

## TRAVEL ACCESSIBILITY AND DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS

### 1 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report seeks Members views of a new approach to the calculation of developer contributions towards transport improvements arising from planning applications. The Essex Planning Officers Association has prepared the methodology, and a copy of the consultation report has been placed in the Members Lounge.

### 2 INTRODUCTION

- 2.1 The Transport Act 2000 requires local authorities to promote sustainable and integrated transport systems by encouraging the use of alternative modes.
- 2.2 PPG13 states that 'Planning Obligations may be used to achieve improvements to public transport, walking and cycling, where such measures would be likely to influence travel patterns to the site involved either on their own or as part of a package of measures'.
- 2.3 Developers are required to consider the overall accessibility of a potential site and to submit any proposals for improvements with their planning application and including a travel assessment. PPG13 includes advice on the matters that should be examined in preparing a travel assessment.
- 2.4 Whether or not a travel assessment is required, it is appropriate for the local planning authority and the highway authority to consider the scope of contributions that should be sought towards transport improvements and to be included in a Section 106 obligation. Obligations (often called 106 agreements) can be used to address impacts from any increase in traffic, and to consider the requirements for improvements to develop non-car modes of transport.

### 3 METHODOLOGIES OUTLINED

- 3.1 Three methodologies are proposed, either to be used singly or in combination, as follows:
- **Accessibility Index Scoring System (AISS)** – this method will apply to the majority of developments and can be used on its own or in conjunction with a transport model
  - **Transport Model Method** – applied to large scale developments

- **Local Needs** – to be used where either the Transport Model or AISS is not appropriate.

3.2 Each of these methodologies is explained in detail in the consultation document and summarised briefly here.

*Accessibility Index Scoring System*

3.3 The key to the index scoring system is an assessment of how accessible a site is by means of walking, cycling, and public transport. The system also allows an assessment of existing infrastructure/facilities and will identify any additional infrastructure/facilities needed to bring a development up to standard.

3.4 Two types of assessment are carried out: a site accessibility audit with percentage marks being on how accessible the proposed development site is, and; an infrastructure audit which lists the infrastructure needed to allow a development site to be accessible to all modes of transport. An extract from the scoring system is attached to this report as appendix one.

*Transport Model Method*

3.5 This method would apply to large-scale developments, and would involve the use of software modelling as part of the preparation of a design/development brief. The consultation document provides details of the different software models that are currently available.

3.6 Given the high costs associated with the preparation of a transport model, the application of this method will only be for large-scale developments.

*Local Needs Approach*

3.7 The cumulative effect of small scale developments can be significant with the context of a local road network. Local needs may include the widening of footways, signing, lighting, and the provision of bus stops. Measures to improve safety should be given the highest priority.

3.8 It may be appropriate to collect contributions for a number of sites in a local area, and the arrangements for this would need to be included in a development brief with the contributions from individual sites being pooled. (Eastwood Rise/Rayleigh Avenue is an example of such an arrangement)

3.9 Whichever methodology is employed to calculate transport requirements, a Section 106 Obligation will then be required to ensure that the financial contributions for the works is forthcoming from the developer.

#### **4 DISCUSSION**

- 4.1 There is no doubt that difficulties have been encountered on a regular basis by the local planning authority and the highway authority in preparing a supportable case for the specific items to be funded by a developer when planning proposals are being considered. The aim of the proposed methodologies is to introduce a more objective approach focused specifically on the need to ensure that developers provide appropriate transport improvements.
- 4.2 On that basis, the approach proposed, particularly the Accessibility Index Scoring System provides a very clear expression to a developer of the matters that will be assessed as an application is being determined.
- 4.3 It must though be borne in mind that if this methodology is adopted in due course it will not be possible to apply it retrospectively. It will also be necessary to link the methodology to appropriate policies and to promote these as a part of the next local plan.

#### **5 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 5.1 The provision of appropriate transport infrastructure and sustainable development schemes are key environmental issue for the district.

#### **6 RECOMMENDATION**

It is proposed that the Committee **RESOLVES**

That, subject to additional comments from Members, the approach prepared by the Essex Planning Officers Association for dealing with Travel Accessibility and Developer Contributions merits support and that further consideration will be given to adopting the methodology as Supplementary Planning Guidance when the results of the consultation exercise have been analysed and reported back. (HPS)

Shaun Scrutton

Head of Planning Services

---

---

**Background Papers:**

Travel Accessibility and Developer Contributions – Essex Planning Officers Association, July 2002

For further information please contact Shaun Scrutton on:-

Tel:- 01702 318100  
E-Mail:- [shaun.scrutton@rochford.gov.uk](mailto:shaun.scrutton@rochford.gov.uk)

## Site Accessibility

APPENDIX ONE

### Pedestrians

#### 1. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES - ON SITE

##### a) Footway/Footpath Quality

BASELINE - 90%

	YES	NO	SCORE
Footways/Footpath - hardened	0	0	30
Footways present, and connect to main buildings & parking areas	0	0	30
Width is 1.8m and above	0	0	30
Footway is on desire lines	0	0	10

#### 2. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES - OFF SITE

##### a) Pedestrian Route(s)

BASELINE - 100%

	YES	NO	SCORE
Identifiable direct route from the nearest catchment area to the development site	0	0	100

##### b) Pedestrian Links to Amenities - Route

BASELINE - 50%

	Post Office	Convenience Store	Supermarket	Primary School	Secondary School	Rail Station	Bus Stop(s)	Town Centre
Identifiable direct route:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCORE:	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%	12.5%

##### c) Pedestrian Links to Amenities - Distance

BASELINE - 37.5%

	Post Office	Convenience Store	Supermarket	Primary School	Secondary School	Rail Station	Bus Stop(s)	Town Centre
Within 800m	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCORE:	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%	10%
801 - 1.1km	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
SCORE:	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%	2.5%

##### d) Footway/Footpath Quality

BASELINE - 90%

	YES	NO	SCORE
Footways/Footpath - hardened	0	0	30
Footway present, but does not connect to development	0	0	30
Width is 1.8m and above	0	0	30
Footway is on desire lines	0	0	10

## Infrastructure

### Pedestrians

#### 1. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES - ON SITE

##### a) Footway Quality

Accessibility Element	Existing Development Score	Proposed Development Score
Lighting	5	5
Continuity of footway	2	2
Tactile paving	5	5
Dropped kerbs	5	5
Sign posting	4	4
Possible Score: 21	Baseline Score: 21	Actual Score: <input type="text"/>

#### 2. PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES - OFF SITE

##### a) Route from Nearest Catchment Area to the Development

Accessibility Element	Existing Development Score	Proposed Development Score
No direct route	0	0
Route is signed	4	4
Route is lit	5	5
Possible Score: 9	Baseline Score: 9	Actual Score: <input type="text"/>

##### b) Pedestrian Links to Local Amenities - Footway Quality

	Post Office	Convenience Store	Supermarket	Primary School	Secondary School	Rail Station	Bus Stop(s)	Town Centre
Street lighting	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Continuity of footway	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Tactile paving	6	5	5	6	5	5	5	5
Dropped kerbs	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Sign posting	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Seating	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Possible Score: for each amenity: 25	Baseline Score: 21		Actual Score: <input type="text"/>					

##### c) Pedestrian Links to Local Amenities - Route

	Post Office	Convenience Store	Supermarket	Primary School	Secondary School	Rail Station	Bus Stop(s)	Town Centre
No direct route to:	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Route is signed	4	4	4	4	4	4	4	4
Route is lit	5	5	5	5	5	5	5	5
Pedestrian crossings nearby	8	8	8	8	8	8	8	8
Possible Score: for each amenity: 17	Baseline Score: 17		Actual Score: <input type="text"/>					