



# **HEARING STATEMENT – MATTER 18 TRANSPORT**

## **ROSSENDALE LOCAL PLAN EXAMINATION**

### **TAYLOR WIMPEY (UK) LTD**

Date: August 2019

Pegasus Reference: (KW/GL/MAN.0299/R014)

## **Pegasus Group**

Suite 4b | 113 Portland Street | Manchester | M1 6DW

**T** 0161 393 3399 | **W** [www.pegasusgroup.co.uk](http://www.pegasusgroup.co.uk)

Birmingham | Bracknell | Bristol | Cambridge | Cirencester | East Midlands | Leeds | Liverpool | London | Manchester

**DESIGN** | **ENVIRONMENT** | **PLANNING** | **ECONOMICS** | **HERITAGE**

© Copyright Pegasus Planning Group Limited. The contents of this document must not be copied or reproduced in whole or in part without the written consent of Pegasus Planning Group Limited.

**CONTENTS**

1. INTRODUCTION..... 2

2. MATTER 18: QUESTION A – POLICY TR2 - STRATEGIC TRANSPORT ..... 3

3. MATTER 18: QUESTION B – POLICY TR4 – PARKING STANDARDS ..... 4

4. MATTER 18: QUESTION C – POLICY TR4 – PARKING STANDARDS ..... 5

## **1. INTRODUCTION**

1.1 Pegasus Group have been instructed on behalf of their client, Taylor Wimpey (UK) Ltd, to prepare Hearing Statements to the Rossendale Local Plan Examination (EiP) in support of their land interests in the Borough. This relates to the following sites, which are both allocated in the submitted plan:

- Land west of Market Street, Edenfield (within Housing Allocation H72); and
- Grane Village, Helmsore (within Housing Allocation H74).

1.2 This Statement deals with Matter 18 'Transport' which addresses the following issue:

**Issue – are policies TR1 – TR4 positively prepared, justified, effective and consistent with national policy?**

**2. MATTER 18: QUESTION A – POLICY TR2 - STRATEGIC TRANSPORT**

**[Policies TR1 – TR6 with individual infrastructure projects considered under Matter 7]**

**a) Does Policy TR2 make appropriate provision for horse riding?**

2.1 Taylor Wimpey do not wish to comment on this matter.

---

### 3. MATTER 18: QUESTION B – POLICY TR4 – PARKING STANDARDS

**b) Is Policy TR4 effective and consistent with national policy? Is the requirement for parking provision to incorporate charging points for electric vehicles where the Council considers it appropriate to do so justified? Is this consistent with Policy ENV6? Is it necessary for both policies to require this?**

- 3.1 Policy TR4 requires all new development to "*incorporate charging points for electric vehicles where the Council considers it appropriate*" and Appendix 1 requires the provision for electric car charging points to the satisfaction of the Highways Authority.
- 3.2 It is unclear as to exactly when the Council may consider it appropriate, or not, for development proposals to incorporate charging points and this creates uncertainty for development proposals. Therefore, Taylor Wimpey do not support this policy wording as currently drafted and do not consider it to be justified.
- 3.3 Whether or not it is appropriate for new development to provide charging points for electric vehicles depends on whether it is practical for the development proposed. For example, certain sites may require the provision of a sub-station on the site to serve the charging points, if there isn't sufficient capacity within the local network, which can carry significant costs which could render a development unviable, and this is particularly relevant to smaller scale developments, which are predominant within Rossendale.
- 3.4 Taylor Wimpey therefore recommend a minor change to the policy to "*incorporate charging points for electric vehicles where practical*". This allows for the consideration of reasons which may make the provision of electrical charging points impractical.
- 3.5 Taylor Wimpey are also of the view that it is unnecessarily repetitive to refer to the requirement for charging points in both policy TR4 and policy ENV6. The wording of ENV6 is also inconsistent with TR4, with the following stated:
- "Provision of electric charging points will be expected on all new housing developments unless exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated"*
- 3.6 The wording of ENV6 suggests that exceptional circumstances must be demonstrated if electric charging points are not to be provided, whereas TR4 does not require this and is more flexible (albeit we do suggest amendments to the wording in line with the above).
- 3.7 We recommend that ENV6 removes reference to electric charging points, given it is unnecessarily repetitive and restrictive. Policy TR4 should be amended to provide more flexibility by including the wording 'where practical'.

---

**4. MATTER 18: QUESTION C – POLICY TR4 – PARKING STANDARDS**

**c) Policy TR4 requires development to meet maximum parking standards set out in Appendix 1 of the Local Plan. Are they underpinned by clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density in a location which are well served by public transport as required by paragraph 106 of the National Planning Policy Framework?**

- 4.1 Taylor Wimpey do not support this policy as currently drafted, neither do they support the proposed introduction of maximum parking standards.
- 4.2 Paragraph 106 of the NPPF confirms that maximum parking standards for development should only be set where there is a clear and compelling justification that they are necessary for managing the local road network, or for optimising the density of locations well served by public transport.
- 4.3 The NPPG<sup>1</sup> also notes how maximum parking standards can lead to poor quality development and congested streets, and that local planning authorities should seek to ensure parking provision is appropriate to the needs of the development and not reduced below a level that could be considered reasonable.
- 4.4 Clear and compelling justification to introduce maximum parking standards is yet to be provided, therefore we politely suggest that the maximum parking standards contained at Appendix 1 are deleted.

---

<sup>1</sup> Paragraph 42-008-20140306