

Report No: 2T1
Objections: 2096, 2356, 2308
Support:
Subject: Transport Introduction
Chapter: 7
Policy:
Para: 7.2.2
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Final sentence of para 7.2.2 should be amended to reflect the wording set out in the minutes of the Planning, Environment and Transport Key Priority Group (PETKPG) meeting of 15 November 2005 as follows.
“The Assembly’s Planning, Environment and Transport Key Priority Group (PETKPG) meeting of 15 November 2005 noted the concerns expressed by Copeland Borough Council and Cumbria County Council regarding the wider economic regeneration significance of accessibility for West Cumbria. The issue would be given further consideration through the development of the Spatial Framework within RSS, its policies and priorities, informed by the advice and recommendations of the government’s Strategic Forum for West Cumbria. (2096)”
2. The phrasing of this paragraph does not make clear that the Access to Furness and West Cumbria study was advised by representatives including Copeland Borough Council and its regeneration partners. The study management was an integral part in informing and shaping the recommended strategy. The HA does not consider it appropriate to include a description and snapshot of an emerging position that will be superseded by events in the short term, in a development plan to be adopted and cover a period in the longer term to 2016. Recommend that second half of paragraph be deleted and replaced by factual statement such as “The NWRA will consider the advice and recommendations of the Strategic Forum for West Cumbria on transport improvements as part of developing the new RSS (which will incorporate a revised RTS)”. (2356)
3. New text refers to Council’s and regeneration partners disappointment at results of the study. Would appear to be inappropriate for inclusion in local plan which should focus on matter of fact rather than opinion and focus of those aspects of the study that are relevant to the justification of subsequent policies.

Suggest that the text should explain Study's purpose, which was to inform the development of the RTS within RSS by making recommendations for a long term strategy.

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The final sentence of text added to 7.2.2 adequately summarises the latest position on RSS production and the role of the West Cumbria Strategic Forum.
 - 2&3. Regeneration is a major policy driver in the Local Plan and investment in transport infrastructure will have a significant influence on regeneration initiatives. It is therefore appropriate for the Council to express an opinion about progress on such matters so long as it clarifies which bodies are responsible for the investment decisions and how the strategy behind them is put together. In any event this is background material and does not link directly to a particular Local Plan policy
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T2
Objections:
Support: 2105
Subject: Developer contributions for public transport
Chapter: 7
Policy:
Para: 7.3.11
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Part of recently introduced text makes positive provision for developments to pay commuted sums to the council or other infrastructure / service providers to deliver improved public transport, in line with the Council's sustainable development objective.
-

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T3

Objections:

Support: 2379

Subject: TSP5: Cycleways, Footpaths and Bridleways

Chapter: 7

Policy: TSP5

Para:

Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support inclusion of bridleways.

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T4

Objections: 2354

Support:

Subject: TSP6: General Development Requirements

Chapter: 7

Policy: TSP6

Para:

Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Reference to DLTR Circular 04/2001 should be included in the policy wording.

RESPONSE

Objection

1. This is not a duly made objection as it does not relate to a change in the 2D version of the Plan. The amendments made to paragraph 2D changes to paragraph 7.4.3 do appear to address the concerns raised however.

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T5

Objections: 2355

Support:

Subject: Transport New Development

Chapter: 7

Policy:

Para: 7.4.3

Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Proposed revision is supported in principle but could be further strengthened to more fully recognise the importance of the trunk road network in order to fully afford adequate protection to its safe and efficient operation. Recommend that the first sentence beginning 'Where access is via a trunk road' Should be deleted and replaced with 'Access to the Highways Agency's trunk road network, whether directly via a new built one, or indirectly by way of an existing access, will be assessed on a graduated basis. Developer's Transport Assessments should assess the impact of development proposals on the entire affected trunk road network.'

RESPONSE

Objection

1. It is believed that the wording as proposed in the 2nd Deposit Version of the Plan is more appropriate and provides greater clarity.

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T6
Objections: 2353
Support:
Subject: TSP7 Transport Assessments and Travel Plans
Chapter: 7
Policy: TSP7
Para:
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. Current wording of TSP7 although supported in principle does not adequately recognise the importance of the trunk road network and, as such may not afford adequate protection to it. Recommend add “The Highways Agency should be consulted on any development which may impact upon the trunk road network” At end of second paragraph add “This includes any such works affecting the trunk road network which must be agreed by the Highways Agency. Where a development would impact on the operation of the trunk road network, the content and findings of the transport assessment must be discussed with the Highway’s Agency.
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. The Council will carry out consultations in accordance with The Town and Country Planning (General Development Procedure) Order 1995. It is therefore unnecessary, and would be inconsistent with the approach taken throughout the rest of the plan to refer to the Highways Agency in this way in the Policy. The wording suggested to be added at the end of the second paragraph is also unnecessary and could lead to confusion in interpretation of the Policy. The issues raised are already addressed – the Highways Agency are a statutory consultee on developments affecting the trunk road network.
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T7
Objections:
Support: 2104
Subject: Provision of parking at transport nodes
Chapter: 7
Policy:
Para: 7.4.6
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Support

1. Support – provision of parking facilities at train stations and other supported as it increases accessibility to public transport , in line with the Council’s sustainable development objective.

RESPONSE

Support

1. Support noted

PROPOSED CHANGES

No change

Report No: 2T8
Objections: 2062
Support: 2106
Subject: Rail Freighting
Chapter: 7
Policy: TSP9
Para: 7.5.1
Other:

ISSUES RAISED

Objection

1. First sentence of 7.5.1 is still inaccurate. It is not difficult to expand freight use of the Cumbrian Coastal Railway. The 'physical state' is not an impediment to anything except a very large expansion in use. It is more a matter of scheduling train movements, and if there are insufficient train paths during the day, or otherwise on the single sections north of Sellafield, expansion can still be achieved by opening the signal boxes for night use. Freight operating companies prefer overnight operation anyway. Para 7.5.1 should be completely re-written.

Support

1. Facilitation of the movement of freight by rail is a key SRA objective and it therefore supports planning policies which encourage this potential. (2106)
-

RESPONSE

Objection

1. Agree to amend first sentence.

Support

1. Support noted
-

PROPOSED CHANGES

Amend first sentence, paragraph 7.5.1 to read:
"The physical state of the line does not assist easy expansion of rail freighting and associated facilities"