being easy to locate and use for people with all disabilities.
5	Transition Exeter	We welcome the identification of Cycle Parking standards (Section 5) although we view the minimum standards as too low and would prefer the city to take a more robust stance on this. The problem with the table (Table 2) used is that some properties will be more suited to cycling because of their location and accessibility than others, and some sites (e.g. University) will attract residents more capable of regular bike use because of their age.	The standards are expressly minima and 5.1.3 says that applicants should consider providing more if the site is favourably located for cycling. The standards are based on evidence from:- • workplace surveys: staff numbers, parking provision and how well used it is; • visual surveys of provision and use of cycle parking, especially at supermarkets and retail parks; • ECC "Wavelength" survey to establish the

			extent to which lack of cycle parking is a barrier to cycling.
		Additionally, we call for the development of more route networks for cycling and walking, tying that in to the possibility of using the Park and Ride sites for change to any mode of travel in particular cycling onwards into the city centre, and so on.	See Exeter Walking and Cycle Strategies, referred to at 3.10, also for example 9.2.5 and 10.1.1. Existing park and ride facilities can be used in conjunction with cycling.
		The potential of cycling in conjunction with rail and bus use is not referred to in this section, which we believe is an oversight. Our own view is that some bikes could be taken on buses, as is common in European countries and in the United States, and was formerly the case on the Truro bus company; although this is currently considered unduly hazardous by the operator Stagecoach in the SouthWest. A trial on a commuting bus route might help to test feasibility. We think there is great potential for 'cycle and ride' for those who may not want to cycle long distances or feel the whole journey by bicycle is too far. I would favour a series of high quality, covered and secure cycle parks at important PT junctions/hubs. This would be a crucial aspect of the enhanced Devon Metro as well.	Cycle facilities (casual and secure storage, and hire) are already being developed, particularly at stations in conjunction with train operators; it is not considered necessary to elaborate on this in a document aimed at developers. Buses in Exeter are too well-used and subject to time constraints to expect the operator to carry bikes, even if the physical and/or legal issues could be overcome.
5	University of Exeter	Welcomes the comprehensive guidance on cycle parking and facilities. Meaning of "secure" needs to be clarified, because some locations under natural surveillance may be sufficiently secure without a lockable enclosure. This needs to be assessed on a case by case basis.	Agreed. Clarified in 5.3.1 that an open facility for staff will only be acceptable if well overlooked at all times it is likely to be used.
5.2.1	Mrs Norton	Supports need for garages to be wide enough for modern cars, and enable bicycles to be taken in and out with car in situ.	Support welcomed.
5.5	CTC Right to Ride	Question the dimensions in the linked ready reckoner for calculating cycle parking. Firstly, I don't think the 1m aisle width is adequate to allow bikes to be turned into racks.	These measurements are the minimum that will work, because the purpose of the calculator is to establish how many bikes can be parked in a

		Secondly, is the 1.2m width between stands adequate to allow bike plus rider to squeeze between two other bikes to reach back of store when b is 3.5m long. I suggest limit b to 1.75m long. Front aisle width should be increased from 1m to at least 1.8m (reference Cambridge Cycle Parking Guide)	given space, using an easy, secure and uncomplicated storage system. A note has been added to the calculator to indicate that they are minimum standards.
5 and 6	Transition Exeter	Tables 2, 3 and 4 would be much easier to assess if the cycle and car parking lists followed the same categories and scale of measurement.	Cycle parking standards are being retained as minima, therefore Table 2 has been reviewed using an evidence-based approach. However the former maximum car parking standards are being retained purely as indicative standards (except for those for disabled users, which remain as minima), so they have not been reviewed.
		Table 2 – Cycle Parking suggests that the requirement can be reduced for retirement homes if age >60 – but this parking is for staff as well as residents and older people need more staff so the reduction seems inappropriate.	Retirement apartments: staffing is typically low, with one home manager serving a large number of flats.
		Questions whether parking standards for workplaces are enough, and what are they based on.	Workplaces in the city were surveyed for amount of cycle parking, numbers of staff, and usage made of cycle parking.
6	University of Exeter	Welcomes the comprehensive guidance on car parking requirements; also the flexibility resulting from the standards in Table 3 being indicative not maxima. In tandem with a strong travel plan and other proposals in the University's Masterplan Framework, this is likely to allow more flexibility, so preventing parking constraints being a hindrance to economic prosperity and job creation.	Support welcomed.
6	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Census data (due by end of Jan 2013) should provide up to date information on car ownership in Exeter, which could inform this chapter and provide more accurate guidance on car parking requirements in new developments. (The data should be able to be broken down on a ward basis, and	As the former maxima are being retained purely as indicative standards, they have not been reviewed. Paragraphs 6.2.1 and 6.2.2 have been reordered and 6.2.2 amended to make this clear. However, the census data will be examined for

		according to household size/type, so we can compare car ownership in city centre with more peripheral locations). This could then be reflected in the SPD and the Site Allocations and DM DPD.	relevance to 6.3 (Car free developments.)
		Asked whether any analysis was available on parking requirements for retail development in city centre/edge of centre/out of town locations.	Again, as the standards are being retained as indicative only, they have not been subject to rigorous examination.
6	Transition Exeter	We believe Car Parking strategies need to be accompanied by a stronger disincentives for car use, and in particular co-related to equivalent bus fares. It should not be cheaper to park than to use the bus for parallel single person return journeys.	This would be impossible to achieve, because parking charges relate to length of stay regardless of distance travelled, whereas public transport fares relate to length of journey regardless of stay.
		We support car-free developments and look to the first of these to be developed in Exeter and applaud the use of car sharing through car clubs such as Exeter Co-Cars (Section 11). We believe that all new developments of 50 dwellings or more (whether 'car-free' or not) should include a car club, funded by the developer, and again in place before the dwellings become occupied. New occupants could receive discounts on first year's usage, again funded by the developer. This could act as a major incentive to new occupants to enable them to feel confident/secure living there without owning a car.	Support for car clubs is welcomed. The suggested one car per 50 dwellings is too high for most locations; see response from Co-Cars to 11.2.4. Car clubs need to be complemented by other sustainable transport measures, hence their suitability for inclusion in travel plans; see 8.1.3.
6.2	Mrs Lant	Some parking spaces for disabled users need to be wider.	There is already a cross-reference to 4.1.1; reference to dimensions of spaces now included.
6.3.1	Mrs Lant	Residents' Parking system needs to remain accessible to people who don't use the internet.	A practical matter for DCC outside the scope of this SPD; comment has been forwarded to them.
6.3.2	Transition Exeter	The requirement to contribute to the enhancement of facilities for public transport, cycling and pedestrians (6.3.2) should apply to all developments, not just car-free.	See Chapter 9.
6.5.1	Co-Cars	Provision of an electric charging point as part of a car club provision (see section 11) in a new development, whether	If this refers solely to points for car club vehicles, see Chapter 11. If Co-Cars mean that the SPD

		business or residential would create a wider network and faster. Co-cars are happy to manage and look after the electric points, and are aiming to introduce electric / hybrid cars. Co-cars believe the policy could be stronger in stating this are a requirement maybe in the large developments, or as an optional second car.	should be more prescriptive in relation to charging points generally, it is difficult to justify anything beyond the current future-proofing approach, as it is not known what the uptake of electric vehicles will be.
6.5.1	Low Carbon Task Force	Welcomes the encouragement of provision for electric vehicle charging. Suggests that public facilities (including car parks) should be added to the list in the last sentence of this paragraph. Amend model conditions in section 6.8 to give some greater focus to efforts to include charging points within the approvals for forthcoming major developments.	Public parking now included in 6.5.1. Charging points included in model condition in 6.8.1, but optional for the same reason as set out above.
6.6.2	Mrs Lant	Car parks need walkways for people to get between parking spaces; also taxis need to be able to get close to the entrance to premises, to assist customers with disabilities.	Agreed and included.
6.6.2	Transition Exeter	“Shops and offices should be designed and located so that their front entrances are directly off main streets, not involving a long walk across a car park.” Should this not also apply to other buildings: hotels, schools, health centres, community centres, etc.?	Agreed; changed to “premises”.
7	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Relate more explicitly to Residential Design SPD context appraisal chapter.	Agreed; reference included in 7.1.2.
7.1.1	Mrs Lant	There needs to be a mechanism for informing visually impaired people know when pedestrian routes are going to change as a result of development.	This is not really a matter of planning policy. The practicality of achieving this will be discussed with DCC.
7.2	Low Carbon Task Force	Need to be more positive on the general merits of connectivity. The wording is at present a bit neutral, but connectivity for bus, bike and walk should be a fundamental design principle.	Agreed; now included in 7.1.2.
7.2.1	ECC	Text should include reference to ensuring development	This is in paragraph 9.2.5.

	Environmental Improvements Officer	makes short and direct connections to local facilities, walking/cycling routes, bus stops and train stations.	
8	Exeter Civic Society	Travel plans for residential and workplaces need to be specified in detail at an early stage as part of a planning application.	Requiring the detailed plan prior to occupation is considered appropriate. Travel plans prepared too early in the process tend to be generic in form with insufficient practical detail.
8	Transition Exeter	We agree very much with the principle of Travel Plans but remain slightly critical as to whether they are sufficiently adhered to, monitored or enforced.	Support welcomed. Model condition at 8.3.1 includes reference to monitoring and review. Enforcement is constrained by resources but does happen, at least on a reactive basis.
8.1.3	DCC	Replace “season tickets” with “bus tickets”.	Replaced with “bus or train tickets”.
8.1.3	University of Exeter	Need to acknowledge the potential tax implications of providing bicycle vouchers or season tickets, which might be a deterrent.	Agreed; included in footnote.
8.1.3	Transition Exeter	The discussion of travel plan contents (8.1.3.) should be strengthened: less ‘is likely to’, ‘may’, and more ‘will’. (Travel packs, 8.1.4, is better).	Travel plans need to suit the individual development and there is no “one size fits all solution”, therefore the list of contents is not prescriptive.
8.1.4	Mrs Lant	Travel packs need to be available in different formats.	This has already been raised with DCC following the EQIA, and reference has now been included in 8.1.4.
9	Exeter Civic Society	Identification of transport improvement is necessary from the earliest stage so that developers realise the extent of their commitment, even when contemplating purchase of the site and evaluating costs.	All ECC planning policies are publicly available, in addition to which the Council has a protocol for major applications, whereby prospective developers can obtain pre-application advice.
9	Simon Lloyd	Need to do more to encourage cycling: install more cycle routes; also close streets on Sundays for family cycle days.	Cycle routes are referred to in 9.2.5 and 10.1.1, for example. Occasional street closures are outside the scope of this SPD.
9.2.1	Transition Exeter	‘Contributions may be required for roads’, should include a reference to meeting the needs of cyclists – cyclists mentioned in 9.2.5 but cyclists are road users alongside cars	This is covered in chapter 10 which relates to on-site roads constructed by developers. Off-site roads funded by developer contributions will

		and roads design needs to account for them e.g. cycle paths, signage, links to primary and secondary cycle networks.	normally be constructed by DCC who will determine the design.
9.2.3	Transition Exeter	In our view the role of rail for the city is still not realised, but we applaud the decision to construct 3 new stations (noting in passing that these have been proposed in planning developments for the city since the 1970s but still not built!). The potential for the Devon Metro is beginning to be recognised and extra investment in infrastructure and rolling stock is essential. We hold that this concept could be extended through better integrated transport and ticketing—linking of trains, buses, cycles and taxis, and will outline our views on this our forthcoming 10 point plan ‘Devon Metro Plus’ to be published in 2013.	Support welcomed. ECC and DCC are engaging with the rail industry with a view to securing more investment in rolling stock and infrastructure. Smart and integrated ticketing is developing nationally and locally; it is not something over which developers have any influence, hence its omission from this SPD.
9.2.4	Transition Exeter	The wording ‘may be required’ is weak in this context. The provision of enhanced services in the future will necessitate better travel facilities, including realistic and reliable information. It will also need new bus priority measures and their implementation. It is clear that existing bus lanes are abused and this detracts significantly from any step change to better bus services.	Whether and for what purpose financial contributions are sought will depend on the location and circumstances, therefore the wording is appropriate and consistent with all subparagraphs of 9.2.
9.2.4	Mrs Lant	Electronic displays should include audio for visually impaired people.	4.1.1 has been amended to say that information systems should, wherever practicable, be easy for all disabled users to locate and use. It would not be possible to require audio as a mandatory planning requirement.
10	Exeter Civic Society	This section should include access requirements for emergency vehicles and refuse collection.	Agreed; added to 10.2.1.
10	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Relate more explicitly to Residential Design SPD context appraisal chapter.	Agreed; added to 10.2.1.
10	Transition	Support the concept of a Hierarchy of Streets. Ask how this	As with much of the SPD, it is directed at new

	Exeter	will be implementable to existing road networks.	development rather than existing networks.
10.1	ECC Environmental Improvements Officer	Add 'Making Connections' section here to state at the start of this chapter that development must make short and direct connections to local facilities, walking/cycling routes, bus stops and train stations.	Inserted in 10.2.6.
10.2.4 – 10.2.6	Transition Exeter	As indicated above enactment of new services in conjunction with new building developments is vital, but the timing of this should be brought forward prior to occupation of properties. Services must be phased in much earlier in all major developments. New bus facilities should be easily accessible (quantified in terms of distance, level of service) as soon as the first residents move in,	It is not viable to run services prior to occupation, and during early stages of occupation it may be necessary for residents to rely on existing services, so development should be phased accordingly. Paragraph 10.2.5 is designed to address this as far as possible.
10.2.6	Stagecoach South West	Roads do not have to be narrow or awkwardly laid out to be safe, and unnecessarily slow bus journeys are less attractive to potential passengers and therefore less sustainable. Designated bus routes need to be wide enough to allow manoeuvres without encroaching on the kerb or opposing carriageway. They also need to be direct. Bus-only measures could prevent access by other large vehicles if so desired.	Mostly agreed and included in 10.2.4. Bus only roads not specifically referred to; they can be appropriate in some situations but give rise to enforcement problems.
10.2.6	Mrs Lant	Favours segregation of pedestrians and cyclists. Cyclists should be required to use bells on shared paths.	The study on Shared Use paths by Atkins for the DfT (2012) found that segregation by white line was ineffective in securing compliance, and had little effect on conflict between users. National law does not require cyclists to maintain bells on cycles, and Councils have no legal power to require use of bells.
10.2.7	Mrs Lant	Steps, railings etc enable visually impaired people to tell where they are; although if badly placed they create obstacles.	Reference included to the need to cater for all disabled users, in accordance with paragraph 4.1.1.
11	Co-Cars	Smart card system to be introduced in 2013 gives potential for links with bike hire systems, bus tickets etc, and reference should be made to this.	Now included in 11.1.2.

11.2.1	Co-Cars	It's not just key safes; include telematic swipe card system. Additionally if the car bay is covered by CCTV or in the case of the housing development a security patrol.	Smart card now included in 11.2.1; CCTV already in 11.2.4.
11.2.2	Co-Cars	Add in a line: Contribution to the car club operators costs.	Agreed.
11.2.4	Co-Cars	The costs need updating:- • Capital cost 15,000. • In-car telematics system, plus fitting and licensing requirements 2,000. • The contribution to the car club costs is low but still stands, as this is only a contribution to our costs. • Subscription cost 50 per dwelling. These costs increase the cost per dwelling of 250 houses to 143. An option would be to have an electric fast charging point of maximum 6000, but this includes cost of capital, maintenance and civil engineering works.	Agreed. Table 5 amended.
11.2.7	Co-Cars	One car per 250 dwellings is reasonably accurate though 200-250 would be more so. More detailed calculations provided which supersede 11.2.5 and 11.2.6. Should also refer to business use would be useful, ie. a car for developments of 2000sqm or more of Class B1 offices.	Reference to B1 use included.
12.1	Robert McLarin	Greater use of the existing rail network and provision of new halts is applauded and should be implemented asap.	Support welcomed.
12.1	Mrs Lant	Talking customer info systems are desirable at new stations.	Now included in 4.1.1 which sets out detailed requirements for people with all disabilities.
12.2	Exeter Civic Society	Support the proposals, particularly park and ride at Alphington/Ide interchange.	Support welcomed.
12.2	Transition Exeter	Park & Ride is a semi-successful attempt to reduce the pressure of car parking in city centres. It should however be seen as a temporary solution to urban traffic challenges and not permanent. It brings a reliable service to the car driver but is socially exclusive, providing better and cheaper bus routes than in the poorer areas of the city. We think it should be part	Park and ride is part of a package of measures, not a complete solution in itself. Given Exeter's rural hinterland, parts of which are impossible to serve with regular public transport, park and ride provides residents of these areas with the option of not driving into the city.

		of a longer-term strategy to bring better public transport closer to people's homes so that no car driving is necessary. There might be a longer term role for 'Link and Ride' with buses along strategic routes from rural areas into Exeter with a series of smaller car and secure cycle parks along the route.	Park and change is already being considered for locations on existing frequent bus services.
12.3	Transition Exeter	In our view Exeter has good radial bus routes but services around the city are poor in comparison, especially linking residential areas with employment sites. We would therefore propose new services, such as an orbital bus route to open up different journey possibilities, possibly feeding in to stations and other community hubs. Smart ticketing will be essential for all public transport use in the future.	Service development and smart ticketing are both considered in the Exeter Growth Bus Strategy, referred to at 12.3.2.
12.3.1	Low Carbon Task Force	Include 'high quality facility' somewhere in the second sentence - this is important given the current facility's utilitarian nature.	Agreed and included.
12.3.1	Mrs Lant	New bus station needs audio information systems and appropriate tactile paving.	Paragraph 4.1.1 includes reference to these and will apply to the bus station redevelopment.
12.3.2	Exeter Civic Society	To avoid traffic problems caused by, and to, long distance coaches, they should serve a hub in the Sowton area, with smaller vehicles providing transfer to the city centre; would need to provide assistance with luggage.	Coaches make up a very small percentage of vehicles on the road and are not considered to contribute significantly to traffic problems. The desirability of such a transfer system is therefore a matter for their commercial operators.
12	Mr Cummings	Need to safeguard land for a ring road and rail route, westwards from Pinhoe to the A30 at Barley Wood, with rail continuing to rejoin the main line near Exminster. Should feature freight transfer facilities (with biofuel filling stations) and park and ride (with shelter and CCTV). Need automated control of traffic systems. Recycling plants need to be in more convenient locations.	There are no plans for such routes, and it is outside the scope of this document to propose them. Chapter 12 simply summarises proposals which already exist.
12.4	Exeter Civic	Support the proposals, particularly the new roads. Exhibition	Support welcomed.

	Society	Way link (with traffic control at rail bridge) essential for viability of Ibstock development.	
12.4	ECC Estates	What is meant by safeguarding and should there not be a plan for these routes? No intention of creating an additional railway crossing at Exhibition Way, merely enhancement of existing bridge.	More detail and relevant plans are being included in the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. Description of Exhibition Way link clarified.
12.4.3	Mrs Lant	Opposes Exhibition Way link; the area is valued for recreation, dog walking, listening to birdsong, relaxation, release of stress. Trees were planted just five years ago. Development would exacerbate the flood risk.	Opposition noted; the proposal still has to pass through a number of stages including a public inquiry into the village green application in addition to the planning application process.
12.4.4	Robert McLarin	Water Lane link should be a priority now, and should have been implemented when the last phases of residential development were completed. Madness to have one junction serving this area on a major arterial road. Need to build the Water Lane link or improve existing Tan Lane to Exton Road link by widening the bridge under the railway for all traffic. Make greater use of car park between Haven Road and Water Lane.	Support for safeguarding welcomed; however, construction of the road is not a short or medium term objective for DCC as highway authority.
General	Sustrans	This comprehensive document deals with most sustainable transport issues in urban development very well. There is however a special need to consider transport to and from schools above other journeys because this often causes greatest local traffic congestion problems, has the greatest potential to influence the future travel behaviour of young people and has the most risks for vulnerable road users. The development of schools and the infrastructure around them should give far greater priority to encouraging walking and cycling and discouraging car use.	Support welcomed. Reference to routes to schools covered in 10.2.6, with cross-reference from 7.2.1. Travel plan requirements now included in 8.1.1.
		Secondly, parks and open spaces are places that people of all ages and abilities go for recreational walking and cycling. Where these spaces are provided as part of larger developments the design of the spaces needs to provide	On-site open spaces covered by 10.2.7. Reference to routes to parks covered in 10.2.6, with cross-reference from 7.2.1.

		good facilities for their use, e.g. widths and surfaces of paths. The access to these or pre-existing open spaces from residential developments by foot and cycle also needs to be provided.	
General	Environment Agency	No wish to comment.	Noted.
General	Avocet Line Rail Users Group	No wish to comment.	Noted.
General	Exeter St James Forum	Document a useful reference to how planning rules encourage sustainable transport.	Support welcomed.
General	DCC	Support document, which is comprehensive and well-aligned with Local Transport Plan and Core Strategy transport policies. Suggest restructuring chapters as it's not explicitly clear that chapters 4 to 6 relate to smaller forms of development, or that 7 to 10 are for progressively larger developments. could simplify the order into on-site improvements, parking provision (including car clubs), off-site improvements, and ending with travel planning and significant transport proposals.	Support welcomed. No change is proposed to the structure, which was revised considerably in response to comments received on an initial draft from DCC and ECC officers. It is considered that the existing structure is clear by virtue of section 1.2, Table 1, and the "Applicable to the following" section at the beginning of each chapter. The current structure comprises short chapters which are considered easy to read.
General	Devon Countryside Access Forum	Gratified to see the attention being paid to pedestrian and cycle routes, including such matters as cycle parking.	Support welcomed.
General	Low Carbon Task Force	LCTF welcomes the preparation of this SPD which is an important aspect of planning policy which can, if properly conceived, help to reduce the City's carbon footprint. The draft document does, indeed, address the major issues and priorities which will promote the provision of sustainable transport infrastructure and maximise its likely usage. It should thereby help to contain and eventually reduce the City's carbon footprint. Finally, the document is very easy to	Support welcomed.

		read and the way it has been structured is excellent.	
--	--	---	--

SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT SPD CONSULTATION STATEMENT

APPENDIX 3 – PHASE 2 CONSULTATION – CHANGES IN RESPONSE TO REPRESENTATIONS

Sustainable Transport Supplementary Planning Document

Final draft
March 2013

Contents

1	Introduction.....	1
1.1	Purpose of this document.....	1
1.2	Structure of this document.....	1
1.3	Why promote sustainable transport?.....	2
2	National Planning Context.....	5
2.1	National Planning Policy Framework.....	5
2.2	Community Infrastructure Levy.....	5
2.3	DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment	6
2.4	Manual for Streets.....	6
2.5	Design and Access Statements.....	6
3	Local Policy Context	8
3.1	Exeter Core Strategy	8
3.2	Exeter Local Plan First Review.....	10
3.3	Exeter Sustainable Community Strategy (Exeter Vision)	11
3.4	Green Infrastructure Strategy	11
3.5	Residential Design SPD	11
3.6	Planning Obligations.....	12
3.7	Site-specific Masterplans.....	12
3.8	Car Club SPG	13
3.9	Devon County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP3).....	13
3.10	Walking, Cycling and Bus Strategies	13
3.11	Air Quality Strategy and Air Quality Action Plan	14
4	Access and facilities for people with disabilities	15
4.1	Requirements.....	15
4.2	Checklist for applications.....	16
4.3	Model conditions	16
4.4	Planning obligations.....	17
5	Parking and other facilities for cyclists	18
5.1	Quantity	18
5.2	Cycle parking at home	20
5.3	Cycle parking at workplaces.....	21
5.4	Cycle parking for visitors.....	21

5.5	Checklist for applications	22
5.6	Model conditions	22
6	Car parking.....	24
6.1	Rationale	24
6.2	Quantity	25
6.3	Car free developments	26
6.4	Extensions to Controlled Parking Zones	27
6.5	Electric vehicles	27
6.6	Layout and management arrangements	27
6.7	Checklist for applications	27
6.8	Model conditions	28
6.9	Planning obligations.....	28
7	Connections between the site and its surroundings	29
7.1	Alterations to existing infrastructure	29
7.2	Connections	29
7.3	Checklist for applications	30
7.4	Model conditions	30
7.5	Planning obligations.....	30
8	Travel plans and travel packs	31
8.1	Requirements.....	31
8.2	Checklist for applications	32
8.3	Model conditions	32
8.4	Planning obligations.....	33
9	Off-site improvements	35
9.1	Identification of requirements	35
9.2	Potential need for contributions	36
9.3	Checklist for applications	37
9.4	Planning obligations.....	37
10	On-site movement networks	38
10.1	Hierarchy of streets.....	38
10.2	The movement framework	38
10.3	Checklist for applications	41
10.4	Model conditions	41
10.5	Planning obligations.....	43
11	Car clubs.....	44

11.1	Rationale	44
11.2	Requirements.....	45
11.3	Checklist for applications	46
11.4	Planning obligations.....	46
12	Significant transport proposals	47
12.1	Rail proposals	47
12.2	Park and Ride	47
12.3	Buses	47
12.4	Roads	48
Appendix A		49

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of this document

1.1.1 Development gives rise to a need to travel. This document offers guidance to applicants for planning permission, developers, and others on the design features and contributions that may be required to satisfy planning policies and ensure that development results in sustainable travel outcomes. It has been designed to fit within the overall context of the Development Plan for Exeter, for the purpose of achieving a consistent approach to determining planning applications and mitigating the impact of development.

[1.1.2](#) If development generates a need to travel that is greater than, or significantly different from, that generated by the previous use of a site, improvements are likely to be required to the infrastructure, services and facilities in the locality. Not doing so could result in adverse effects for local amenity, the environment, and the wider transport networks. The policies contained in the Development Plan are designed to ensure that developers mitigate the impacts of, and provide for the infrastructure required by, development in a sustainable way.

[1.1.3](#) This is a Supplementary Planning Document forming part of Exeter's Local Development Framework. In accordance with the National Planning Policy Framework¹, it sets out practical steps that will ensure compliance with policies in the Core Strategy, the existing Local Plan First Review, and the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD². It is designed to help applicants make successful planning applications, as well as aiding the delivery of necessary infrastructure, and is therefore essential reading for anyone proposing development in Exeter.

1.2 Structure of this document

1.2.1 Chapter 2 sets the national context, in terms of legislation, policy and guidance. Chapter 3 then summarises the applicable local policy documents. Subsequent chapters contain the policy material itself.

1.2.2 The contents of Chapters 4 to 11 have been arranged so that Chapters 4, 5 and 6 apply to all but the smallest forms of development, whereas the later chapters apply progressively to development that is more extensive or has a higher impact.

1.2.3 The requirements are generally cumulative, so that where, for example, Chapter 9 is relevant to a proposal, the preceding chapters, in this case Chapters 4 to 8, should also be referred to. Chapter 11 on car clubs is something of a special case, because these can form part of a package of travel plan measures in a number of situations, ranging from larger developments down to small car-free

¹ Paragraph 153 of the NPPF. See also Chapter 2 of this document.

² See Chapter 3 of this document.

schemes. In the latter situation, some of the preceding chapters may not be applicable. Table 1 sets this out in more detail.

- 1.2.4 Finally, Chapter 12 refers to major infrastructure proposals which by their very nature are site-specific.

1.3 Why promote sustainable transport?

- 1.3.1 The following chapters set out how proposals need to enable and encourage sustainable travel to comply with national and local policies. However, this is not purely a matter of policy, but also of economics and common sense.

- 1.3.2 Just as it would be unthinkable to provide development without road access, it should be instinctive to design it so as to encourage people to walk, cycle or use public transport. This applies both to the overall layout of the site and its connections to its surrounding area, and to the design of individual premises. Nationally, 25% of households do not have access to a car, and the number of driving licence holders appears to be declining in younger age groups³. Older people may reduce their driving or cease altogether, either through choice or necessity. In the latter case they may become dependent on community transport. Planning development around the motorist, to the exclusion of other modes, makes development inaccessible to a significant proportion of the population. For housebuilders or retailers this excludes potential customers; for businesses it excludes potential employees.

1.3.3 In addition, transport accounts for around 20% of the UK's total carbon emissions. These emissions continue to grow, although successive governments have recognised the need to reduce them. The effective promotion of low carbon modes of transport could make a significant contribution to this.

- 1.3.4 Making development easily accessible by different modes can add little or nothing to the cost if designed in from the outset, and may even enhance the sale price or rental that can be realised.⁴ The National Planning Policy Framework recognises this in saying that the transport system needs to be balanced in favour of sustainable transport modes to give people a real choice about how they travel.⁵ Even if a household considers it essential to own a car, a wide range of transport options can save them the need to, and the cost of, running a second vehicle. That said, the policy objective is to reduce car use, not ownership; any cost saving to households is therefore an incidental benefit.

³ National Travel Survey 2010 - <http://www.dft.gov.uk/statistics/releases/national-travel-survey-2010>.

⁴ See for example <http://www.guardian.co.uk/environment/green-living-blog/2009/nov/05/bike-storage>.

⁵ At paragraph 29.

Table 1 – Applicability of chapters

Examples	Chapter						
	4	5	6	7	8, 9	10	11
✓ = relevant, (✓) = may be relevant							
<i>All development where access arrangements and/or facilities are affected.</i>	✓						
<i>All but the smallest proposals, ie:-</i> <i>Residential newbuild or conversion (including multiple occupation), from single dwellings upwards.</i> <i>Residential extension increasing the number of bedrooms, and/or affecting cycle parking arrangements.</i> <i>Non-residential newbuild or conversion/change of use, from single premises upwards.</i> <i>Extension increasing the number of staff and/or visitors, and/or affecting cycle parking arrangements.</i>	✓	✓					
<i>Extension of any premises increasing the number of staff and/or visitors, and/or affecting car parking arrangements.</i>	✓	✓	✓				
<i>Proposals having a direct physical impact on existing infrastructure; this may include (for example) a single dwelling which would involve alterations to an access, or for example to a cycle path or bus stop.</i> <i>Sites with more than one potential access.</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓			
<i>Proposals putting additional demand on transport infrastructure or services; generally involving more than an individual dwelling or other premises.</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		(✓)
<i>Developments large enough to have roads and/or paths within the site.</i>	✓	✓	✓	✓	(✓)	✓	(✓)

Examples	Chapter						
	4	5	6	7	8, 9	10	11
✓ = relevant, (✓) = may be relevant <i>Car free developments.</i> <i>Larger developments, as part of a package of travel plan measures to reduce car use.</i>	✓	✓	✓	(✓)	(✓)	(✓)	✓

2 National Planning Context

2.1 National Planning Policy Framework

2.1.1 Transport is key to all three of the dimensions to sustainable development identified in the [National Planning Policy Framework](#) (NPPF). It is relevant to the three corresponding roles to be performed by the planning system:-

- the economic role includes the provision of infrastructure required by the development;
- the social role includes the creation of a high quality built environment with accessible local services; and
- the environmental role includes minimising pollution and mitigating and adapting to climate change, including moving to a low carbon economy.⁶

[2.1.2](#) Paragraph 29 explicitly recognises the role to be played by transport policies in facilitating sustainable development, as well as contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives. [Paragraph 30 refers to the need to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and congestion, while paragraph 124 states the need to secure compliance with EU and national air quality objectives. The Government therefore urges local authorities to facilitate and encourage the use of sustainable transport modes through their Local Plans.](#)

[2.1.3](#) Section 4 contains advice on promoting sustainable transport. This document builds upon that advice.

[2.1.4](#) Section 7 “Requiring good design” is also highly relevant. Good design can promote use of sustainable travel modes. While the NPPF discourages prescriptive design policies, it lists “layout” among the issues that policies should concentrate on, as well as the access of new development in relation to neighbouring buildings and the local area more generally.⁷ There is some overlap with section 8 “Promoting healthy communities”, which stresses the need for places to promote active street frontages, safe and accessible environments, clear and legible pedestrian routes and high quality public space.⁸

[2.1.5](#) Paragraphs 203 to 206 require local planning authorities to consider whether unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or planning obligations, and sets out the tests to be satisfied in using those mechanisms.

2.2 Community Infrastructure Levy

2.2.1 The Planning Act 2008 has made provision for the collection of a Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) to ensure the costs incurred in providing infrastructure

⁶ NPPF paragraph 7.

⁷ At paragraph 59.

⁸ At paragraph 69.

to support the development of an area are funded by owners or developers of land. The levy would not replace the need for all planning obligations, which would continue to play a role in securing site-specific requirements. References in this document to financial contributions from developers are intended to apply not only to contributions payable pursuant to planning obligations created under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, but also to funds generated by CIL.

2.3 DfT Guidance on Transport Assessment

- 2.3.1 This Guidance sets out indicative thresholds for the production of Transport Statements, Transport Assessments and travel plans⁹, and gives guidance on their preparation. It has not been replaced by the National Planning Policy Framework, which says that “all developments that generate significant amounts of movement should be supported by a Transport Statement or Transport Assessment”¹⁰.

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/guidance-on-transport-assessment>

2.4 Manual for Streets

- 2.4.1 This Government publication specifically discourages the building of streets that are primarily designed to meet the needs of motor traffic, are unsafe and unwelcoming to pedestrians and cyclists, and difficult to serve by public transport¹¹. It requires the street’s function as part of the movement network to be considered not in isolation, but in conjunction with its other functions as a place¹².
- 2.4.2 This document has not been replaced by the NPPF, which promotes the design of development so as to give priority (among other things) to pedestrian and cycle movement¹³.

<http://www.dft.gov.uk/publications/manual-for-streets/>

2.5 Design and Access Statements

- 2.5.1 From August 2006 Design and Access statements have been required to accompany applications supporting the application and illustrating the process that has led to the proposal, and to explain and justify the proposal in a structured way. The level of detail required within a statement will depend on the scale and complexity of a proposal, but it should show how access arrangements will ensure that all users will have equal and convenient access to buildings and spaces and the public transport network.

⁹ Appendix B of the Guidance.

¹⁰ At paragraph 32.

¹¹ At paragraph 1.1.6.

¹² At paragraph 2.3.6.

¹³ At paragraph 35.

2.5.2 Many Design and Access Statements give detailed consideration to design, but limited attention to access issues. In particular, a statement must address:

- The development plan policy context (including this document) and how policies have been taken into account;
- Points of access to the site from roads and public transport;
- Access to buildings within the site (in the case of an outline application, the statement should explain the principles which will be used to inform the access arrangements with reference to neighbourhood movement patterns);
- How the access arrangements help to create an environment which is safe from crime and other hazards;
- In relation to the inclusion of disabled people:-
 - What consultation has been carried out in relation to access, and how that has informed the proposals;
 - How sources of advice on design and accessibility and technical issues will be or have been followed;
- Arrangements for emergency evacuation, and access for the emergency services.

2.5.3 Further information can be found in:-

The Residential Design SPD¹⁴, Chapters 2 to 4 generally, but especially paragraphs 2.9 and 4.4 (IV).

DCLG Circular 01/2006:

<http://www.communities.gov.uk/publications/planningandbuilding/circularcommunities2>;

CABE's publication 'Design and access statements: how to write, read and use them': <http://www.cabe.org.uk/publications/design-and-access-statements>.

¹⁴ See Section 3.4.

3 Local Policy Context

3.1 Exeter Core Strategy

3.1.1 The [Exeter Core Strategy](#) was adopted on 21 February 2012.

3.1.2 Chapter 8, on Transport, points out that adequate transport infrastructure is necessary for the delivery of sustainable growth. It gives examples of the relationship between planning and transport, including how transport links help to determine where development takes place, and how transport capacity is constrained by the layout of development.

3.1.3 The same chapter sets out specific and generic proposals to improve the travel experience in and around Exeter. Policy CP9 reads as follows:-

“Comprehensive strategic transport measures to accommodate the additional development proposed for the City and adjoining areas shall include:

- a step change in the quality, capacity and environmental performance of public transport, especially between the City Centre and proposed developments adjoining the City to the east in East Devon and to the south west in Teignbridge;
- additional Park and Ride sites around the City including Ide interchange;
- improvements to the strategic road infrastructure including key junctions on the M5, outer bypass and the Alphington Road corridor;
- new rail halts at Hill Barton and Newcourt on the Exeter to Exmouth line and at Matford on the Exeter to Plymouth line;
- demand management measures; and,
- improvements to facilities for pedestrians and cyclists.

The contributions necessary to ensure the delivery of transport infrastructure will be secured through the application of Policy CP18.”

3.1.4 Chapter 10 on the Environment includes a section on air quality¹⁵. It refers to the Council’s local Air Quality Strategy¹⁶ which has identified a need to tackle emissions of nitrogen dioxide generated by motor vehicles along the busiest roads into the city. This has resulted in the designation of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), and production of an Air Quality Action Plan. Policy CP11 requires development to be located and designed so as to minimise and, if necessary, mitigate against environmental impacts. Within the AQMA, it provides that measures to reduce pollution and meet air quality objectives will be brought forward, as proposed by the Air Quality Action Plan and Local Transport Plan. This is also relevant outside the AQMA; development of an area such as

¹⁵ Paragraphs 10.3 to 10.7 of the Core Strategy.

¹⁶ See also paragraph 3.11 of this document.

Newcourt or Monkerton without robust sustainable transport measures is likely to increase congestion and therefore have an adverse effect on air quality along radial routes.

- 3.1.5 Chapter 10 requires enhanced walking and cycling links as part of a Green Infrastructure network.¹⁷ It also contains a section on Design and Local Distinctiveness¹⁸, which requires permeable layouts that encourage travel by foot, cycle, and public transport, along safe and convenient routes, together with the provision of associated facilities.¹⁹
- 3.1.6 The Infrastructure Schedule at Appendix 2 to the Core Strategy identifies the transport, green and other infrastructure needed to deliver the quantum of development envisaged for the city. Where possible, cost is estimated, and funding sources including developer contributions are identified.
- 3.1.7 Policy CP18 reads as follows:-
- “New development must be supported by appropriate infrastructure provided in a timely manner. The City Council will continue to work in partnership with infrastructure providers and other delivery agencies to keep an up to date infrastructure delivery plan that will enable proposals, in accordance with the spatial strategy, to be brought forward.
- Developer contributions will be sought to ensure that the necessary physical, social, economic and green infrastructure is in place to deliver development. Contributions will be used to mitigate the adverse impacts of development (including any cumulative impact). Where appropriate, contributions will be used to facilitate the infrastructure needed to support sustainable development.”
- 3.1.8 Chapter 12 sets out the infrastructure needs of the various strategic allocations. Further detail is to be found in the site specific Masterplans referred to at paragraph 3.7 below:-

Newcourt²⁰

- a transport hub to be focussed on a new rail station;
- good permeability through a safe network of walking and cycling routes;
- bus routes with priority eg. along Topsham Road;
- improvements to the strategic road network, particularly at Countess Wear roundabout.

Monkerton/Hill Barton

- a comprehensive footpath and cycleway network;
- public transport to be convenient to all dwellings;

¹⁷ Paragraph 10.32 onwards of the Core Strategy and policy CP16.

¹⁸ Paragraph 10.53 onwards of the Core Strategy and policies CP15 and CP17.

¹⁹ Paragraph 10.55 of the Core Strategy, especially (iv) to (vi).

²⁰ Paragraph 12.5 onwards of the Core Strategy and policy CP19.

- highest densities along public transport corridors;
- a road link to the area east of motorway, for use by an enhanced bus service;
- a rail station on the Exmouth branch.

South of Alphington

- good permeability and links for pedestrians and cyclists;
- high quality bus service to city centre;
- a rail station in the Matford area.

3.1.9 These are brief summaries of the requirements and reference should be made to the Core Strategy document for full details.

3.2 Exeter Local Plan First Review

3.2.1 It is intended that a Strategic Allocations and Development Management DPD²¹ will form part of the Local Development Framework. In the meantime, for detailed development management policies, it is necessary to refer to the [Exeter Local Plan First Review](#), adopted in 2005. This advocates the use of spatial planning to minimise travel and, where travel is essential, to encourage the use of more sustainable forms of transport.²²

3.2.2 In the Local Plan, transport policies are principally to be found in Chapter 9. Policy T3 contains a package of requirements designed to maximise the use of sustainable modes:-

- “(a) all existing and proposed walking and cycle routes are safeguarded or alternative reasonably convenient routes are provided;
- (b) suitable cycle parking provision is provided in accordance with the standards set out in Schedule 2;
- (c) where more than 20 people are employed facilities for showering and changing are provided;
- (d) full account is taken of the needs of bus operation through and alongside new development by the provision of lay-bys, roads and other associated facilities;
- (e) where appropriate, pedestrian and cycling links are provided to existing or proposed rail stations;
- (f) the particular needs of people with disabilities are taken into account.”

3.2.3 Certain other policies require transport provision to be made in connection with other types of development. For example, Policy H2(d) promotes city centre development without private parking (except for disabled people). In the latter

²¹ A [draft](#) was recently subject to consultation.

²² Exeter Local Plan, Chapter 9 – “Objectives”.

case, as well as secure cycle parking, a contribution towards facilities for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians will be required.²³

3.3 Exeter Sustainable Community Strategy (Exeter Vision)

3.3.1 The Exeter Vision is the Sustainable Community Strategy for Exeter, produced by the Exeter Local Strategic Partnership.

3.3.2 Under the theme “An Accessible City”, the Vision is one of a city where:-

- jobs, key services & facilities can be accessed by public transport, walking and cycling, and
- local and national transport networks are easily accessible, with less dependence on cars.

3.3.3 Under the theme “A City that cares for the environment”, the Vision proposes measures to reduce carbon emissions, 22% of which are produced by road traffic. These measures include developing a strategic partnership approach to transport and implementing the Green Infrastructure Strategy²⁴.

<http://www.exeter.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=10063>

3.4 Green Infrastructure Strategy

3.4.1 The Green Infrastructure Study (Phase 1) and the Green Infrastructure Strategy (Phase 2) were commissioned by East Devon District Council, Exeter City Council, Teignbridge District Council and Natural England as part of their ongoing commitment to meeting the needs of new and future communities and to general environmental protection and enhancement.

3.4.2 The Green Infrastructure work provides a framework for green infrastructure to be taken into account in planning for the significant amount of new growth in the area. Although not all GI is accessible, the Strategy promotes measures which facilitate and encourage walking, cycling and use of public transport as the primary means of movement within the strategic development areas.

<http://www.exeter.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=10986>

3.5 Residential Design SPD

3.5.1 The Residential Design SPD was adopted on 28 September 2010. In providing guidance on good design practice for buildings and the public realm, it takes into account the need to enable and encourage the use of sustainable modes of transport wherever possible.

3.5.2 The RD SPD contains much of relevance to this current document, including:-

- permeable and well-connected layouts;

²³ Paragraph 4.8 of the Local Plan.

²⁴ See section 3.4.

- priority for pedestrians and cyclists, and facilities such as cycle parking;
- sustainable design, including safe and attractive public realm.

Cross-references are included in this document where they are relevant.

<http://www.exeter.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=12730>

3.6 Planning Obligations

- 3.6.1 The [Planning Obligations SPD](#) sets out how, during pre-application discussions with developers, planning officers will identify a list of issues relevant to the development site to be considered in respect of planning obligations. Developers should identify what measures might be taken to mitigate the impact of their development and ensure its sustainability²⁵. Where specific issues need to be discussed with the City or County Council, that is highlighted in this document.²⁶
- 3.6.2 Developers should explain through Heads of Terms what they are proposing should be contained in and secured through planning obligations.²⁷
- 3.6.3 It is intended that developers should provide for all infrastructure and services necessary to achieve sustainability from their proposals. Until adoption of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), the City Council's normal position will be to secure this through planning obligations.²⁸
- 3.6.4 The Council's standard clauses for planning obligations, including those for financial contributions and highway works, are on its website at www.exeter.gov.uk/planningobligations. Relevant obligations and model planning conditions are listed, where applicable, at the end of each chapter of this document.

3.7 Site-specific Masterplans

- 3.7.1 Masterplans currently exist for the areas of Newcourt and Monkerton/Hill Barton, where considerable development is proposed (and in the case of Newcourt, under way). As with the Residential Design SPD, these indicate how development should be planned to make sustainable travel choices a realistic and attractive proposition. They have been subject to public consultation and have been approved for development management purposes.
- <http://www.exeter.gov.uk/newcourt>
- <http://www.exeter.gov.uk/monkerton>

²⁵ Paragraphs 4.2.1 and 4.2.2 of Planning Obligations SPD.

²⁶ See for example paragraphs 9.1.2 and 10.2.2.

²⁷ Paragraph 4.2.3 of Planning Obligations SPD.

²⁸ Paragraph 4.4.1 of Planning Obligations SPD.

3.8 Car Club SPG

- 3.8.1 The Council has previously produced Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in relation to car clubs. This SPD (specifically Chapter 11) ~~replaces~~ that SPG.

3.9 Devon County Council Local Transport Plan (LTP3)

- 3.9.1 Devon County Council's Local Transport Plan (LTP3) was adopted in April 2011. In its Exeter Strategy it outlines successes in achieving more use of sustainable travel modes than the national average. For example, as a Cycling Demonstration Town from 2005 to 2011, the city saw a 10% increase in people cycling to work and 40% in students cycling to school. Patronage of rail, park and ride and bus services has also increased steadily; in the case of bus this represents an exception to the national trend.
- 3.9.2 The Exeter Strategy highlights the need to make greater use of sustainable travel options to accommodate the level of development and growth expected by 2026. It identifies the priorities for the city as being to:-
- improve access to the city;
 - enable and support smarter travel;
 - unlock major growth east of Exeter;
 - deliver major development within Exeter;
 - protect Exeter as a gateway.
- 3.9.3 The document points out that "with funding opportunities limited, it will be necessary to negotiate contributions towards sustainable transport infrastructure from all new development, including funding for travel planning measures. Alternative sources of funding will also need to be sought and using demand management measures such as workplace parking for new developments will help generate income for reinvesting in the transport system."²⁹
- http://www.devon.gov.uk/index/transportroads/devon_local_transport_plan/ltp3.htm

3.10 Walking, Cycling and Bus Strategies

- 3.10.1 The City and County Councils have prepared a Walking Strategy and a Cycle Strategy, as well as a Growth Bus Strategy for Exeter.
- http://www.devon.gov.uk/index/transportroads/devon_local_transport_plan/transport-plan-exeter-ldf.htm

²⁹ At page 62 of LTP3.

3.11 Air Quality Strategy and Air Quality Action Plan

3.11.1 The City Council has prepared a local Air Quality Strategy which outlines the measures it will take in order to protect and improve air quality throughout Exeter. It identifies a need to tackle emissions of nitrogen dioxide generated by motor vehicles along the busiest roads into the city, which has resulted in the designation of an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA), and production of an Air Quality Action Plan. This identifies the Council's role, as part of its forward planning function, in ensuring that future development does not significantly adversely affect the air quality within the city.³⁰

3.11.2 The AQAP has been reviewed and a new version published in early 2013. In recognition of the fact that goods vehicles produce a higher proportion of total emissions than their proportion in total traffic flow would suggest, the new AQAP aims in particular to reduce emissions from these vehicles. Part of the AQAP is to develop a Low Emissions Strategy for the city, one of the aims being to increase the uptake of sustainable transport choices.

Air Quality Strategy: <http://www.exeter.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=4261>

Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP):
<http://www.exeter.gov.uk/index.aspx?articleid=4292&listid=4261>

³⁰ At Page 11 of the Executive Summary.

4 Access and facilities for people with disabilities

Applicable to the following:

All development where access arrangements and/or facilities are affected.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially paragraphs 8.6 (e) and 10.55 (viii); and policies CP9 and CP17.

Local Plan policy T3(f) and T9.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD especially policy DM26(e).

Residential Design SPD.

4.1 Requirements

4.1.1 The transport and access needs of residents and visitors with disabilities must also be taken into account in the design of all development:-

- Footpaths and footways must be designed to take account of the needs of [visually impaired people, as well as](#) users of pushchairs, wheelchairs and buggies [\(but see paragraph 4.1.3\)](#).
- Routes from public transport stops and car parks must be free from hazards and accessible to wheelchair users.
- Raised kerbs should be provided at bus stops.
- Where obstructions are unavoidable, they should be detectable by visually impaired people, for example through use of colour contrasts, and tap rails to enable identification by long cane users. [Well-placed street furniture can help visually impaired people to know where they are.](#)
- Crossing points should be identified using tactile paving of the appropriate colour.³¹
- Seating should be provided at bus stops where space permits, and at intervals along (but not obstructing) key pedestrian routes.
- Dedicated parking should be provided for people with disabilities, in accordance with Table 4 at paragraph 1.1.1. There are recommended dimensions in the DfT's Traffic Advisory Leaflet.³²
- Entrances to buildings, internal doorways and circulation space should be accessible to wheelchair users, [and navigable by visually impaired people.](#)

³¹ See "[Guidance on the use of Tactile Surfaces on Pavements](#)", DfT 2007.

³² No. 5/95:

http://webarchive.nationalarchives.gov.uk/20090505152230/http://www.dft.gov.uk/adobe/pdf/165240/244921/244924/TAL_5-951/.

- Toilets should be accessible to wheelchair users and people with other disabilities.
- There should be appropriate means of access to upper floors, with corresponding means of escape.
- Information systems should, wherever practicable, be easy for all disabled users to locate and use.

4.1.2 The Residential Design SPD elaborates on these requirements.³³ While directed at dwellings, much of the guidance is appropriate to other types of development. Further information can be found in the relevant Government guidance.³⁴ In addition, buildings must comply with Part M of the Building Regulations.

4.1.3 It has to be recognised, however, that Exeter is hilly, and there are instances where best practice requirements (for gradients etc.) cannot be met. In such cases, developers should take a common sense approach to design of the public realm, including reasonable measures to accommodate all people, taking into account the underlying topography.

4.1.4 A contribution towards community transport services may form part of a package of transport measures funded by development³⁵. Community transport in Exeter is generally provided by the third sector, with considerable local authority support. It provides an essential service for people who would not otherwise be able to travel, for example because the distance to a bus stop is too great, or because their disability prevents them using conventional vehicles. The existing network will need to be improved and extended in order to serve new development.

4.2 Checklist for applications

- On the application form, include the number of parking spaces for people with disabilities.
- On the drawings, indicate the location and dimensions of these spaces, and identify any other features listed in paragraph 4.1.1.
- In the Design and Access or Planning Statement, describe the rationale for these features, with reference to the relevant guidance documents.

4.3 Model conditions

4.3.1 Highways condition (see paragraph 10.4.3).

4.3.2 Pedestrian and cycle routes condition (see paragraph 10.4.1).

4.3.3 Parking condition (see paragraph 6.8.1).

³³ For example at RD SPD paragraphs 6.46 and 9.50 onwards.

³⁴ Those cited above, plus "[Inclusive Mobility](#)", DfT 2005.

³⁵ See paragraph 9.2.6.

4.4 Planning obligations

- 4.4.1 Contribution towards community transport – see [Standard Clause 04](#) – “Financial contribution”.

5 Parking and other facilities for cyclists

Applicable to the following (ie. all but the smallest proposals):

Residential newbuild or conversion (including multiple occupation), from single dwellings upwards.

Residential extension increasing the number of bedrooms, and/or affecting cycle parking arrangements.

Non-residential newbuild or conversion/change of use, from single premises upwards.

Extension increasing the number of staff and/or visitors, and/or affecting cycle parking arrangements.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially policy CP9.

Local Plan policy T3.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM28.

Residential Design SPD.

Site-specific Masterplans.

5.1 Quantity

- 5.1.1 Cycle parking standards are set out in Policy T3 and Schedule 2 of the Local Plan, but have been reviewed in the light of local experience, the high levels of cycling in Exeter³⁶, and examples of good practice³⁷, and revised standards are detailed in Table 2 below.
- 5.1.2 These are intended to indicate an appropriate level of cycle parking, as required by the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD. In the meantime these standards update those set out in the Local Plan.
- 5.1.3 These are minimum standards; applicants should consider providing more parking if, for example, the site is well located in relation to high quality cycle routes. For extensions to existing premises, the use made of existing cycle stands may be a good guide to the appropriate level of future provision.
- 5.1.4 Newbuild properties will always be expected to include cycle parking in accordance with the policy requirement. It is accepted that this may be more difficult to achieve with conversions.

³⁶ Exeter's status as a Cycling Demonstration Town from 2005 to 2011 and accompanying investment in infrastructure and measures such as training, resulted in substantial increases in cycling; see paragraph 3.9.1.

³⁷ See for example [TfL Proposed Guidelines](#). London is seen as comparable in that, like Exeter, it has seen a dramatic increase in cycling using a mixture of dedicated facilities and heavily trafficked roads.

Table 2 - Cycle parking standards (minimum)

The standards below are cumulative, eg. for retail, cycle parking is required for both staff and customers.

The absence of a use from this table does not mean no cycle parking is required. Applicants should consider likely numbers of residents, staff and visitors, and assess their likely needs by comparison with the following examples.

Land use		Number of cycles	Notes
Parking for residents			
Houses and flats	1 or 2 bedrooms	1 per dwelling	
	3+ bedrooms	2 per dwelling	
HMOs, bedsits, cluster flats, student accommodation	For first 10 bedrooms	1 per bedroom	
	For 11 th bedroom upwards	1 per 2 bedrooms	
Retirement flats (includes staff parking)	For first 4 flats	1 per flat	Assumes lower age limit of 60 or less. Reduce requirement if age limit is higher.
	For subsequent flats	1 per 5 flats (minimum 4 spaces)	
Parking for staff			
General rule	For first 4 full time equivalents (FTEs)	1 per FTE	
	For subsequent staff	1 per 7 FTEs (minimum 4 spaces)	
Example for specific cases -			
Offices	Assume 1 FTE per 12.5m ² of office space, and provide cycle parking as above.		
Method of calculation for other uses which include office space	Consider level of staffing likely to be accommodated in the building, eg. medical practice - assume 1 FTE per consulting room, plus 1 FTE per 12.5m ² of office space, and provide cycle parking as above.		
Industrial uses	If number of staff is not known, assume 1 FTE per 50m2 of workshop space, plus 12.5m ² of office space, and provide cycle parking as above.		
Retail	1 staff cycle space per 350m ² of net retail floorspace (minimum 4		

		spaces).	
Parking for visitors/customers			
Retail	Food	1 per 350m ² of net retail floorspace (minimum 10 spaces)	
	Non-food	1 per 500m ² of net retail floorspace (minimum 4 spaces)	
Hotels and conference facilities	Overnight guests	Equal to staff parking, and may be in same secure space	
	Day visitors (conferences etc)	1 per 20 peak period visitors	
Sports facilities		1 per 20 peak period visitors	
Other premises open to the public	eg. other leisure uses, medical practices, food and drink	Same number of spaces as for staff	
Offices and industrial uses not generally open to the public		One or two spaces for ad hoc callers	
Student accommodation		One space per 20 beds (minimum 2 spaces)	
Other residential blocks		One or two spaces for ad hoc callers	
Educational establishments	Consider on an individual basis depending on age and other characteristics of students.		

5.2 Cycle parking at home

5.2.1 Cycle parking must be secure and convenient. The Residential Design SPD sets out detailed requirements for cycle storage at paragraph 6.56 onwards.

- For a single garage measuring 6m x 3m, 0.5m needs to be added to either the length or the width for bike storage. If added to the length, a personal door should be included so the bikes can be taken in and out with the car in situ.

- Individual stores in gardens should have easy access to the road via a gate. For two bikes, the store should measure about 2m x 1m (a 6' x 4' shed will suffice).
 - Communal stores should be conveniently located and secure. See [Devon County Council's Cycle Parking Design Guidance](#) in relation to storage systems.
 - Storage space for bikes is additional to that required for bins; the same space cannot be counted for both.
- 5.2.2 In the case of an application to convert a garage to living accommodation, while it is accepted that this will usually be designed to meet the requirements of the current occupier, consideration should be given to how cycle storage could be provided in future, such as a shed within the curtilage.

5.3 Cycle parking at workplaces

- 5.3.1 For staff who will be leaving their cycles on site for the whole day, security will be paramount.
- Cycle parking should be in a secure location within the curtilage and/or in a secure structure wherever possible. [An open facility will only be appropriate if the location is well overlooked at all times when it is likely to be used. In any event,](#) the location should be such that users feel safe accessing it. See [Devon County Council's Cycle Parking Design Guidance](#) in relation to storage systems.
 - Showers, lockers, and space to dry clothes will all encourage staff to cycle to work. Where more than 20 people are to be employed, these facilities must be provided³⁸. Where possible, they should also be provided for smaller employment premises, particularly newbuild development which is well-located in relation to the city's cycle network. See model condition at paragraph 5.6.1.

5.4 Cycle parking for visitors

- 5.4.1 Cycle parking should be provided in convenient and safe locations, immediately adjacent to destinations such as shops or schools, at transport interchanges or next to community facilities.³⁹
- For casual visitors, cycle parking should be located by the main entrance, in a well-overlooked position, to which cycles can be locked. Conveniently sited parking will prevent bikes being chained to other structures.
 - In areas like retail parks with multiple premises, small groups of bike stands close to individual shop entrances will be preferable to one large group of stands. The former will be more convenient for users, easier to accommodate, and less visually intrusive.

³⁸ Local Plan policy T3(c).

³⁹ Paragraph 10.53 of the RD SPD.

- At premises where visitors stay for hours rather than minutes, covered parking is preferable.
- Conference centres and hotels should provide secure cycle parking. If visitors are allowed to use the store provided for staff, the size of the store needs to reflect this.
- In city centre or local centre locations where there is no space on site for cycle parking for visitors, it may be appropriate for the developer to contribute to additional provision in the vicinity.
- Good surveillance is essential, to ensure the security of cycles and their users.
- See [Devon County Council's Cycle Parking Design Guidance](#) in relation to storage systems.

5.5 Checklist for applications

- On the application form, include the number of cycle parking spaces.
- On the drawings, indicate the location of cycle parking, and dimensions so that capacity can be verified. The Council has produced a [ready-reckoner](#) showing how many bicycles will fit in a given area.
- In the Design and Access or Planning Statement, describe the quantity and nature of cycle parking, including storage system used (eg. Sheffield stands), security arrangements where applicable, and method of controlling access to communal stores.

5.6 Model conditions

5.6.1 Cycle parking identified in application:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, secure cycle parking^{(a)(b)} shall be provided^(c) in accordance with [details^(d) previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority]^(e), and the cycle parking shall be maintained at all times thereafter.^(f)

Reason - to ensure that cycle parking is provided, in accordance with Local Plan policy T3, to encourage travel by sustainable means.

Variations:-

- May need to specify “cycle parking for visitors and secure cycle parking for residents and staff”, or any combination of these appropriate to the use.
- For a workplace, it may be appropriate to include provision of lockers, showers and changing facilities.
- If location is shown on a drawing, insert after the word “provided”: “in the location shown on drawing number ...”
- After “details” insert any specific requirements; for example in the case of a small store room it may be necessary to specify “(including arrangements as to access)”, to prevent it from being simply a locked cupboard.

- (e) If sufficient detail is shown on a drawing, replace the words in square brackets with *“the details shown on drawing number ...”*.
- (f) For larger developments, may need to link occupation of premises to provision of cycle parking for those premises.

5.6.2 No cycle parking identified in application:

Prior to commencement of the development, details shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority of secure cycle parking.^{(a)(b)(d)} Development shall not be commenced until such details have been agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and prior to first occupation of the development, the cycle parking shall be provided in accordance with the approved details.

Reason and variations are as above.

If no obvious solution is apparent from the submitted drawings, applicants will be asked to provide additional details, in the absence of which the application will be liable to refusal for failure to comply with policy T3.

6 Car parking

Applicable to the following (ie. all but the smallest proposals):

Residential newbuild or conversion (including multiple occupation), from single dwellings upwards.

Non-residential newbuild or conversion/change of use, from single premises upwards.

Extension of any premises increasing the number of staff and/or visitors, and/or affecting car parking arrangements.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially policy CP9.

Local Plan policy T10.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM19, DM28 and DM31(o).

Residential Design SPD.

Site-specific Masterplans.

6.1 Rationale

6.1.1 There are a number of reasons for including a chapter on car parking in an SPD relating to sustainable transport:-

- The definition of sustainable transport modes in the NPPF⁴⁰ includes low and ultra low emission vehicles and car sharing, all of which generate a requirement for parking.
- The NPPF does not advocate maximum standards for parking; it permits the setting of local standards based on a number of factors, only one of which is the need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles⁴¹. Another factor is local car ownership levels, implicitly making the point that to some extent car ownership governs the appropriate level of parking, not the reverse; that is, restricting parking provision does not necessarily reduce car ownership, and can have adverse consequences such as encouraging parking on footways. In any case, the policy objective is to reduce car use rather than ownership⁴².
- Another factor to be taken into account is the availability and opportunities for public transport. This reflects the fact that driving is part of an overall package of transport possibilities, and an effective way of reducing car use is to offer people other attractive choices.
- Sections 6.3 to 6.6 therefore set out a number of ways in which car parking needs to mesh with other transport modes.

⁴⁰ In Annex 2.

⁴¹ At paragraph 39.

⁴² See paragraph 1.3.4.

6.2 Quantity

6.2.1 It is intended that the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD will require an “appropriate” level of car parking for development, and the standards in Table 3 and Table 4 below indicate what that level is for different types of development.

6.2.2 These standards are taken from policy T10 and Schedules 3 and 4 of the Exeter Local Plan. The Residential Design SPD elaborates on the parking standards for dwellings, including unallocated parking, and provides detailed guidance on its location and layout.⁴³ Although described as maxima in the Local Plan and RD SPD, in accordance with government policy the standards in Schedule 3 are now treated as indicative standards to assist applicants.⁴⁴ They have therefore not been reviewed or updated during the production of this document. Schedule 4 sets out requirements for parking for disabled users; these continue to be minimum standards⁴⁵.

6.2.3 The tables focus on car parking, but any additional operational requirements (such as for commercial vehicles to service the premises) need to be accommodated.

Table 3 – Car parking standards (indicative)

Inside the pedestrian priority zone	
Non-residential	Operational only
Residential	Average of 1.5 spaces per dwelling*
Outside the pedestrian priority zone	
Food retail	1 space per 14 sq m (gross internal area)
Non-food retail	1 space per 20 sq m
Cinemas and conference facilities	1 space per 5 seats
D2 including leisure	1 space per 22 sq m
B1 including offices	1 space per 30 sq m
B2 employment	1 space per 50 sq m
B8 warehousing	1 space per 200 sq m
Hospitals	1 space per 4 staff + 1 space per 3 visitors

⁴³ RD SPD Chapter 6.

⁴⁴ NPPF paragraph 39 requires standards to be set taking into account a number of factors.

⁴⁵ See also paragraph 4.1.1 in relation to dimensions of spaces for disabled users.

⁴⁷ See item 6 at http://www.devon.gov.uk/index/councildemocracy/decision_making/cma/cma_document.htm?cmadoc=agenda_exh_20101125.html.

Higher and further education	1 space per 2 staff
Stadia	1 space per 15 seats
Residential	1.5 spaces per dwelling*
*See Residential Design SPD Figure 6.2 for ratio of allocated to unallocated spaces	

Table 4 - Car parking standards for disabled users (minimum)

Car park used for	Car park size	
	Up to 200 bays	Over 200 bays
Employment premises – employees and visitors	Individual bays for each disabled employee + 2 bays or 5% of total capacity	6 bays + 2% of total capacity
Shopping, recreation, leisure	3 bays or 6% of total capacity, whichever is greater	4 bays + 4% of total capacity

6.3 Car free developments

6.3.1 Where a Residents' Parking Zone (RPZ) has been designated by Devon County Council, their policy⁴⁷ is that new properties will not be eligible for a permit and developers will be required to provide sufficient spaces off-street or designate the property as car free; see further paragraph 6.3.2. For conversions, permits will be issued on a first come, first served basis, up to the number of permits previously existing for the property, or the number of new properties, whichever is the lower, provided that any of the new properties without a permit are designated car free.

6.3.2 Policy H2 and paragraph of the Exeter Local Plan First Review refers to a City Centre Core Area within which car free developments will be permitted. Similar considerations may apply to justify a car free development in other locations well served by public transport. In all cases this will be subject to the following:-

- parking should be provided for cycles and disabled drivers, as well as space for deliveries;
- where occupiers will not be entitled to a residents' parking permit from Devon County Council, they should be made aware of that;
- a travel plan and/or travel pack may be required in accordance with section 8.1;
- a contribution will be sought towards the enhancement of facilities for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians. A contribution to a car club is deemed to comply equally with the objectives of paragraph 4.8.⁴⁸

⁴⁸ In accordance with NPPF paragraph 39 which says that if parking standards are set they should take into account, among other things, the accessibility of the development and the availability of and opportunities for public transport. For car clubs see chapter 11.

- 6.3.3 On car free developments, or other locations where a car club forms part of the travel plan strategy⁴⁹, parking for a car club car or cars should be provided in accordance with chapter 10.

6.4 Extensions to Controlled Parking Zones

- 6.4.1 Where a development is likely to encourage on-street parking to the detriment of existing residents or businesses, the applicant may be required to make a financial contribution to enable the creation or extension of Controlled Parking Zones. The contribution will need to cover the costs associated with making the necessary Order, as well as signage and road markings.

6.5 Electric vehicles

- 6.5.1 The Government's Plug-in Vehicle Infrastructure Strategy⁵⁰ envisages that as plug-in electric vehicles become more widespread, most charging will take place at home, with additional facilities at workplaces and locations such as shopping centres. The Residential Design SPD requires developers to plan for the future installation of charging points for all residential parking, including on-street locations. As a minimum, ducting and potential for easy connection to the electricity network should be provided.⁵¹ Workplace, retail, and public parking facilities should also be future-proofed in this way.

6.6 Layout and management arrangements

- 6.6.1 Parking areas should be well overlooked, by buildings or public spaces, to provide security for users and their vehicles.
- 6.6.2 [Premises](#) should be designed and located so that their front entrances are directly off main streets, not involving a long walk across a car park [for people arriving on foot, by public transport or by taxi](#). [Paths between spaces should also be provided for car users](#).
- 6.6.3 Where parking is provided for customers of retail estates, in the interests of discouraging unnecessary vehicle movements, management arrangements for those parking areas should not preclude customers from leaving their cars parked for short periods while they visit other nearby premises. The model condition at paragraph 6.8.2 is designed to deal with this. Paths should provide easy connections in and out of the car park, to avoid pedestrians taking short cuts through planting.

6.7 Checklist for applications

- On the application form, include the number of parking spaces for different types of vehicle and user.

⁴⁹ For travel plans see chapter 7.

⁵⁰ "Making the Connection", June 2011.

⁵¹ Paragraph 6.34 of the RD SPD.

- On the drawings, indicate location of parking, and dimensions so that capacity can be verified.
- In the Design and Access or Planning Statement, describe the rationale for the number of spaces, with reference to the indicative standards in Table 3 and Table 4, Figure 6.2 of the RD SPD, and the criteria listed in paragraph 39 of the NPPF.

6.8 Model conditions

6.8.1 Parking:

The proposed car parking shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. For this purpose, plans and sections indicating, as appropriate, the design, layout [including allocated and unallocated spaces], [charging points.] levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate information is available for the proper consideration of the detailed proposals.

Note: this may be part of a composite condition requiring approval of details of estate roads etc.⁵²

6.8.2 Flexible parking:

The car park shall at all times be managed in such a way that car-borne customers are not prevented from leaving the site to visit nearby premises on foot.

Reason - to encourage short journeys to be made on foot rather than by car, in accordance with Local Plan policy T3.

Note: intended particularly for retail parks; see paragraph 6.6.3.

6.9 Planning obligations

- 6.9.1 Contribution to enable the creation or extension of a Controlled Parking Zone - see [Standard Clause 04](#) – “Financial contribution”.

⁵² See paragraph 10.4.3.

7 Connections between the site and its surroundings

Applicable to:

Proposals having a direct physical impact on existing infrastructure; this may include (for example) a single dwelling which would involve alterations to an access, or for example to a cycle path or bus stop.

Sites with more than one potential access.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy policy CP9.

Local Plan policy T3.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM27.

Residential Design SPD.

7.1 Alterations to existing infrastructure

7.1.1 Development may have a physical impact on existing infrastructure, particularly where access to the development is improved or newly created. Physical works may be necessary:-

- To avoid danger or inconvenience to existing users of the road, or to vehicles or persons entering or leaving the property; measures would include the creation of visibility splays or a priority arrangement for pedestrians and cyclists crossing the access;
- To relocate infrastructure such as a bus stop.

7.1.2 Individual proposals must respect the overall movement strategy for the wider area, both current and as proposed through the Exeter Walking and Cycle Strategies and Exeter Growth Bus Strategy⁵³. Notwithstanding the existence of separate strategies, journeys should be considered seamlessly across modes (eg. crossing the road to reach the bus stop). Proposals must also respect the movement strategy in any applicable Masterplan.⁵⁴ This should be part of the context appraisal required by the Residential Design SPD.⁵⁵

7.1.3 Where the required works are on the application site or within land controlled by the applicant, and off the public highway, a condition will usually suffice; otherwise they will be secured by a planning obligation.

7.2 Connections

7.2.1 Where there is more than one possible access point to the development site, Devon County Council as highway authority may wish to prevent vehicular

⁵³ See paragraph 3.10 of this document.

⁵⁴ See paragraph 3.7 of this document.

⁵⁵ See paragraph 3.6 onwards of the RD SPD.

access at one or more of those points. However, in the interests of keeping walking and cycling distances to [local facilities to](#) a minimum ([see 10.2.6](#)), preferably pedestrian and cycle access should still be provided. As a general rule, this should be the case wherever a site boundary abuts an existing highway or public open space.

7.3 Checklist for applications

- On the application form, complete the section about access and rights of way.
- Provide a plan showing all access points, together with detailed drawings showing all necessary works.
- In the Design and Access Statement, set out the rationale for the access points and associated works.

7.4 Model conditions

7.4.1 On-site works:

*No part of the development hereby approved shall be brought into its intended use until the *[visibility splays, on-site parking, turning, loading and unloading facilities] have been provided in accordance with the requirements of this permission and retained for those purposes at all times.*

Reason: To ensure the safety and convenience of the traffic attracted to the site and other road users.

*Note: *adapt to reflect the actual requirements.*

7.4.2 Restriction on vehicular access:

Prior to occupation of the development, the access to [name of road] shall be closed to motor vehicles in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and shall remain closed at all times thereafter.

Reason: To ensure the safety and convenience of the traffic attracted to the site and other road users.

7.4.3 Provision of pedestrian/cycle access:

Prior to occupation of the development, access for pedestrians and cyclists at the points shown marked on drawing no. [] shall be provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority, and maintained at all times thereafter.

Reason - to encourage travel by sustainable means in accordance with Local Plan policy T3.

7.5 Planning obligations

7.5.1 See [Standard Clause 05](#) – “Highway works”.

8 Travel plans and travel packs

Applicable to:

Proposals putting additional demand on transport infrastructure or services; generally involving more than an individual dwelling or other premises.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially paragraph 8.6(g) and policy CP9.

Local Plan policy T10.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD especially policy DM27(f).

Residential Design SPD.

8.1 Requirements

8.1.1 An effective travel plan can play a significant part in encouraging sustainable travel. The NPPF says that a travel plan should be provided for all developments which generate significant amounts of movement.⁵⁶ Devon County Council's general requirements are as follows:-

- Residential development:-
 - basic travel plan and travel pack (see 8.1.4) – for 20 or more dwellings, or HMO/student accommodation with ten or more rooms;
 - comprehensive travel plan (see 8.1.3) and travel pack – for 50 or more dwellings, or student accommodation with 50 or more rooms;
- Workplaces:-
 - basic travel plan and travel pack – for ten or more staff;
 - comprehensive travel plan and travel pack – for 20 or more staff.
- Schools:-
 - all applications for a new school should include a comprehensive travel plan;
 - all applications to significantly increase the capacity of an existing school should include an upgraded travel plan which reflects any appreciable changes to travel patterns;
 - all applications for additional accommodation should include an update to the travel plan which reflects any changes to travel patterns.

8.1.2 In all such cases, approval of and adherence to a travel plan will be secured by condition.⁵⁷ Although travel plans should be submitted to the City Council for approval, Devon County Council will be consulted, and applicants should

⁵⁶ At paragraph 36.

⁵⁷ See condition in paragraph 8.3.1.

therefore have regard to their requirements, which are included with more general travel planning advice at <http://www.devon.gov.uk/travelplanning>.

- 8.1.3 A comprehensive travel plan is likely to include the provision of vouchers for bus or train tickets for new residents or staff, or towards the cost of bicycles for residents⁵⁸. It may provide for a car club facility in accordance with Chapter 11. It will require employment of a travel plan co-ordinator (although for smaller workplace schemes a member of staff appointed travel plan champion will suffice). A financial contribution to any or all of these measures will need to be secured through a planning obligation. Additional funding may be raised, for example, by charging staff to park on the premises and reinvesting it in travel plan measures.
- 8.1.4 A travel pack should be produced for residents of new development and for workplaces in all cases where a travel plan is required. This will include details of walking and cycling routes, as well as public transport including maps, timetables, and information about ticket offers.⁵⁹ Where applicable, it should also include information about car sharing schemes, car clubs, eco-driving and motorcycle safety. Devon County Council may be able to produce packs for developers upon payment of a financial contribution. In all cases they will need to approve the form and content of the travel pack. They will also be able to advise on making it available in alternative formats.
- 8.1.5 The RD SPD requires a Home User Guide to be produced for all dwellings. In the case of major residential development, this will be secured by a planning obligation, a requirement of which will be that the content of the Guide must be approved by the Council.⁶⁰ Where a travel pack is provided, it should form part of this Guide.

8.2 Checklist for applications

- Include a draft travel plan in appropriate cases.

8.3 Model conditions

8.3.1 Travel plan:

No part of the development shall be occupied until a travel plan (including recommendations and arrangements for monitoring and review) has been submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority^{(a)(b)}. Thereafter the recommendations of the travel plan shall be implemented, monitored and reviewed in accordance with the approved document, or any amended document subsequently approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.^(c)

Reason: to encourage travel by sustainable means, in accordance with Local Plan policy T3.

⁵⁸ Some benefits may be taxable.

⁵⁹ See condition in paragraph 8.3.2.

⁶⁰ Paragraph 9.29 of the RD SPD.

Variations:-

- (a) May need to insert after “Local Planning Authority”: “(who shall both consult with the Local Highway Authority and Highways Agency acting on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport⁶¹)”.
- (b) May need to specify that *“the travel plan shall include as a minimum:-*
- *The identification of targets for trip reduction and modal shift;*
 - *The methods to be employed to meet these targets;*
 - *The mechanisms for monitoring and periodic review;*
 - *The mechanisms for reporting;*
 - *Actions (including payment of financial contributions) in the event that targets are not met;*
 - *The mechanisms for mitigation;*
 - *Implementation of the travel plan to an agreed timescale or timetable and its operation thereafter;*
 - *Mechanisms to secure variations to the travel plan following monitoring and review.”*
- (c) May need to be specific about review, eg: *“A review of the targets shall be undertaken within 6 months of the occupation of the development and on a periodic basis thereafter.”*

8.3.2 Travel pack:

Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, a travel pack shall be provided informing all residents^(a) of [the car free status of the development, and]^(b) walking and cycling routes and facilities, public transport facilities including bus stops, rail stations and timetables, car sharing schemes, car clubs, eco-driving, and motorcycle safety^(c), as appropriate, the form and content of which have previously been approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that all occupants of the development are aware of [its car free status and] the available sustainable travel options.

Variations:-

- (a) Replace “residents” with “staff” etc., as appropriate.
- (b) Include or omit words re car free status, as appropriate.
- (c) Omit those which do not apply.

8.4 Planning obligations

Financial contribution⁶² to cover travel plan measures including any or all of the following:-

- production of travel pack;

⁶¹ Where traffic on a trunk road is affected by the proposal.

⁶² See [Standard Clause 04](#), “Financial contribution”.

- vouchers for discounted bicycle purchase and/or season tickets;
- appointment of travel plan co-ordinator.

9 Off-site improvements

Applicable to:

Proposals putting additional demand on transport infrastructure or services; generally involving more than an individual dwelling or other premises.

Relevant policies:

Local Plan policies especially T3, T5, T6 and T7.

Core Strategy policies CP9 and CP18.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policies DM19, DM27 and DM28(d).

Residential Design SPD.

Planning Obligations SPD.

Site-specific Masterplans.

9.1 Identification of requirements

- 9.1.1 Where improvements to transport networks are necessary to accommodate journeys generated by the development, and to enable and encourage use of sustainable modes for those journeys, the development will be expected to make a financial contribution towards those improvements.
- 9.1.2 The nature and extent of these contributions will be identified through the Transport Assessment process and pre-application discussions, particularly with Devon County Council. DCC generally follows DfT thresholds⁶³ as to when a Transport Assessment is required, although a simple assessment may be required in additional cases to illustrate the impact from a development.
- 9.1.3 Exeter City Council is working towards adopting a CIL Schedule which will indicate what is intended to be funded from the Community Infrastructure Levy. In the meantime, planning obligations fulfil this role, and will continue to play a part in relation to site-specific requirements.
- 9.1.4 Although planning obligations must be directly related to the proposed development, a degree of flexibility will sometimes be necessary as to how transport contributions are spent. This is particularly the case where infrastructure or services are required to support multiple developments, from which contributions will be pooled. It may not be possible to predict the sequence in which those developments will come forward, and that sequence may determine which transport measures should properly be funded by each of the developments.

⁶³ See paragraph 2.3.1.

9.2 Potential need for contributions

9.2.1 Roads – contributions may be required towards the following:-

- Local improvements to mitigate congestion and therefore emissions which would otherwise be exacerbated by traffic from the development.
- Measures to encourage drivers to take one route rather than another, for example using signage or traffic calming, or to compel them to do so by restrictions on particular movements.
- Extensions to Controlled Parking Zones in the circumstances described in paragraph 6.4.1.
- The strategic links referred to in section 12.4.

9.2.2 Park and ride – contributions may be required towards the sites referred to in paragraph 12.2.2. This may be appropriate for development in the city centre and therefore served by park and ride, or where park and ride can play a role in reducing traffic congestion on a radial route which the development will exacerbate.

9.2.3 Rail – contributions may be required towards the following, particularly where the development is in a location close to an existing or proposed station:-

- The new stations and other elements of the Devon Metro proposals referred to in section 12.1.
- Measures which encourage occupiers to travel by train, such as better waiting or information systems.

9.2.4 Bus – contributions may be required towards the following:-

- To enhance or bring a service within walking distance of development, or increase the frequency of an existing service.
- To provide shelters, seats, static or electronic information displays, raised kerbs to assist access by wheelchairs and pushchairs, and/or crossing facilities, all of which have the capacity to make bus travel more attractive.
- To provide bus priority measures which benefit the development

9.2.5 Walking and cycling – contributions may be required towards improving facilities for pedestrians and cyclists in the vicinity of the site, including the creation of links to reduce walking and cycling distances to public transport and other local facilities; also directional signage, lighting, crossing facilities and public cycle parking.

9.2.6 **Community transport** – a contribution may be required, particularly in an area not served by current community transport services⁶⁴, which therefore need to be extended.

9.3 Checklist for applications

- In the Transport Assessment, indicate how the site relates to transport networks, and identify improvements which would enable and encourage use of sustainable modes.

9.4 Planning obligations

9.4.1 See [Standard Clause 04](#) - “Financial contribution”.

⁶⁴ See paragraph 4.1.4.

10 On-site movement networks

Applicable to the following

Developments large enough to have roads and/or paths within the site.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially policy CP9, CP16, CP17 and CP19.

Local Plan policy T2, T3 and T5.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM27.

10.1 Hierarchy of streets

10.1.1 This document adopts the hierarchy used in the Monkerton Masterplan⁶⁵, namely primary, secondary, tertiary and green streets.

- Primary streets will be through routes for all vehicles, therefore carriageway widths will need to take account of large vehicles, including buses, while maintaining a safe and attractive pedestrian and cycle environment.⁶⁶
- Secondary streets will not be designed to encourage through traffic, although they will need to accommodate buses on local services.
- Tertiary streets are not generally through routes, and should be designed as places that prioritise people rather than vehicles.
- Green streets are footpaths and cycleways with no access for motorised traffic.

10.2 The movement framework

10.2.1 The combined effect of the model conditions in section 10.4 is to require a movement framework to be drawn up, including bus routes (where applicable), access for refuse and emergency vehicles, and a pedestrian and cycle network. Ideally this should be an integral part of the application, with as little detail as possible left to be secured by conditions. This should be part of the context and site appraisal process required by the Residential Design SPD.⁶⁷

10.2.2 Devon County Council will be able to advise as to whether a single or multiple vehicular accesses should be provided, and whether any roads on site need to be primary or secondary streets.

10.2.3 In the case of accesses to the site:-

⁶⁵ See link at paragraph 3.7.1 of this document; page 54 of the Masterplan.

⁶⁶ Paragraph 5.11 of the RD SPD.

⁶⁷ Paragraphs 3.5 onwards of the RD SPD.

- DCC will be able to advise whether or not vehicular accesses need to be signal controlled.
- If so, push button facilities should usually be provided for pedestrians, which should include toucan facilities for cyclists where cycleways are present. Inconvenience to users of existing pedestrian and cycle routes should be minimised, and existing and potential desire lines should be catered for.
- Wherever the site boundary abuts an existing highway or public open space, pedestrian and cycle access should be provided, even if there is no vehicular access. Where an adjoining site may be developed in future, footpath/cycleways should be built up to the boundary to enable a connection to be made in at a later date.

10.2.4 DCC's Transport Co-ordination Service will also be able to advise which primary or secondary streets (if any) need to accommodate buses:-

- A new service will inevitably require pump-priming through developer contributions, and a diversion from or extension to an existing route is likely to be more cost effective than a completely new service.
- The roads concerned should be designed to allow buses to manoeuvre, particularly at junctions and corners, without encroaching on kerbs or the opposing carriageway, although this has to be balanced with the need to keep down the speed of all vehicles and make it easy for pedestrians to cross. Routes should be reasonably direct.
- DCC will also be able to advise as to the location of the bus stops which (together with lay-bys, shelters, seats and information systems where appropriate) will need to be provided by the developer.
- If shelters are sourced from the Councils' usual supplier and included in its city-wide contract, it should be possible for the developer to be relieved of maintenance responsibility on payment of a commuted sum.

10.2.5 Phasing is important on a larger development site. Areas nearest to existing transport infrastructure should be developed first⁶⁸, so that, for example, the new dwellings or workplaces (depending on the type of development) can be served by existing bus services. Only when occupancy of the development reaches a certain critical mass will it become worth diverting a bus service through the site, and even then it will require a pump-priming contribution from the developer. Developing a site from the "wrong" end can make it difficult or impossible to provide public transport.

⁶⁸ This is consistent with NPPF paragraph 17 – Core Planning Principles, the penultimate of which is to actively manage patterns of growth in this way; also paragraph 30.

10.2.6 With access points defined and the primary and secondary streets identified, a pedestrian and cycle network should be devised across the whole site, [in conjunction with connections beyond its boundaries](#)⁶⁹, to minimise walking and cycling distances, [especially between homes and local facilities, schools, parks, bus stops and rail stations](#):-

- All roads should provide safe and attractive routes for pedestrians and cyclists; therefore primary and secondary streets should include segregated footways and cycleways, plus safe and convenient crossing points.
- Subject to the need to accommodate buses⁷⁰ and other large vehicles, junction radii should be minimised in order to slow down turning vehicles, and pedestrians and cyclists should be given priority across side turnings where possible.
- On quiet residential roads, pedestrians and cyclists should be accommodated on the carriageway,⁷¹ and the RD SPD advocates use of Home Zones wherever possible⁷².
- Culs de sac are discouraged as inhibiting connectivity,⁷³ but if they are included, there should be through routes for pedestrians and cyclists which are overlooked and therefore secure.⁷⁴

10.2.7 Public spaces must include paths which support desire lines between key destinations.⁷⁵

- Green streets are particularly appropriate for key walking and cycling routes and links, where there is no direct connection by road.
 - They (and all footpath links) should always be designed to accommodate not just pedestrians, but also cyclists, pushchairs, [and the needs of all disabled users in accordance with paragraph 4.1.1.](#)
 - They should be at least 3 metres wide, step-free [or with a step-free alternative](#) (including drop kerbs on desire lines), and free from obstructions such as barriers or railings. Where there is a need to slow users, this should be achieved by other design features (such as alignment) wherever possible.⁷⁶

⁶⁹ [See Chapter 7.](#)

⁷⁰ [See paragraph 10.2.4 of this SPD.](#)

⁷¹ Paragraph 10.16 of the RD SPD.

⁷² Paragraph 6.26 of the RD SPD.

⁷³ Paragraph 5.8 of the RD SPD.

⁷⁴ This will assist compliance with the accessibility criteria in Local Plan policy T2, and NPPF paragraph 38 which says that key facilities should be located within walking distance of most properties.

⁷⁵ Paragraph 10.16 of the RD SPD.

⁷⁶ Paragraph 10.52 of the RD SPD.

10.2.8 If they do not become part of the highway network, arrangements need to be put in place to ensure that they are maintained to a high standard, including keeping adjoining plant growth under control.⁷⁷

10.2.9 Use of signs and bollards purely to demarcate different transport modes should be avoided;⁷⁸ however:-

- Directional signage should be used to maximise use of strategic pedestrian and cycle routes.
- Signs should be consistent with other pedestrian and cycle signage in the area, and designed so as to preserve or enhance the townscape.

10.2.10 Routes should generally be well and consistently lit using light sources with a good colour rendering ability (e.g. white light sources).⁷⁹ In some cases it may not be appropriate for a route to be lit (such as where, for example, a route has a rural character), but in such cases an alternative signed route, which is well lit and overlooked, should be created to provide a safe and convenient alternative during hours of darkness.

10.2.11 Although much of the above is taken from the RD SPD, for the most part it is equally relevant to uses other than residential development. In the past, employment estates have been developed in a piecemeal manner, with little thought to the possibility of access by any means other than the car. Even where retail units occur within such estates, they tend to be designed in small self-contained areas, with little thought as to how people might walk between one and another, or to a bus stop or railway station. And yet provision of safe and pleasant facilities for pedestrians and cyclists is particularly important in an environment dominated by heavy goods vehicles.

10.3 Checklist for applications

- Include a drawing showing movement hierarchy including bus routes and comprehensive pedestrian and cycle networks.
- Include a phasing plan where the size of the development justifies it.
- In the Design and Access Statement, explain the rationale behind these networks and phasing.

10.4 Model conditions

10.4.1 Pedestrian and cycle routes:

⁷⁷ For appropriate planning obligation see [Standard Clause 08](#), "Management Company"; see also model condition at 10.4.1.

⁷⁸ Paragraph 10.16 of the RD SPD.

⁷⁹ Paragraph 10.18, 10.59 of the RD SPD.

[Prior to commencement of the development][As part of the first application for approval of reserved matters], a detailed scheme for the pedestrian and cycle network shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:-

(a) details of routes, road crossings, [bridges,] surface treatments, lighting, street furniture and signage;

(b) a programme for implementation synchronised with the progressive occupation of the development; and

(c) such temporary measures as are necessary (such as ramps where routes cross unfinished roads) to ensure the routes are fully usable during the construction period.

The approved scheme shall be adhered to at all times, including (where applicable) any amendments subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The routes provided in accordance with this condition shall be maintained at all times thereafter, including keeping them free from vegetation, unless or until they become maintainable at public expense.

Reason - to ensure that the pedestrian and cycle routes are provided, to encourage travel by sustainable means in accordance with policy T3.

Note: Alternative introductory versions are for detailed and outline applications respectively. Where routes and certain other details are already adequately shown on a drawing, replace the initial paragraph with the following:-

"Prior to occupation of the development hereby permitted, the pedestrian and cycle routes shown on drawing number ... shall be provided in accordance with details previously submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. Those details shall include:-"

Continue with (a), (b) etc as above, omitting reference to details already shown.

10.4.2 Bus routes and facilities

[Prior to commencement of the development][As part of the first application for approval of reserved matters], a scheme for on-site bus routes shall be submitted to and approved in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The scheme shall include:-

*(a) details of routes, *[turning arrangements, and stops (including bays, shelters, seats, and static and electronic signage)];*

(b) a programme for implementation synchronised with the progressive occupation of the development, road adoption programme, and/or applicable funding;

(c) any temporary arrangements during the construction period.

The approved scheme shall be adhered to at all times, including (where applicable) any amendments subsequently agreed in writing by the Local Planning Authority. The facilities provided in accordance with this condition shall be maintained at all times thereafter, unless or until they become maintainable by or on behalf of a public authority.

**delete any elements which are not applicable.*

Reason - to ensure that suitable bus routes and stops are provided, to enable and encourage use of public transport in accordance with policy T3.

Note: Alternative introductory versions are for detailed and outline applications respectively.

10.4.3 Roads and other infrastructure:

The proposed estate roads, footways, footpaths, verges, junctions, street lighting, sewers, drains, retaining walls, service routes, surface water outfall, road maintenance/vehicle overhang margins, embankments, visibility splays, accesses, car parking and street furniture shall be constructed and laid out in accordance with details to be approved by the Local Planning Authority in writing before their construction begins. For this purpose, plans and sections indicating, as appropriate, the design, layout, levels, gradients, materials and method of construction shall be submitted to the Local Planning Authority.

Reason: To ensure that adequate information is available for the proper consideration of the detailed proposals.

10.4.4 Phasing:

[Prior to commencement of the development][As part of the first application for approval of reserved matters], a detailed phasing plan shall be submitted to, and approved in writing by, the Local Planning Authority. The phasing plan shall specify the proposed timing for the delivery of the areas of public open space/green infrastructure as well as the construction programme for the housing and other built elements of the development.

Reason: To ensure that the development proceeds in accordance with an agreed programme of delivery, that areas closest to existing transport services are developed first, and that within individual phases the open space associated with the development is co-ordinated with the construction of the houses which it will serve.

Note: Alternative introductory versions are for detailed and outline applications respectively.

10.5 Planning obligations

10.5.1 A planning obligation may be required to secure financial contributions:-

- To pump-prime a bus service.
- For provision and maintenance of bus shelters.

See [Standard Clause 04](#), "Financial contribution".

10.5.2 A planning obligation may also be required to ensure the formation of a management company to maintain unadopted paths. See [Standard Clause 08](#), "Management Company".

11 Car clubs

Applicable to the following

Car free developments.

Larger developments, as part of a package of travel plan measures to reduce car use.

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy especially policy CP9.

Local Plan policy T3 and H2.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM27(f) and DM28(d).

11.1 Rationale

11.1.1 Policy H2 of the Exeter Local Plan First Review refers to a City Centre Core Area (where shopping, employment and other facilities are within easy walking distance), within which car free developments will be permitted (with disabled persons' and cycle parking and space for deliveries). Paragraph 4.8 states that such schemes will be considered on their merits, occupiers will be excluded from residents' parking schemes, and a contribution will be sought towards the enhancement of facilities for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians. A contribution to a car club is deemed to comply equally with the objectives of paragraph 4.8.⁸⁰

11.1.2 Similar considerations may apply to justify a car free development in other locations well served by public transport. In addition, car clubs also have a role to play as part of the overall package of transport measures required for the larger development areas such as Newcourt, Monkerton/Hill Barton, and Alphington/Marsh Barton, even though these will not be car free developments. The advent of smart card technology brings the potential for links to bike hire schemes, bus tickets, etc, and developers should consider whether this type of sustainable transport package is appropriate when drawing up their travel plans.

11.1.3 A car club may also be an element of a workplace travel plan, with an employer making a financial contribution to set up or expand a car club, so that employees can take out corporate membership for work-related journeys. Well-placed car club vehicles may cater for work use during weekdays, and domestic use during evenings and at weekends.

⁸⁰ Consistent with NPPF paragraph 39 which says that if parking standards are set they should take into account, among other things, the accessibility of the development, the availability of and opportunities for public transport, and local car ownership levels.

11.2 Requirements

11.2.1 Larger car club schemes are likely to be more successful since they can offer a choice of vehicle types and better availability; therefore the preferred approach is as follows:-

- A financial contribution enables extension of an existing car club.
- Parking for car club cars is provided on the highway, to raise their profile and so they are not seen as “exclusive” to a particular development. A suitable security arrangement such as key safe or smart card will need to be put in place.

11.2.2 The financial contribution may be part of a larger, flexible contribution to sustainable transport measures. However, it should include:-

- a capital contribution to fund one or more vehicles;
- a contribution to the car club operator's costs;
- a year's introductory membership for each household;
- the cost of the traffic order, signing and lining associated with the parking space.

11.2.3 The first two elements should be calculated in accordance with Table 5. All payments will be index linked to the RPI from January 2013 to the date of actual payment. Payments will be required before the occupation of 25% of the dwellings.

11.2.4 Details of the location will need to be submitted to and agreed in writing by the Council. In the case of off street parking, approval will also be required in respect of the dimensions, surfacing, lighting, signing, any CCTV and key safe or smart card arrangement. Spaces should be within five minutes (500 metres) walk of the property. Design of car parking facilities should take account of the needs of persons with disabilities. The ownership of off street spaces should pass to the Council to lease to the nominated car club provider.

Table 5 – Calculation of car club contributions

	Car free city centre site of up to 45 dwellings	Major development area, per <u>200 to 250 dwellings (or 2000m² of B1 offices)</u>
Capital cost		<u>15,000</u>
Purchase / installation of in-car telematics		<u>2,000</u>
Contribution to the car club		6,325

operator's costs (assume £2,530 in first year decreasing by 25% a year as scheme becomes viable)		
Subtotal	<u>23,325</u>	
Cost per dwelling	/45 <u>518</u>	/250 <u>93</u>
Add introductory subscription (£50 per dwelling)	(household membership per dwelling, for one year) <u>50</u>	(household membership per dwelling, for one year) <u>50</u>
Total per dwelling	<u>568</u>	<u>143</u>
Plus:		
Cost of Traffic Regulation Order: from £1500 per order		
Cost of road markings and signage: from £1500 per vehicle		

[11.2.5](#) A rate of one car per 200 to 250 dwellings is assumed for major development areas which are not car free. A Class B1 office development of more than 2000m² would also support a car on this basis.⁸²

11.3 Checklist for applications

- Include details in draft travel plan.

11.4 Planning obligations

11.4.1 See [Standard Clause 06](#) - "Reserved Car Scheme".

⁸² See 11.1.3 for the potential for "mixed use" car clubs.

12 Significant transport proposals

Relevant policies:

Core Strategy policies CP9, CP18 and CP19.

Local Plan policy T6, T7, T14, KP3, KP6 and KP8.

Emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD policy DM20, DM26 and DM27.

12.1 Rail proposals

- 12.1.1 Devon County Council's "Devon Metro" proposals⁸³ include new stations at Newcourt and Marsh Barton, as well as longer trains, particularly in the peaks.
- 12.1.2 In the longer term a station is proposed at Hill Barton to serve the Monkerton area, and increased frequencies, although these will require additional investment in passing facilities and signalling.

12.2 Park and Ride

- 12.2.1 Exeter benefits from a successful park and ride network, although there is an imbalance in provision, with no sites on the western side, and the Matford site is operating at capacity.
- 12.2.2 To address this, a planning application has been made for a new site at the Alphington/Ide interchange on the A30. Possibilities for supplementing or replacing the Matford site, probably in Teignbridge District, are being considered as part of emerging strategic allocations to the south west of the city.

12.3 Buses

- 12.3.1 Proposals are being worked up for redevelopment of the area including the bus and coach station and bus depot. These proposals will need to include the provision on site of a **high quality** replacement bus and coach station, of sufficient capacity to meet Exeter's current and future needs, and well located and accessible in relation to the city centre and other public transport services. A replacement bus depot site will also need to form part of these proposals.
- 12.3.2 The [Exeter Growth Bus Strategy](#) identifies additional and extended services and additional frequencies that will be required to serve new housing and employment growth. These include a high quality service (labelled "enhanced public transport") between Cranbrook, Monkerton, the city centre and Matford with priority measures to assist speed and timekeeping.

⁸³ See <http://www.devon.gov.uk/eldf-devonmetroappraisal.pdf>.

12.4 Roads

- 12.4.1 Three routes are proposed to be safeguarded for roads through the emerging Site Allocations and Development Management DPD⁸⁴.
- 12.4.2 The first is a link with an improved crossing of the M5 at Tithebarn Lane, westwards to Cumberland Way (with the potential for future provision of a bus lane on the approach to the junction), and onward to provide a bus-only link to Pinhoe Road. This will form part of the enhanced public transport route referred to in paragraph 12.3.2.
- 12.4.3 The second is a link northwards from Exhibition Way, Pinhoe, to provide a connection to the former Ibstock Brickworks site and beyond.
- 12.4.4 The third is a link road through the Water Lane area of Haven Banks/Marsh Barton, which may be required in the longer term, in particular to serve the Matford leg of the enhanced public transport route.

⁸⁴ See draft policy DM26.

Appendix A - Glossary of Acronyms

<u>AQAP</u>	<u>Air Quality Action Plan</u>
AQMA	Air Quality Management Area
CIL	Community Infrastructure Levy – a statutory levy on development, to provide for infrastructure
DCC	Devon County Council
DfT	Department for Transport
DPD	Development Plan Document – a component of the LDF
GI	Green Infrastructure
LDF	Local Development Framework – a suite of local planning policy documents, to replace the Local Plan
LTP3	Local Transport Plan adopted by DCC in 2011
NPPF	National Planning Policy Framework
RD SPD	Residential Design Supplementary Planning Document (produced by Exeter City Council)
RPZ	Residents' Parking Zone
SPD	Supplementary Planning Document – a component of the LDF
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance – amplifies policies in the Local Plan