

4.5 THEME 5: A CITY WITH A MODERN AND SUSTAINABLE TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

Image walking

4.5.1 Vision and Objectives

4.171

Vision

Durham City will have Providing sustainable transport access to economic, educational, training, cultural and social opportunities for all, thereby enabling a swifter transition to a healthier environment and a low-carbon future.

4.172

Objectives

1. To ensure that new developments are Our Neighbourhood is well-served by sustainable transport;
2. To make transport travel healthier and safer for all;
3. To improve the integration of public transport services;
4. To avoid unnecessary travel resulting from new development;
5. To reduce vehicle exhaust emissions in order to meet climate change commitments and national air quality objectives;
6. To create pleasant and healthy streets, public places and areas of natural environment.

Note: No. 4 removed as it is covered by Theme 1. No. 3 removed as no direct policy to achieve this. No. 5 removed as covered partly by 2 and will come about through objective 1.

4.5.2 Context

4.173 Decisions on transport policy, proposals and investments are crucial in achieving a more sustainable future. Thus it is timely that the 'Durham City Sustainable Transport Strategy Delivery Plan' (STS STDP) for Durham City for the period 2015 2018 to 2030 has been produced by Durham County Council (2016g) and, indeed, the issues and opportunities identified (p.9 to 14; Durham County Council, 2015b) are the starting point for our Neighbourhood Plan, which emphasises the role of new development in helping to deliver sustainable modes of transport appropriate to the special character of Durham City.

4.174 The context provided by the Sustainable Transport Strategy Delivery Plan can be summarised as follows: below and influences, but does not necessarily determine, the policies.

- **Highways:** the need to maintain the highway network remains of crucial importance for all forms of movement, but the need to keep motor traffic flowing freely must not continue to take precedence over the needs of other users. The A690 through the city is a barrier to pedestrians and cyclists, and vehicle emissions have an impact on the health of local people. The Sustainable Transport Strategy concludes that the building of a Northern relief road would tackle these problems by removing up to 30% of the 48,000 vehicles per day that use Milburngate Bridge. With traffic volumes over the Milburngate Bridge in decline over the last 16 years, our Neighbourhood Plan considers it unwise to invest heavily in constructing new roads before seeking to meet travel needs by improving alternatives to car use. The building of relief roads is beyond the remit of our Neighbourhood Plan as their proposed locations fall outside Our Neighbourhood, but it is nevertheless a decision that could entrench the dependence of the city on the use of the car.
- **Walking and cycling:** in Durham City, where 35% 36% of people walked to work (in 2011), improvements to the pedestrian networks are a high priority. Addressing footway congestion on routes to the University, dealing with safety issues, including conflict with cyclists, wheelchair users and motor vehicles, and improving crossings at major junctions are among the interventions which could help walking reach its full potential. Cycling accounts for a low percentage of travel currently. City centre routes are complex and incoherent, there is little continuous cycling infrastructure, and no high quality routes to Durham University from the city centre. Round the outskirts there are many busy junctions with no provision for cyclists. There is a significant opportunity for improvement. The lack of protected space on main roads and an incoherent network mean that most people do not consider cycling to be safe enough for them or for their children, but if this is addressed cycling has great potential in a small city like Durham. The Government's commitment to a national Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy through the 'Infrastructure Act 2015' (UK Parliament, 2015, section 21) presents a new determination to secure greater investment in the future.
- **Public transport:** the Sustainable Transport Strategy Delivery Plan identifies issues which prevent the City from realising its full potential including too many services terminating in the City centre making many journeys inconvenient, the poor quality of bus stops and bus station, and poor connectivity to Durham railway station. Congestion affects bus reliability and journey times. The Park and Ride service and other bus services do not run late enough into the evening for some users, and the Park and Ride requires a subsidy despite its popularity. While national rail connections are very good, train services to local settlements are limited. There was support for upgrading the bus station on the current site as part of regenerating North Road in the Forum's priority survey (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2015). Durham County Council's most recent consultation on its proposals for a new bus station was carried out in the autumn of 2016. The Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum submitted views which questioned the desirability of the proposals. The case for building an £8 million bus

station in a new location is unconvincing. There are fundamental objections to its location, orientation, scale and materials and in particular the relationship of the building to its surroundings. It has proved to be impossible to satisfactorily integrate a building and its operating area of such a scale and nature into the sensitive and limited site chosen for it. It is therefore contrary to the intentions of heritage Policy H2 in respect of new buildings. There would also appear to be serious and unresolved traffic circulation and pedestrian and cycling problems arising from the proposal. The County Council has developed, costed and consulted on its scheme without providing equivalent assessments for improving the bus station on its existing site and therefore no conclusions can reliably be made of other courses of action. The view of the Forum is that an improved bus station on its existing site is likely to be less costly, less intrusive, more convenient and more popular than the current proposal.

- **Parking:** the Sustainable Transport Strategy highlights the extensive provision of free car parking at major employment sites across the City, which might discourage the uptake of sustainable transport modes. The STS STDP presents somewhat simplified conclusions on parking by in comparison with the full Durham Sustainable Transport Plan Issues and Opportunities Report (Durham County Council, 2015b) which better reflected the diversity of opinion on this issue. In particular there are concerns about the continued economic viability of city centre retail which could be alleviated by better management of car parking.

4.175 The A fuller treatment of the transport context and details of facilities are is given in section E5 of Appendix E. A number of the projects proposed in Chaper ??? deal with aspects of transport provision which cannot be addressed by the policies of the plan. These include the need to upgrade the bus station, which was mentioned frequently during public consultation on the plan. [Wording to be finalised along with projects.]

4.5.3 Justification

4.176 This justification refers to the Transport theme as a whole. Additional, specific justification for each transport policy is given with the policy itself.

4.177 There is a limit to what our Neighbourhood Plan can achieve with respect to transport, especially when so many people travel to, or through, Our Neighbourhood from other areas. The maintenance and upgrading of the road network is adequately covered by policies that apply across County Durham for assessing the transport impacts of developments. Thus the policies in our Neighbourhood Plan focus on where value can be added, particularly dealing with shorter journeys by walking and cycling, access to bus services, and the design of our streets. Car and cycle parking is also covered, to promote effective use of housing land.

4.178 The main justification for prioritising sustainable modes of transport in our Neighbourhood Plan is the County Council's recognition of the need to deal with

competition for road space in its adoption in the Sustainable Transport **Strategy Delivery Plan** of the hierarchy set out in the Department for Transport (2007) 'Manual for Streets'. This accords with the core planning principles of the National Planning Policy Framework (para 17, point 11) to “actively manage patterns of growth to make fullest possible use of public transport, walking and cycling”. The Council's earlier '**Transport Strategy**' (Durham County Council, 2011b) is also supportive of sustainability. This Local Transport Plan is for the period 2011 onwards and covers the whole of Durham County, with Durham City as a section within this. It is organised under 6 themes, including: Reduce our carbon footprint; Safer and healthier travel; Better accessibility to services; Improve quality of life and a healthy natural environment; Maintain the transport asset.

4.179 The national 'Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy' (Department for Transport, 2017) aims to make cycling and walking the natural choices for shorter journeys, or as part of a longer journey. Its 2020 objectives are to: increase cycling activity, increase walking activity, reduce the rate of cyclists killed or seriously injured on England's roads, increase the percentage of children aged 5 to 10 that usually walk to school. It recognises that insufficient investment has been put into cycling and walking and notes that "walking and cycling should be seen as transport modes in their own right and an integral part of the transport network, rather than as niche interests or town-planning afterthoughts". (p.7)

4.180 Therefore, to meet expectations for a more sustainable city with a modern transport infrastructure, investment in future transport needs will be according to this user hierarchy:

1. Walking;
2. Cycling;
3. Public transport;
4. Specialist services, e.g. emergency vehicles, waste collection;
5. Other motor traffic.

4.181 The second justification can be found in the Forum's surveys of the views of local people and of young people in the city (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2015, 2016a) which reveal a variety of opinions on the transport issues facing us. People appreciate the pedestrianised areas, the compact size of the city and the public transport links, but many raised the poor pedestrian environment, traffic congestion, and parking as issues. The Park and Ride service is valued, but could also be much improved. People would like traffic management and the road system improved, including the pedestrian environment and safe routes for cycling. The Sustainable Communities Strategy for County Durham 2014-2030 (County Durham Partnership, 2014) has the theme 'Altogether safer' including the aim of reducing road casualties.

4.182 There were views also on the need to address climate change, air quality, congestion, and active travel (walking and cycling) to bring health benefits. Active travel suggestions included proposals for network improvements that were needed including specific paths to be improved by better surfaces or lighting. Ideas to improve walking were also gathered at the Eco-Festival held at St John's, Neville's Cross, in June 2016 and evidence on cycling needs was gathered via a meeting of local cyclists (Durham City

Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2016b) and these findings have been updated in the light of responses to the public consultation.

4.183 A further justification for a sustainable transport approach is to be found in the 'County Durham Climate Change Strategy' (County Durham Environment Partnership, 2015b, p.17)

County Durham will aim to reduce CO2 emissions from transport, through the promotion of travel choices and alternatives to private car travel, ultra-low carbon vehicles, walking, cycling and more integrated travel planning.

4.184 As pointed out in the strategy, 23% of CO2 emissions come from the transport sector. Nationally over a third of journeys under two miles, and 55% of journeys under five miles are made by car or van. If people are given more transport options, through improving public transport and the pedestrian and cycling environment, big reductions in emissions and congestion could be achieved. But it is also important to encourage the use of electric vehicles and cleaner, fuel-efficient cars among those who still need to use cars for their daily travel, particularly as an Air Quality Management Area runs through the centre of Our Neighbourhood. Developments which would normally fall below the threshold for requiring a Transport Statement or a Transport Assessment may be required to provide this analysis if the site falls within or is close to the AQMA. This may also lead to transport improvements being required as mitigation. (EQ41, Q57, Q58, Q65, Q73, WC49, WC163) Air quality is covered in detail in section 4.1.3 of our Plan.

4.185 The Durham City Regeneration Masterplan (Durham County Council, 2014c) and its update (Durham County Council, 2016f) have a number of implementation projects and actions relevant to transport in Our Neighbourhood (a subset of the Durham City area covered by the Masterplan): i.e. Modern infrastructure - new relief roads (outside Our Neighbourhood) are proposed. In addition, there are projects to improve the bus station, cycle and pedestrian routes, and junctions on the A690. The Masterplan update notes what has been delivered and outlines key future activities. Completed projects include the refurbishment of most of the road and pavements in North Road, cycle path provision to the railway station, and preparations for installation of a SCOOT system at the traffic lights on the Gilesgate and Leazes Bowl roundabouts. However, our Plan can only address issues within Our Neighbourhood and consider ways to encourage cycling and walking and the use of public transport.

4.186 A number of saved policies of the City of Durham Local Plan which are relevant to transport (City of Durham Council, 2004; Durham County Council, 2015a: T4,13,19,21; Q2,8) and these policies have been incorporated into the policies below.

4.5.4 Planning Policies and Proposals for Land Use

4.187

- Policy T1: Accessibility of Proposed Developments Sustainable transport accessibility and design

- Policy T2: Designing for Sustainable Transport
- Policy T3 T2: Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)
- Policy T4 T3: Residential Storage for Cycles and Mobility Aids

Image signposts

New policy combining former T1 and T2.

Aim is to reduce duplication between T1 and T2.

Policy T1: Sustainable transport accessibility and design

Development proposals will be required to demonstrate best practice in respect of sustainable transport accessibility and design.

Accessibility

T1.1: Approach routes to the site, and access within the development should be accessible to all, giving the highest priority to walking, then cycling and public transport, and should meet the travel needs of people with mobility impairments.

Impact

T1.2: Adverse transport impacts, including additional circulation and parking space for private motor vehicles, should be minimised.

T1.3: To mitigate adverse impacts, proposals should be made to improve access by walking, cycling and public transport in the area around the development, and thereby contribute to modal shift towards sustainable transport.

Design

T1.4: By following best practice, new access roads and residential streets, and alterations to existing ones, will include:

1. safe, direct and continuous routes for walking, cycling and public transport users to, from and within the site; and
2. measures to minimise car traffic, exclude through-routes for motor vehicles, and to discourage vehicle speeds exceeding 20mph; and
3. a family-friendly environment in a high quality public realm, with opportunities for play in residential streets, and a safe environment at day and night.

The Planning Authority will give pre-application advice on the level of assessment required, which might be a full Transport Assessment, a Transport Statement, or a statement of accessibility within a Design and Access Statement. Durham County Council's thresholds based on the scale of a development proposal are published in the 'Planning Validation Requirements' (Durham County Council, 2017) and are drawn from the national 'Guidance on Transport Assessment' (TSO, 2007). It should be noted that full Transport Assessments may be required for sites falling below the guideline thresholds if a development is proposed within or adjacent to the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA)

or if local transport infrastructure is judged to be inadequate. The Guidance on Transport Assessment (Appendix B, p. 49) indicates that this should apply where there are substandard roads, poor pedestrian or cyclist facilities or inadequate public transport provisions. With respect to pedestrian and cyclist facilities, the context maps (Appendix X) and detailed paper produced by the Neighbourhood Planning Forum (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2016b) should be used to help identify inadequate facilities. Over time this evidence base may be revised by the City of Durham Parish Council or in the course of production of the Durham City LCWIP (Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan).

Paragraph 4.14 of the Guidance on Transport Assessment stipulates that “an assessment should be made of the available capacity of the existing cycleway and footpath network in the area of the development” using “appropriate analytical tools and methodologies”. This assessment should inform the development of any Travel Plan, the assessment of modal split, and should indicate any enhancements to the local cycleway and footpath network that may be required. Objective 1 of the 'County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018-2028: Action Plan 2018-2023' (Durham County Council, 2018xxx) sets out a range of audit tools which are considered suitable, including Appendices B and C of 'Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013' (Welsh Government, 2014).

It will not be acceptable for Transport Assessments and Transport Statements merely to illustrate the potential walking and cycling catchment areas for a development. The current conditions and deficiencies in the networks are material considerations which must be included in the analysis.

4.192 Potential will often exist for development proposals to encourage accessibility by foot, cycle or public transport through the provision of off-site improvements. Funding to remedy deficiencies in the transport network, or to provide capacity enhancement, may be sought via planning obligations. Improvements may include, but should not be limited to, the following measures:

1. widening footways and improving road crossings; or
2. providing cycle infrastructure, and addressing conflict with pedestrians; or
3. improving accessibility for those using wheelchairs and mobility aids, for example by provision of at-grade crossings or dropped kerbs;
4. improving the lighting, surface or drainage of footpaths, with solutions that respect their urban or rural nature; or
5. contributing towards construction of new public transport infrastructure; or
6. subsidising public transport services for a number of years until they are viable.

In all cases, solutions should respect the urban or rural context of the routes being adapted.

4.199 Current best practice, in terms of design, can be found in the 'Design Guidance: Active Travel' (Welsh Government, 2014), which is one of the design guides mandated by the County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan (Durham County Council, 2018xxx). It is currently the most comprehensive and up to date walking and cycling design guide to have received approval through a UK legislative process, and is in accord

with UK highways practices. It gathers in one document best practice from earlier publications such as the 'Manual for Streets' (Department for Transport, 2007), 'Inclusive Mobility' (Department for Transport, 2005), and 'Cycle Infrastructure Design' (Department for Transport, 2008). Designing walking and cycling infrastructure in accordance with this, or similar, guidance will enable the fullest uptake of walking and cycling in Our Neighbourhood. The guidance should be applied to all types of roads and off-road routes so that a network of consistently high quality can be developed.

4.197 The 'Design Guidance: Active Travel' (Welsh Government, 2014) covers topics such as surfaces, lighting, the need for seating, for managing street clutter, and for good maintenance, along with advice on determining how pedestrian and cyclist priority at side roads should be handled, when separated cycling infrastructure is appropriate, and facilities at bus stops. A full range of design elements is provided, which embody best practice, including minimum dimensions. Highly congested pavements are a particular problem in Durham. Objective techniques for assessing footway capacity are provided (para. 4.7.5, page 38) which will determine what level of enhancement is required.

An important consideration in Our Neighbourhood, which came through strongly during the public consultation, is the need to separate pedestrian and cycle facilities. This is in part prompted by the poor design of existing routes, which are noted on the evidence maps, exacerbated by the potential for high speeds obtained by cyclists travelling downhill. Section 6.11 (pages 117-120) of the 'Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013' gives detailed advice on segregation of pedestrian and cycle routes, and lists factors that should be used to determine the best design solution. The gradient of the route is an important factor to consider within Our Neighbourhood. (Q42, Q56, Q68, Q74, EM7, EM14, WC99, WC113, L5)

4.194 As transport is a key issue in Durham City, travel plans and transport assessments accompanying development proposals should incorporate local detail, rather than being desk-based exercises. Developers and their consultants are encouraged to engage from the outset with local groups such as the Durham City Cycle Forum (a focus group convened by the County Council), Durham City Access for All Group, and other relevant bodies. Paragraph 128 of the NPPF states that "applications that can demonstrate early, proactive and effective engagement with the community should be looked on more favourably than those that cannot". Applications should include walking and cycling provision in the design brief at the inception of the design process, as recommended by CIHT (Response to the Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy Review, Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation, June 2018, paragraphs 4-10).

4.193 In assessing the transport impacts of a development, a holistic view is required if the application forms part of a larger development zone, or part of a larger estate in the city. For example, car parking levels provided across the zone or estate should be compared to the prevailing car parking policy, and a commitment made to reduce any excess provision which is not justified.

Justification

As acknowledged in the 'Durham City Sustainable Transport **Strategy Delivery Plan**' (Durham County Council, 2016g 2018xxx, p.7), the relatively small, compact nature of the city suits the promotion of sustainable modes of travel, and thus higher standards and a stronger emphasis on good design are required in Our Neighbourhood. **The NPPF (para. 58) indicates that neighbourhood plans should develop policies relating to design quality, including policies aiming to optimise the potential of development sites to support local transport networks.** Regarding land use planning, the Sustainable Transport **Strategy Delivery Plan** (p. 19-20 33) recommends the highest possible design standards should be applied to **the design of development sites and of to access on foot, by cycle and by public transport.** **Section 12 of the NPPF sets out how to achieve well-designed places, particularly emphasising that local and neighbourhood plans should set out a clear design vision, including recommending design guides. These provide clarity to developers at the earliest stage of the design process.** To meet climate change commitments, and to build a healthier, more liveable environment, a sustained shift towards sustainable transport modes will be required, and new developments present an opportunity to increase the proportion of sustainable transport journeys over the average in the local area.

Policy T1: Accessibility of Proposed Developments

T1.1: Proposals for new development will be required, where applicable, to:

1. demonstrate that any new or altered infrastructure favours sustainable transport; and
2. meet the mobility needs of all including the special needs of people with disabilities.

T1.2: For larger developments, which require a transport statement or transport assessment to be completed, development proposals will be required to:

1. apply the transport user hierarchy above to minimise adverse transport impacts and avoid the need for additional motor vehicle capacity; and
2. contribute to modal shift towards sustainable transport; and
3. demonstrate convenient public transport access to the whole development, with bus stops being available within 400 metres' walk; and
4. provide high quality routes which prioritise foot and cycle traffic within the site, are direct and continuous and segregated from other road users, directly linked to external foot and cycle networks, giving good connections to local services, amenities and public transport.

T1.3: Assessment of accessibility: Where a Transport Assessment is required to be submitted the accessibility of the proposed development by walking, cycling and public transport should be assessed thoroughly, with the object of identifying any constraints on access and any measures, on or off site, which would reduce generated motor traffic or improve the conditions for sustainable transport.

4.188 Transport statements and assessments should examine the feasibility of typical journeys associated with the site. For example, for residential developments the assessment should look at routes to general food shops, community facilities including healthcare, and schools. For student accommodation, routes to the appropriate university or college buildings would also be assessed. For retail and business premises consideration should be given to deliveries, and journeys by employees and customers.

4.189 The quality of walking and cycling routes to and from the development should be assessed through applying objective techniques such as the walking and cycling audit tools found in Appendices B and C of 'Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013' (Welsh Government, 2014), as adopted for infrastructure audits by Durham County Council's sustainable transport team. It will not be acceptable to describe the walking or cycling catchment area by taking a radius without evaluating the quality or utility of the travel networks. Highways England (2016) interim advice note gives requirements and advice on designing for cycle traffic for the Strategic Road Network (SRN), i.e. roads managed by the Highways England. Its purpose is to ensure that SRN infrastructure facilitates the convenient and safe movement of cycle traffic crossing or travelling along the SRN, where cycling is legally permitted.

4.190 The accompanying maps (Map 11 and Map 12 - <http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/the-plan/maps/>) are based on consultations carried out during the development of our Neighbourhood Plan (Durham City Neighbourhood Planning Forum, 2016b), and show walking and cycling routes which need improvement. They should not be taken as comprehensive. Assessment of routes extending beyond Our Neighbourhood may be required to demonstrate the acceptability of a proposed development. Durham County Council is compiling and maintaining assessments of current cycle infrastructure, public rights of way, and potential improvements, and these should be used in analysis.

4.191 County Durham Cycling Strategy and Action Plan, 2012–2015 (Durham County Council, 2012a) is the current cycling strategy: a revised policy is being prepared and is expected to be its successor, the County Durham Strategic Cycling and Walking Delivery Plan 2018–2028 (Durham County Council, 2018) was published for consultation in the summer of 2017 2018. The aims of the strategy include: integrating cycling policies within other strategies; creating consistently high standards for on and off road cycle infrastructure; developing and maintaining a more comprehensive network; contributing to economic growth by encouraging cycling tourism and reducing car travel through Travel Plans; protecting the cycling network from negative impacts of development.

Justification

First sentence omitted, remainder merged into justification of new T1.

4.195 The definition of a Transport Assessment in the glossary of the NPPF lays particular emphasis on the need to identify measures to improve accessibility for walking, cycling and public transport. To meet climate change commitments, and to build a healthier, more

liveable environment, a sustained shift towards sustainable transport modes will be required, and new developments present an opportunity to increase the proportion of sustainable transport journeys over the average in the local area.

Map 11: Map of Pedestrian Issues

Map 12: Map of Cycling Issues

4.196 Map 12 (<http://npf.durhamcity.org.uk/the-plan/maps/>) shows a possible cycle network. Residential streets are not included unless they act as important through routes. Only those routes coloured green or yellow currently have specific provision for cycling. For the routes coloured red, purple or blue, it may be appropriate to provide a cycle route which parallels the indicated route, providing it is not much less direct or much steeper. Upgrading or redesignation of any routes would be subject to the usual consultation processes: this map indicates possibilities for the density of network needed if people are to be able to make cycle journeys throughout Our Neighbourhood.

Policy T2: Designing for Sustainable Transport

Where development is of a scale that requires the provision of new or extended streets or service roads, or the upgrading of existing infrastructure on or off site, the following requirements should be met:

T2.1: Design of walking and cycling infrastructure throughout Our Neighbourhood should accord with Design Guidance: Active Travel (Wales) Act 2013.

T2.2: Residential access roads and residential streets should be designed according to these principles:

4. Designed as part of the public realm enabling a family-friendly environment and safe conditions for walking, cycling and play; and
5. Car traffic minimised, through-routes for motor vehicles excluded and with streets designed to 20mph design speeds; and
6. Direct, continuous and prioritised routes for walking and cycling provided throughout the site, with good connections to the walking and cycling network of the surrounding area; and
7. Provision for car parking within the curtilage of each property or within a nearby neighbourhood parking area. Where on-street parking is necessary, it should be provided in designated bays, and designed to ensure the safety and convenience of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users; and
8. Designed to minimise the potential for crime and to foster personal safety.

Justification

Other paragraphs that were part of T2 justification moved to new T1

4.198 Durham County Council (2014d) 'Highways Design Guide For Residential Development' lays down the standards which should be complied with for roads to be adopted for maintenance at the public expense. It includes some guidance on design for walking, but very little guidance on satisfying cycling needs.

Policy T3 T2: Residential Car Parking in the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ)

Black text is unchanged but clauses have been reordered. Green text in T3.1 is relocated from the former T2.2(10).

Development proposals incorporating or having an impact on car parking will be supported if they comply with the following:

Design

T3.1: Access to off-street car parking should be designed to minimise additional vehicle movements on residential streets. Where on-street parking is necessary, it should be provided in designated bays, and designed to ensure the safety and convenience of pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users. The in-curtilage element of car parking for dwellings without garages may be instead be provided within a nearby neighbourhood parking area to make more efficient use of land and improve the public realm. (EQ05)

T2.5: Where electric vehicle charging provision is required by the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards, the facilities must not hinder the movement of pedestrians or disabled people, and should respect the character of the area. (EQ04, EQ31, WC34)

Reducing car parking provision

T3.2: Provision of car club spaces for residents and neighbouring users is encouraged.

T3.3: Within the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) encouragement will be given to development proposals making provision at less than the minimum car parking levels prescribed in the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards. if the following conditions are satisfied (L9b, L25, WC37):

1. It can be demonstrated that there will be no adverse impact on existing car parking users in the vicinity; and
2. The applicant has demonstrated that genuine demand exists for car-free or low-car housing in the proposed location; and
3. The proposal site should be within 400 metres' walk of a high daytime frequency (every 15 minutes) direct bus route to the city centre; and
4. Key local services (e.g. small supermarket, newsagent, pharmacy) are conveniently and safely accessible by foot within 800 metres' walk; and
5. Residents have a choice of safe and convenient walking and cycling routes to key local services and the city centre; and
6. Visitors' access needs, and the needs of occupiers and visitors with disabilities have been considered; and

7. Information is provided as to how any on-site parking will be allocated, which might include residents renting an allocated space.

Extending the Controlled Parking Zone

T2.5: Extensions to the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) in order to mitigate the effects of a proposed development will have the costs recovered via planning obligation.

Situations which might justify CPZ extension include:

1. a development close to, or accessed from, an area which is currently in the CPZ; or
2. a development close to the city centre or to a major employment site, such that parking controls would be necessary to maintain residential amenity and avoid use for long-stay commuter car parking; or
3. development of student accommodation within or adjoining a residential area, which could increase competition for parking spaces in the residential area (Q37); or
4. any residential development outside the CPZ where a developer proposes to provide fewer parking spaces than normally required by the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards. (EQ18, Q76)

4.200 If planning permission for a development with a reduced level of car parking is granted, conditions will be applied to keep the development car-free or low-car. Car-free proposals will require a Transport Assessment to demonstrate full consideration of accessibility, mitigation and enforcement. Text unnecessary as control is covered by CPZ or extensions to CPZ.

4.201 The following questions will be considered when assessing car-free or low-car the car parking associated with proposed development, including infill development:

1. Does existing street character rule out on-site parking?
2. Is the application fully sufficiently evidenced, for example, by parking surveys, highway safety audit, or public transport impact assessment?
3. Is there likely to be an adverse impact on existing car parking users in the vicinity, and how can this be mitigated?
4. Are key local services conveniently and safely accessible by walking, cycling and public transport?
5. Have the needs of visitors and the needs of disabled people been considered?

The costs involved in extending the CPZ would include, but are not limited to, the costs of consulting affected residents and businesses, of carrying out parking usage surveys, and the costs of installing signage and equipment such as parking ticket vending machines. It is essential, at the application stage, to perform an adequate assessment: it will not be acceptable for impacts to become apparent only after a development has been completed. An extension to the CPZ might be limited to the new development, or might need to encompass neighbouring streets.

4.202 This policy will be applied pragmatically. For example, additional car parking up to, but not exceeding, the levels prescribed in the 'County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards' (Durham County Council, 2014b) may be required if a development is close to the edge of the Controlled Parking Zone, in order to mitigate against residents keeping cars on residential streets outside this zone. Now covered by 4.201(3).

4.203 New developments outside the Controlled Parking Zone must provide the minimum levels of car parking set out in the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards. Applications providing less than the minimum level of car parking will only be considered in conjunction with an extension of the Controlled Parking Zone to the development and possibly to neighbouring streets. Such extensions would be subject to acceptance by the local authority and consultation with affected residents. In such cases the costs of extending the Controlled Parking Zone may be sought via planning obligation. Situations which might justify Controlled Parking Zone extension include:

1. a development close to, or accessed from, an area which is currently in the Controlled Parking Zone; or
2. a development close to the city centre or to a major employment site, such that parking controls would be necessary to maintain residential amenity and avoid use for long-stay commuter car parking; or
3. development of student accommodation within or adjoining a residential area, in which case extending the Controlled Parking Zone to the residential area may help to manage competition for parking spaces from students keeping cars in the residential area.

Text used to form new section of policy.

Image parking

Justification

Paragraphs reordered: will be renumbered in black-and-white version.

4.206 In setting parking standards the NPPF (para. 39 105) recommends authorities consider:

- the accessibility of the development; and
- the type, mix and use of development; and
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport; and
- local car ownership levels; and
- the need to ensure an adequate provision of spaces for charging plug-in and other ultra-low emission vehicles. an overall need to reduce the use of high-emission vehicles.

4.205 Reducing off-street car parking provision generally has a direct bearing on the potential for achieving higher densities, and for good quality amenity space such as landscaping, green space, and areas for children to play. The Transport for New Homes Project Summary and Recommendations (Foundation for Integrated Transport, July 2018, p. 26) recommends that towns and cities plan for higher densities, and to “curtail car

parking to allow our planners to design more attractive places with more space for greenery and better public realm”.

4.204 This policy applies to infill developments in areas already subject to controlled parking. Owing to the historic nature of the streets within the Controlled Parking Zone, the supply of on-street parking space is limited in some most areas, as is evidenced by the Council having ceased to provide resident or visitor permits for occupiers of new developments or conversions since 2000. Car parking space is increasingly coming under pressure with the increase in the size of cars, ownership rates among permanent residents and students, and the increase in student numbers. It would not be possible to meet all the future demand while preserving the special character of Our Neighbourhood, and so the policy emphasis must be on better control and management of car parking, and reducing car dependency. (Q09, Q29, Q37, Q76)

4.207 The current county-wide policy, the 'County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards' (Durham County Council, 2014b 2018xxx), sets different rates of provision for town centres and areas outside town centres. Its definition of the town centre for Durham City is problematic, being based on a simple radius of 400m 800m centred on the market place, which does not take into account the geography of the city. Outside this area, car parking is required on a sliding scale depending on to meet or exceed a level determined by the size of the dwelling. Yet within the Controlled Parking Zone, much parts of which lies beyond the 400m 800m radius, student accommodation may be built with no car parking provision for residents. This has the effect of reducing the viability of ordinary residential development by comparison with the more profitable development of student accommodation.

4.208 Seeking to restore a better community balance within neighbourhoods is a key aim of our Neighbourhood Plan. This policy therefore allows for residential accommodation to be built with a lower level of car parking than the norm, but only where on-street parking controls exist. under strict conditions designed to achieve This will allow for high quality, higher density developments which do not generate extra traffic and support the viability of public transport services, and bring residential life back into the city centre.

Policy T4 T3: Residential Storage for Cycles and Mobility Aids

Residential development proposals for new build or change of use should provide storage facilities for cycles and mobility aids as follows:

T4.1: A minimum of two one covered, secure cycle parking spaces should be provided per residential dwelling, with step-free access convenient for the front of the property. The space and access must also be suitable adaptable for storage of storing other mobility aids, including powered wheelchairs, mobility scooters, children's buggies and prams. Electric power must be available to allow recharging of powered mobility aids and e-bikes.

T4.2: Where **storage cycle parking** is provided communally for a number of dwelling units (such as in the case of apartment blocks or purpose-built student accommodation) then the provision **may be reduced to should be at the rate of 2 spaces per 5 occupants**. The travel plan should include a commitment to **ongoing active management of communal storage spaces, including timely removal of abandoned equipment**, and provision of additional **space capacity** when needed.

T3.3: The design and location of storage must accord with current best practice guidance, with appropriate solutions selected depending on the style and context of the development. (L9b, L25)

Added in order to simplify policy wording, ensure high-quality design and give a wider range of flexible solutions catering for different circumstances and constraints.

T3.4: At multi-occupancy dwellings such as flats, apartments and purpose-built-student accommodation, visitor cycle parking should be provided close to the main entrance(s) at the rate of one space per 20 residents.

Added because the 2018 standards dropped the requirement that was in the 2014 standards without justification.

Note: Consultation draft required space for 2 bicycles, or equivalent, but there were objections that the quantity was excessive. From national ownership rates, you can expect about 53% of houses where 4 people live to have more than one bicycle, so three-bedroomed houses without garages will be worst affected by dropping the requirement to one space. Some councils have higher requirements, e.g. North Tyneside which requires 2 cycle spaces per dwelling and 1 cycle space per bedroom for student accommodation.

Current best practice guidance for cycle storage can be found in the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments (Transport Initiatives LLP and Cambridge City Council, 2010). Developers are strongly encouraged to use this guidance, adapted as necessary for the storage of other travel equipment covered by the policy.

4.209 **In houses with garages**, Cycle and mobility aid storage may be catered for simply by providing **extra sufficient garage space (L25)**. In **other properties without garages**, **cycle storage may be provided through dedicated cycle lockers**, but then a variety of design solutions are shown in the Cycle Parking Guide for New Residential Developments, but particular attention will need to be paid to the storage of other mobility aids. **Solutions such as porch extensions or additional hallway space would give greater flexibility than free-standing sheds or lockers**, as the space could be used to store other belongings if the householder has no need to accommodate cycles or mobility aids. **Multi-storey occupancy buildings must provide storage facilities on the ground floor or in a basement of the building, or in an adjacent secure building or lockable shelter**. In all properties storage areas should be easily accessible, and any ramps should comply with guidelines for wheelchair accessibility. Buildings (including garages) should be designed to enable access to and from the storage unhindered by parked cars or other stored items. **Cycle**

parking and mobility aid storage should be at least as conveniently located as any secure car parking provision. [Can remove this text as the Transport Initiatives *Cycle Parking Guide* covers these aspects in much more detail.]

4.210 Note that the Durham County Council Parking and Accessibility Standards (Durham County Council, 2014b) also require visitor cycle parking to be provided at purpose-built student accommodation at the rate of one space per 20 residents. It should be located near the main entrance(s) to the accommodation to promote awareness and security of the facility. [Removed above text because the 2018 standards drop this requirement, so it is proposed to transfer it into the policy under T4.4.]

4.210 Discretion may be exercised by the Planning Authority in cases of redevelopment and conversion of existing buildings and developments within the conservation areas. It is imperative that cycle and mobility aid storage forms an integral part of any full or reserved matters planning application, rather than treating it as a secondary issue to be resolved by condition. Full details of the location, type of fittings, spacing, numbers, method of installation and access to storage should be provided.

Justification

4.210a It is essential that residents have sufficient space to store the various types of travel equipment they require. Convenience of use strongly influences transport choices, so if sustainable travel is to be encouraged it is essential that it is no harder to access a bicycle (for example) than a car. The 'Manual for Streets' (Department for Transport, 2007, section 8.2.1) states that "providing enough convenient and secure cycle parking at people's homes and other locations for both residents and visitors is critical to increasing the use of cycles". It is clear that having no storage for mobility aids could lead to greater social isolation as a resident's mobility becomes impaired.

4.211 A policy requiring provision of residential cycle parking formed part of the 2003 'Durham County Council Accessibility and Parking Guidelines' but was not included in the 2014 'County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards' (Durham County Council, 2014b). The justification for the omission of the residential cycle parking policy in 2014 is not clear. On page 21 34 of the Durham City Sustainable Transport Strategy Delivery Plan (Durham County Council, 2018xxx) it is stated that higher provision of high quality cycle parking within developments is required, including in residential development within the city, and suggests that this be formalised within planning policies. The latest County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards 2018 (Durham County Council, 2018xxx), if adopted, will require one cycle space per residential dwelling, but does not provide sufficient clarity on design or on cycle parking provision for Purpose-Built Student Accommodation, and does not cater for mobility aids.

4.211a The 'National Travel Survey' (Department for Transport, 2016, Table NTS0608) shows that for adult age bands around 40% of people own or have use of a bicycle, dropping to about 20% only for the 60+ age bracket. However, for the older age brackets

use of other mobility aids would take the place of the need for cycle storage. In the absence of local data the scale of provision in policy T4 takes its cue, therefore, from the level of need identified nationally. The 2011 census shows that the rate of travel to work by bicycle within Our Neighbourhood (about 3%) is similar to the national average rate (2.8%), which therefore justifies the use of the national bicycle ownership rates as the basis of clause T3.2. This is corroborated by figures from the Active Lives Survey (dataset CW0302 downloaded from <https://www.gov.uk/government/statistical-data-sets/walking-and-cycling-statistics-cw>) which show that 10.3% ($\pm 3.0\%$ at a 95% confidence interval) of the population of County Durham cycled at least once a week in 2017 compared with 11.9% in England as a whole. Government targets aim to double cycling activity from 2013 to 2025 (Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy, Department for Transport, 2017, para. 1.15, p. 9) and therefore an increase in the need for cycle storage should also be planned for.

4.211b Facilities for recharging for electric equipment are important for mobility aids, but also for e-bikes. The 2018 revision of the County Durham Parking and Accessibility Standards covers requirements for provision of electric vehicle charging points, and Policy T3 extends this to other personal electric transport modes. The Department for Transport's recommended 'Propensity to Cycle Tool' predicts that, because of the hilly nature of the city, wider uptake of e-bikes would have the potential to almost double cycling trips in Our Neighbourhood.

4.211c This policy therefore seeks to ensure that lack of storage, or poor storage design, is no obstacle to uptake of sustainable travel modes in Our Neighbourhood, and that residential properties are adapted adaptable to the changing mobility needs of individuals and families at different stages in their lives.