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2.2	DCC	Remove references to Local Plan as partly superseded by Core Strategy.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 impossble 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.