

Committee	Cabinet
Date	8 June 2004
Report By	Director of Transport and Environment
Title of Report	Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) - Local Sustainable Accessibility Improvement Contributions
Purpose of Report	To consider and adopt a methodology for determining local sustainable accessibility improvement contributions following stakeholder consultation as an addendum to the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance on Development Contributions

RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet is recommended to:

- 1. adopt the methodology for determining local sustainable accessibility improvement contributions detailed in Appendix 1 of this report as an addendum to the existing Supplementary Planning Guidance on Development Contributions;**
 - 2. commend the District and Borough Councils in the County to adopt and implement the methodology; and**
 - 3. support the development of detailed implementation protocols with the District and Borough Councils.**
-

1 Financial Appraisal

1.1 This proposed methodology for determining local sustainable accessibility improvement contributions (LSAICs) has been progressed by staff within the Transport & Environment Department together with colleagues in neighbouring County Councils and the District and Borough Councils within the county. It has been financed from within existing budgets and any further work required for the publication of this document will be financed in a similar manner.

1.2 If implemented rigorously by the local planning authorities in the county, and assuming development rates reflecting those set out in the Structure Plan, this approach will generate development contributions in the order of £2 million annually towards the implementation of integrated transport and local accessibility improvements.

2. Supporting Information

2.1 The Cabinet adopted a new approach to developer contributions as supplementary planning guidance on 29 July 2003. That guidance established the principle of LSAICs and that new developments should contribute proportionally to the implementation of local integrated transport and accessibility improvements, although it did not establish a transparent methodology for the calculation of the value of such contributions for individual development.

2.2 The proposed methodology establishes a sliding scale of contribution with a lesser contribution sought from smaller dwellings in highly accessible locations compared with larger dwellings in less accessible locations. These range from £250 for a 2 bed roomed house in a highly accessible town centre to £2550 for a large house (>5 bedrooms) in a rural area with limited accessibility to public transport. It is proposed that in the first instance this approach should only be applied to developments in excess of 15 dwellings. A summary of

the proposed methodology and its proposed application for both residential and commercial development is included at appendix 1. A detailed explanation of the proposed methodology is included with the consultation documentation available in the members' room.

3. Consultation

3.1 A comprehensive consultation was undertaken between October 2003 and March 2004 to establish stakeholder feeling about the proposed methodology. A number of concerns were raised by stakeholders in response to that consultation and these are summarised in appendix 2 together with my suggested respective response. A copy of the consultation documentation together with copies of the individual stakeholder responses are available in the members' room.

3.2 The consultation attracted support from the Government Office for the South East (GOSE) who felt that the proposed approach was 'generally consistent with circular 1/97' which establishes the key tests of; necessity, relevance to planning, the relationship with the development, scale and reasonableness against which contributions must be tried. Whilst this view was not shared unanimously by the other consultees the principle of establishing a transparent methodology for the calculation of such contributions was generally welcomed. The findings of the consultation do not lead to any specific modification to the proposed methodology.

4. Environmental Issues

4.1 The approach will tend to encourage the development of smaller units in more accessible and therefore sustainable locations compared with larger units in less accessible locations. To that degree it is consistent with sustainable development principles. Additionally the utilisation of contributions will be limited by planning agreement to integrated transport or accessibility improvements local to the development site. These improvements will be designed to increase travel choices as alternatives to the private car supporting the delivery of the national 10 year transport plan and local transport plan targets.

5. Conclusion and Reason for Recommendation

5.1 The proposed methodology is simple to use and understand and is realistic. Required contributions are proportionate to the type, scale and location of development and the approach is complementary to and consistent with other published County Council guidance on parking standards at new development and broader planning policy. Importantly it also allows for flexibility and negotiation. Adoption of this methodology will allow the County Council to have a greater influence over the distribution of development contributions and should achieve improved levels of funding to improve integrated transport and accessibility for local communities.

BOB WILKINS

Director of Transport and Environment

03 June 2004

Cabinet: C8 June-SPG

Contact Officer: Peter Hayward Tel. No. 01273 482136

Local Members: All

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

Existing SPG on Development Contributions.

Consultation Documentation.

Responses to stakeholder consultation.

Summary of Proposed Methodology for Residential Development

1. The methodology for deriving the LSAIC proposed financial contribution from residential development is summarised below. Full details are set out in the Appendix to the consultation documents available in the members' room.

Additional funding for integrated transport programmes

2. The need for external funding to supplement Highway Authorities' (such as the County Council) Local Transport Plan integrated transport programmes is established in the Government's National Transport Plan. The County Council's integrated transport programmes are designed to alleviate local transport problems in our towns and villages such as traffic congestion, rat-running and speeding traffic, road safety hot spots, parking provision problems, poor facilities for public transport, cyclists and pedestrians (including those with mobility difficulties and the disabled) and environmental pollution from traffic. These problems are aggravated by traffic growth, and additional demand for travel generally, generated by new development. Recent Local Transport Plan settlements from central Government have resulted in a budget of around £4 million available annually to the County Council for local integrated transport programmes. This figure is used as the basis of the calculations set out below but will need to be adjusted to reflect future settlements.

Determination of financial contribution by new residential development to supplement County Council integrated transport programmes

3. The relative proportion that new residential development should contribute towards supplementing the County Council's local integrated transport budget is calculated by taking the projected annual traffic growth in the county generated by new residential development and expressing this as a proportion of the projected total annual traffic growth in the county. Calculations indicate that new residential development accounts for around 51% of total traffic growth in the county. A 51% uplift in the County Council's £4 million annual integrated transport settlement would result in an additional £2.04 million available annually for this purpose, producing a contribution of £6.04 million towards the annual budget.

Average cost per dwelling contribution

4. The average cost per new dwelling of funding this £2.04 million target is calculated by dividing this figure by the annualised Structure Plan dwelling provision requirement for the county (1,800 dwellings per annum). This works out at an average of around £1,150 per dwelling.

Matrix of development contributions per dwelling

5. This average cost per dwelling contribution (£1,150) is converted into a matrix which varies contributions according to the type of dwelling and the accessibility of its location. This is to align the scale of contributions sought with the scale of traffic generation and travel demand arising from new dwellings and, hence, their impact on local transport problems. The conversion is achieved by:-

- firstly, equating the average dwelling contribution cost (£1,150 per dwelling) with the Government's average parking space provision target per new dwelling of 1.5 spaces¹. This translates to £767 per residential parking space; and

¹ Planning Policy Guidance Note 3: Housing, paragraph 62, ODPM, 2000.

- secondly, by applying the figure of £767 per residential parking space to the County Council's published maximum parking space standards matrix. For example, the maximum allowable parking space provision of 1.165 spaces per medium sized house in Accessibility Zone 2 in Table 1 would justify a contribution of £894 (1.165 x £767 = £894), rounded up in the finalised table to £900.

6. Development contributions will be sought on the basis of Table 1 (following). The Accessibility Zones referred to in the table are derived from the County Council's adopted SPG on "Parking Standards at Development" a copy of which is available in the members room.

Table 1: Local Sustainable Accessibility Improvement Contributions: Proposed matrix of development contributions for residential development				
Development Type	Accessibility Zone			
	Zone 1	Zone 2	Zone 3	Zone 4²
Flat/maisonette	£250	£500	£750	£1,000
Small house (1 & 2 bedrooms) & Affordable housing	£250	£500	£750	£1,000
Medium house (3 & 4 bedrooms)	£450	£900	£1,350	£1,800
Large house (5 or more bedrooms)	£625	£1,250	£1,875	£2,500
Sheltered accommodation (units)	£65	£130	£195	£260
Residential hostel (bed spaces)	£30	£60	£90	£120

² Includes all rural areas and any other settlement not specifically covered by an Accessibility Zoning map.

Application of the Methodology for Residential Development

Development types covered

1. The methodology applies to a range of residential development types, including affordable housing, flats, sheltered accommodation and residential hostels.

Development thresholds

2. Development thresholds which would trigger the need for LSAIC are, as appropriate:-
- 15 dwellings or 30 hostel bed spaces;
 - Sites of 0.5 hectares or more where outline permission for residential use is sought and the number of dwellings is not specified; or
 - any other residential development which requires a transport assessment

Considerations

3. In addition to the LSAIC proposed in this technical note, individual developments will continue to be required to make any necessary specific improvements to the local transport network to achieve an appropriate degree of safety and accessibility (consistent with the implementation of the relevant LTP sub-strategy).

4. Where developers can demonstrate to the County Council's satisfaction that any such enabling safety and accessibility measures will also significantly contribute to wider accessibility, this will be taken into account in the calculation of the required LSAIC.

5. The determination of the LSAIC will also take into consideration, as appropriate, the agreed outcome of any submitted Transport Assessment, and, where relevant, Travel Plan. The general provisions set out in the SPG in relation to impact on viability and other relevant considerations will continue to apply.

6. Contributions arising from specific developments would be ring-fenced to take forward only integrated transport improvements local to the development site. Typically, such integrated transport improvements will be as set out in the Local Transport Plan sub-area strategies and packages or other relevant sub-strategies. Schemes funded would include relevant traffic management schemes, road safety remedial measures, cycle and pedestrian improvements, parking controls and improvements to public transport infrastructure etc. The County Council will identify specific schemes wherever practical.

Proposed methodology for non-residential development

1. The LSAIC requirements from non-residential types of development will be calculated on a case-by-case basis.

2. Such requirements will apply to major developments providing 1,000 sq ms or more employment/retail/leisure/tourism/other commercial floorspace and to any development which requires a transport assessment.

3. The determination of the LSAIC will, as appropriate, take account, of the agreed outcome of any submitted Transport Assessment, and, where relevant, Travel Plan.

4. The general provisions set out in the adopted SPG in relation to impact on viability and other relevant considerations and specific considerations described in this technical note apply, as appropriate.

SUMMARY OF CONCERNS RAISED BY STAKEHOLDERS

Respondent	Issue	East Sussex County Council Response
House Builders Federation Lewes District Council	Development contributions and LSAICs must reflect the tests of: Necessity Relevance to planning Directly related to the proposed development Fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind Reasonable in all other respects in the context of Circular 1/97	GOSE believe the methodology is consistent with circular 1/97. A similar approach to LSAIC has been used by other local authorities to seek development contributions to transport infrastructure
Wealden District Council Lewes District Council House Builders Federation East Chiltington Parish Council Rye Parish Council Seaford Town Council Country Land & Business Association	No link between the application/development and the improvement schemes. Contributions would be put towards broader LTP strategies. Any contributions required should achieve direct improvements to the accessibility of the application site and local area.	The contributions sought are intended to be proportional to the wider impact of the development on the transport system. The schemes funded will be restricted to those, which help mitigate these impacts in the area local to the development site.
Wealden District Council Lewes District Council House Builders Federation South East England Development Agency	Non-residential traffic accounts for a substantial amount of development traffic. More transparency is required in methodology to determine contributions required for non-residential development.	
Wealden District Council	There needs to be further clarification regarding the relationship between the local plan allocations.	
Rye Town Council	The document is worded poorly and is difficult to understand	
South East England Development Agency	It is assumed that East Sussex County Council has looked at the ODPM's proposals for development contributions	

Respondent	Issue	East Sussex County Council Response
Wealden District Council Action Rural Sussex	Disagreement with zonal approach. The use of zones should be monitored to ensure objectives are being met	The principle that development in more accessible locations makes a lesser contribution than that with less accessibility is a fundamental principle. The zones and relative differentials were established in the adopted SPG "Parking Standards at new development". For consistency, they have been used for the LSAIC. Their area definition was based on a sound methodology, assessing areas' accessibility by foot, bicycle and public transport and proximity to shops and services. The differentials in the LSAIC correspond to the degrees of parking restraint applied to the zones. The LSAIC and parent SPG will be regularly monitored and zone boundaries updated to reflect local accessibility improvements.
Wealden District Council Network Rail Country Land & Business Association Hastings Borough Council Bodiam Parish Council	LSAIC will have implications for the viability of some developments.	The parent SPG clearly indicates the impact of development contribution on scheme viability will be a material consideration for the determining authority in deciding the scale of the contribution sought. The intrinsic benefits of the development scheme will also need to be weighed up as part of this process.
House Builders Federation East Chiltington Parish Council	The government has allocated East Sussex County Council £4million for capital work programmes. To ask developers to contribute means schemes are paid for twice	The government has made it clear that the LTP contribution towards such improvements only represents a proportion of that required to deliver the objectives. Local authorities are expected to achieve contributions from other sources including developments to make up the shortfall.
Hastings Borough Council House Builders Federation	Attempt by East Sussex County Council to impose a roof tax.	The LSAIC is intended to ensure that new development makes a proportionate contribution to local transport improvements, which it will benefit from rather than those being wholly subsidised by the local community.
East Chiltington Parish Council	Would be simpler to introduce a land tax	A land tax would be contrary to national guidance. The approach of the SPG is consistent with circular 1/97.

Respondent	Issue	East Sussex County Council Response
House Builders Federation East Chiltington Parish Council	No reference to how unspent monies will be returned or reports on where the contributions have been spent.	The approach to refunding unspent monies is set out in the parent SPG which defines that unspent monies would be returned to the developer after a specified time period.
House Builders Federation	Where development benefits a community other community resources should be used to fund improvements.	The LSAIC makes provision for transport benefits resulting from the proposed development to be discounted from any contribution whilst requiring proportionate contributions from development to broader local transport improvements
Network Rail	Where a scheme has in built transport improvements the council should not expect the developer to make LSAIC on top of on site works.	Paragraph 4.4 of the LSAIC document indicates that where the developer can demonstrate to the council's satisfaction that any enabling safety and accessibility measures associated with the development will contribute towards wider accessibility, these will be taken into account in the calculation of the LSAIC. This includes integral transport elements of the schemes such as station/interchange enhancement.
Wealden District Council Heathfield and Waldron Parish Council East Chiltington Parish Council	<p>Concern that developers will reduce number of dwellings to 14/29 to avoid contributions.</p> <p>Would it be better to have no threshold or graduated payments for affordable housing? Or a threshold of 1000sqm for non-residential</p>	<p>The county council is aiming to agree an implementation protocol with the district councils. Whilst the parent SPG recognises that small scale of development can cumulatively have a significant impact on local services and facilities, for practical purposes, the standard threshold of 15 dwellings for residential development adopted by the published SPG has been used. Para 2.20 of the SPG indicates that where allocated or development sites are artificially split to avoid the thresholds and payment of development contribution, a proportional sum will be sought.</p> <p>The thresholds have been chosen for their consistency with those used in the adopted parent SPG and those generally used in the county for affordable housing and for their ease of implementation. No thresholds would be impractical. The artificial sub-division of development on allocated sites or large sites to avoid the threshold will be resisted.</p>

Respondent	Issue	East Sussex County Council Response
East Chilmington Parish Council	The negotiation and implementation of the SPG should be more transparent	The SPG does improve transparency compared with the existing approach of negotiating contributions from individual sites. However, East Sussex County Council is working with the Local Planning Authorities to agree a protocol for the implementation of the SPG, which together with the SPG itself should further improve transparency.
East Chilmington Parish Council	Traffic growth does not arise from new development but increased prosperity and failing public transport	New development contributes toward population growth, which, in turn, generates traffic growth. This places additional pressure on the transport system. The generally poor quality of the alternatives to the car available in the county explains the relatively high car trip rate used. The LSAIC aims to mitigate these transport system impacts and help improve the attractiveness of non-car modes
Action in Rural Sussex	The influence of a travel plan and a TA on the LSAIC is unclear	It is regrettable that the meaning is not clear. The text simply aims to explain that the calculation of the LSAIC will also take into account (i.e. may be offset against) any enabling measures required in a travel plan or in the mitigation works required in a transport assessment.
Passenger Transport Group	Development contributions should be used as revenue funding for bus services not just capital works. If LSAICS are ring fenced the passenger transport group will be in a weakened negotiation position with developers who think their obligations are met. The East Sussex County Council will have to fund services in these locations	
Railfuture	There should be a facility to amend the charge if there were more parking spaces per house and less if there were less, or some real commitment to less car use and the support of existing public transport.	The impact of the LSAIC when considered in parallel with the parking standards will have exactly this effect.