

Kirklees Local Plan Examination Hearing Statement

Matter 19: Transport Policies

16th November, 2017

Our Ref: 171116/MB/PT

Persimmon Homes (West Yorkshire)
3 Hepton Court
York Road
Leeds
LS9 6PW
Tel: 0113 240 9726

1.0 Introduction

- 1.1 This Hearing Statement is made for and on behalf of Persimmon Homes West Yorkshire (PHWY) and responds to the questions set by the Inspector out under Matter 19: Transport Policies which is to be heard during the Stage 3 hearing session.
- 1.2 This Hearing Statement should be read in conjunction with the representations submitted on behalf of PHWY by Lichfields during the Local Plan Consultation (2016) ref: 50579/JG/AJk and the Hearing Statements that were submitted by Lichfields on behalf of PHWY prior to Stage 1 of the Local Plan Examination which took place between 10/10/2017 and 18/10/2017.
- 1.3 The relevant matters and Inspector's Issues and Questions are included in bold for ease of reference, please note that PHWY do not consider it necessary to attend and participate during the Hearing Sessions, but can be available if required.

2.0 Issue – Does the plan set out positively prepared policies for supporting sustainable travel and safe access, which are justified, effective and consistent with national policy?

Question (a): What is the scheme threshold above which Travel Plans will be required, as set out in PLP 20?

2.1 Policy PLP 20 states that Travel Plans will be required for all major planning applications in accordance with current guidance. Whilst PHWY do not object to this in principle, should the council be minded to include a specific threshold, it is considered that Travel Plans should only be required for developments of 100no. dwellings or more.

Question (b): Is Section 2 in Policy PLP 21 justified and sufficiently flexible to allow for mitigation or improvements in the highway network? Is the Council’s proposed modification SPMM23 necessary to ensure the policy is sound?

2.2 Notwithstanding the modifications proposed under SPMM23, PHWY consider that any policy that is overly restrictive of development and does not allow mitigation to overcome highway safety problems would not be supported and clearly is not in accordance with the principles of the NPPF.

Question (c): In what circumstances would Transport Assessments or Transport Statements be sought, as referred to in Policy PLP 21?

2.3 PHWY considers that the requirement for either a Transport Assessment or Transport Statement is best considered on a site-by-site basis and that the necessity for a planning application to be supported requirement for either document should be clearly stated in the accompanying policy text for allocated sites.

2.4 However, if the council are minded to include a specific threshold, it is considered that as a guide, Transport Statements would be sufficient for housing developments of less than 100no. dwellings and Transport Assessments should only be required for developments of 100no. dwellings and above. This is the standard approach elsewhere.

Question (d): Is criterion g in Policy PLP 21, relating to the provision of on-site electric charging points, justified and deliverable?



2.5 Part g of Policy PLP 21 states that EV charging points should be provided for all proposals. PHWY supports the principle of this policy but would consider that it should not be applied rigidly, particularly where this would have a significant impact on the viability of a scheme.

2.6 In addition, the location of parking spaces in relation to the dwelling itself can impact on the practicality of providing EV facilities for all dwellings on a site and this should be recognised. For example, private services should not cross a public footpath or land in other ownership. The guidance for the provision of electric charging points should be flexible as technology advances.

Question (e): What car parking standards will apply in new development schemes?

2.7 No comment