Planning Committee

06 November 2020
Agenda item number 11

Consultation documents

Report by Planning Policy Officer

Summary

This report informs the Committee of the officer's proposed response to planning policy consultations received recently, and invites members' comments and guidance.

Recommendation

To note the report and endorse the nature of the proposed response.

1.   Introduction

1.1.   Appendix 1 shows selected planning policy consultation documents received by the Authority since the last Planning Committee meeting, together with the officer's proposed response.

1.2.   The Committee's comments, guidance and endorsement are invited.

Author: Natalie Beal

Date of report: 22 October 2020

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Appendix 1 – Planning Policy consultations received

Organisation: Norfolk Council Council

Document: Norfolk Local Transport Plan
https://norfolk.citizenspace.com/consultation/norfolk-county-council-local-transport-plan-4/

Due date: 09 November 2020

Status: Draft

Proposed level: Planning Committee Endorsed

Notes
The draft transport plan describes the council's strategy and policy framework for transport and is used as a guide for investment priorities as well as being considered by other agencies when determining their planning or delivery decisions. Norfolk County Council is currently refreshing its Local Transport Plan so that it covers the period 2020-2036 and is undertaking a consultation on the Sustainability Appraisal (including Strategic Environmental Assessment).

The Council is seeking views on the draft of the next Local Transport Plan and the policies it has included. The current Local Transport Plan for Norfolk was agreed in 2011. The document notes that since that time there have been many changes to the way that people travel, and how much. Technology has meant that people are now increasingly able to live their lives without the need to travel, for example using online resources such as internet shopping. The way they travel is also changing, with more information and more technology being built into vehicles and more options such as car clubs and bike share schemes. Norfolk County Council has also recently adopted an environmental policy to work towards 'carbon neutrality' by 2030. The impact of Covid-19 on the way people work, travel, and socialise is still emerging and evolving as society emerges from the pandemic.

Proposed response
The achievements on page 4 seem quite road heavy. Are there any other bus or cycle or walk related achievements to refer to?

Policy 5: New development should be well located and connected to maximise use of sustainable and active transport options**, making them more attractive places to live, thus supporting a strong sense of the public realm.**

The second part, in **bold**, seems to weaken the message. The message is adequately addressed in the first part. The second part sounds a bit like one of the reasons to support this policy. Also, the reasons for choosing this policy is to reduce reliance on single occupancy car use, reducing carbon emissions so the first part seems to be more relevant to this policy. The text in **bold** seems to be addressed by policy 13.

Policy 6: The favoured option could potentially include all of the alternative options, as they all seem reasonable actions to take.

Policy 7: The preferred option will probably reduce the air quality issues associated with development compared to those developments not doing anything to address air quality, but

not necessarily address the baseline of the AQMA. Policy 11 seems as though it would have more of an impact on the baseline in AQMAs.

Policy 12: This says that it will work towards carbon neutrality by 2030. Is that the same as saying the network will be carbon neutral by 2030? It is not clear what the aim is – to do it or to work towards it.

Do you need to expand walking and cycling to include scooting now given the popularity of it? So the usual phrase could be walking, cycling and scooting?

Some policies, like 17, say 'will', others say 'will seek to' or 'should'. Of course, there is on occasion the need for flexibility, but it might be worth checking the policies to see what type of wording should be used.

I could not see anything relating to the following. Are they in the document or are they things that could be addressed?

- Pavement parking – we are aware of the recent consultation on how to address this, but it is an issue in urban areas especially.
- Respect between different modes of transport – this seems to be lacking. Could there be merit in a campaign to try to improve respect?
- HGVs etc and deliveries – this results in large vehicles going through urban areas with associated noise and other issues, and some pavement parking.
- Reviewing parking standards to include electric vehicles and scooters – are the standards fit for purpose or do they need reviewing? Aware that many Neighbourhood Plans are starting to introduce their own parking standards, mainly for cars.
- Traffic lights being more responsive – one of the issues raised in the Plan is that of idling vehicles. It does seem that some sets of traffic lights go through the motions rather than respond to traffic that is waiting, especially out of peak hours. Indeed, some traffic lights seem not to pick up cyclists waiting.

Given the great change in transport that has arisen since the writing of the last LTP, and given that there are some potential changes in the future, does the LTP need to talk more about Drones and automated vehicles and the like? They are raised once, but does the LTP need to say more? Perhaps how NCC will respond to such technologies in between review periods?