

Response ID ANON-8CC9-KD8X-P

Submitted to **Local Plan Issues and Options**

Submitted on **2020-03-15 19:58:01**

Your details

What is your name?

Forename:

M ke

Surname:

Ginger

Are you making an individual response or on behalf of an organisation?

Organisation

If individual, please tell us what type:

Name of organisation:

Taunton Area Cycling Campaign

Please choose one from the drop-down list:

Community Group

What is your (personal/organisational) address?

██████████
████████████████████

██████████
██████████

What is your email address?

██████████
████████████████████

1. Overview and objectives

Do you agree that these are the right Objectives for the Local Plan?

Disagree

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

We are concerned that objective 5 is an invitation for a road building programme which would work against sustainability. Therefore we suggest that the phrase 'broadly carbon neutral' is inserted between essential and infrastructure

We suggest that objective 6 is widened to include car sharing and also reduced car ownership through car clubs

2. Carbon neutrality

Question 1a: Should we aim to require that all newdevelopment is 'zero carbon' by as soon as possible (e.g. by 2025) or give slightly more time (e.g. by 2030) for developers to adapt their design approaches, materials and suppliers?

As soon as possible (e.g. by 2025)

Question 1b: Should we allocate sites for specific renewable energy development or identify broad areas which we consider suitable?

Identify suitable areas through criteria based policies

Question 1c: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

As transport is the highest producer of carbon emissions, substantial investment in walking, cycling and public transport is essential and resources should be re-allocated from road building (which currently gets the lion's share of capital investment locally).

3. Sustainable locations

Question 2a: Do you agree with the tiers that identifies Taunton followed by 6 tiers covering the other settlements?

Not Answered

If not, what changes would you make and why? (200 words max):

Question 2b: Do you think Watchet and Williton should be seen as associated settlements for the purposes of the Local Plan due to their close proximity and in complementing the services of each other (and therefore be in a higher tier to Bishops Lydeard and Wiveliscombe)?

Not Answered

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

Question 2c: Do you think we should carry on with the way housing is currently distributed across our area (see pie chart) or should we be doing something different, such as one of the three options suggested below?

Not Answered

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

What else do you think about housing distribution in our area?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

Question 2d: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

If Wellington is to be 2nd tier, this should be conditional on provision of rail services to Taunton, Bristol, Exeter etc and the provision of a cycle route linking Wellington and Taunton.

5. A prosperous economy

Question 4a: Should we ensure the growth of our local economy through an increase in the proportion of higher value jobs (with limited increase of jobs overall) or through a significant increase in the number of jobs?

Not Answered

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

Question 4b: Should we keep all of our existing employment sites and allocations in employment use or should we allow the loss of some to other uses? How should we decide which ones to lose?

Not Answered

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

New employment needs to be easily accessible by public transport and cycling. Currently many people are excluded from a range of economic based activities including jobs, as reaching them is dependent on a car being available.

Question 4c: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

6. Infrastructure

Question 5a: On what infrastructure should we prioritise developer contributions? (Please rank in order of priority)

IO - 5a - ranking - Affordable housing:

IO - 5a - ranking - Designing for the Climate Change Emergency:

IO - 5a - ranking - Accessible, Adaptable and Wheelchair Accessible homes:

IO - 5a - ranking - Strategic Infrastructure (schools, transport, community facilities):

Question 5b: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

Difficult to answer this as we haven't had a group discussion on it. Think we would lean to Climate Change programme, which would include cycling infrastructure.

7. Connecting people

Question 6a: How can we encourage people not to use their car when travelling into our towns for shopping and work? How can we provide more opportunities for using public transport in rural areas?

Please provide comments (200 words max):

A combination of high quality alternatives to single car occupancy, reducing the need to travel and 'demand management'. In the case of the latter parking supply and pricing should be established to encourage the use of park and ride. Higher densities at transport hubs especially rail stations. Economics of bus provision will limit options in some rural areas and a concerted effort on car sharing and smaller bus solutions needed.

All homes with urban areas to be within 400m of high quality cycle/walking network (as Turn the network blue). Network needs to be identified in the plan, Access via 20mph streets and filtered permeability. New layouts should ensure that walking and cycling routes are more direct than car routes. Draw on <https://www.transportfornewhomes.org.uk/the-project/checklist-for-new-housing-developments/>

The hierarchy would need to apply to the design process. We all know that the predict and provide approach results in designs for traffic capacity, with poor quality cycling and walking tacked on and poor quality public realm.

Question 6b: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

Pg 17 New development should put people rather than vehicles at its heart..... – agreed but needs to give examples of mechanisms for achieving this including criteria for network density

2b/ - agreed but assessment of this needs to be more robust based on real journeys not crow fly distances, and taking into account the quality of links

Low Carbon Transport Hierarchy- agreed but should include car sharing. This needs to apply to the way roads are designed to get away from current predict and provide for cars, with cycling and walking as highly compromised 'add ons' to over engineered roads and junctions

6b/1 New developments to be designed in line with Sport England's active design guidelines⁴¹ so that walking and cycling networks permeate through developments in a safe and convenient way.-needs also to reflect new DfT guidance on cycling/walking infra design

6b/.-transport assessments should be based on assessment of travel impacts and against policy objectives (see https://www.ciht.org.uk/media/10218/ciht-better-planning-a4_updated_linked_.pdf). At the moment they are purely a technical assessment of traffic generation and modelled distribution of traffic to check for congestion effects, but they give no overview of whether sustainable transport policy objectives are supported. The LPA must play a stronger role in this. The LPA has just approved highway infrastructure for Comeytrowe which exemplifies the old predict and provide /plan for car growth approach,

Parking –There are many examples of poor or no cycle parking in new developments (e.g. the two Lidl outlets in Taunton) despite the existence of cycle parking standards. There needs to be a checklist so development proposals are checked-as is the case with car parking.

9a/3–suggest use the word 'apply' rather than 'allow'

8. The natural and historic environment

Question 7a: Are there any specific measures that you would like to see new developments deliver to improve biodiversity locally?

Please provide comments (200 words max):

Question 7b: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

Broadly support but no our specific area of knowledge

10. Wellbeing of our residents

Question 9a: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

Broadly support

11. Policies for our places: Taunton

Question 10a: How do you think we could introduce more housing into Taunton Town centre?

Encouraging car-free developments (which could include allocating specific sites for car-free developments).

Please provide reasons for your answers (200 words max):

These factors aren't mutually exclusive. Broadly support 10a and suggest that this could be applied at the railway station and other potential public transport hubs

Strong support for 10b/4 and better use of land used for car parking 10b/5

Question 10b: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

12. Policies for our places: Wellington

Question 11a: Do you have any comments on these policy approaches?

Please provide comments (250 words max):

11a/7 High St and Fore Street junction doesn't work well for pedestrians and the historic setting is marred by all the traffic engineering furniture including guard railing. Need to develop a scheme to remodel and reduce the dross e.g. possible shared surface.