Highway Statement - NPPF Implications

The Highway Statement prepared by Sanderson Associates, ref: 6451/KS/001/01, dated 21 December 2011 was prepared prior to the publication of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) in March 2012. References to Planning Policy Guidance notes are, however, still considered to be relevant as there is a transitory period of 12 months before these will be superseded by further central government technical guidance.

Notwithstanding the above the NPPF has been reviewed in order to provide up to date information on the issues previously covered by the PPG notes referred to in the report.

Residential Parking Standards (Paragraphs 3.9.1 & 3.9.2 refer).

Barnsley Council adopted an SPD in March 2005 relating to parking standards. The section covering residential standards refers to the guidance contained within the original PPG 13 and sets a maximum limit of 1.5 spaces per dwelling.

Paragraph 39 of NPPF provides advice for Authorities if they are setting their own local parking standards for residential and non-residential developments. This follows the changes to PPG13 which removed this specific standard and the NPPF advises parking standards should take into account:

- the accessibility of the development;
- the type, mix and use of development;
- the availability of and opportunities for public transport;
- local car ownership levels; and
- an overall need to reduce the use of high emission vehicles.

If the Council were to further develop their SPD on parking standards in accordance with the NPPF it is considered unlikely that a level of less than 1 space per dwelling for the type proposed would be set and that this would not be viewed as a “maximum” provision.

The proposed development provides two parking spaces per dwelling which is considered to be a practical level of provision when considering the location of the development and other associated factors such as the existing demand for on-street parking and the Traffic Regulations Orders currently in force in the vicinity of the site. As such it is considered that the proposals accord with the NPPF.

Accessibility

Walking (Paragraphs 4.2.2 & 4.2.3 refer) and Cycling (Paragraph 4.3.1 refers)

The above paragraphs refer to PPS1 and PPG13 in relation to promotion of walking as a sustainable mode of transport and its importance in offering the most appropriate replacement for short car journeys less than 2km and the potential for cycling to substitute for journeys up to 5km.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the NPPF has replaced both the documents it is considered that it seeks to continue the promotion of sustainable modes of travel for all types of development with sustainability being a "golden thread" running through all developments.

Paragraph 34 of the National Planning Policy Framework states:

"plans and decisions should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised"

It is considered that the development under consideration is in a location where there is excellent pedestrian and cycle access to the nearby Town Centre and in the surrounding area there are significant opportunities for employment, leisure, and retail with extensive public transport options.

The proximity of the site as a whole to the Town Centre and the fact that there are opportunities for access by public transport along Pontefract Road provides sustainable access opportunities for future residents and both supporters of the Football Club and "away fans".

As such it is considered that the proposals accord with the NPPF in terms of land use planning and the level of parking provided would not seek to undermine the travel choices that are available for future residents and their visitors.

Finally reference to Section 4 of National Planning Policy Framework relating to promoting sustainable transport and the bullet point:

- *"Improvements can be undertaken within the transport network that cost effectively, limit the significant impact of the development. Development should only be prevented or refused on transport grounds where the residual cumulative impacts of development are severe".*

It is our opinion that the proposed development would not have a material adverse impact on highway safety or the capacity of the local highway network and any impact arising would not be *severe* in the sense set out in the bullet point above.