

Residential Travel Planning

SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report updates Members on the application of residential travel plans in Derby. It further discusses the potential that residential travel plans have in reducing the highway impact of new housing and sites proposed as part of the core strategy.
- 1.2 Residential Travel Plans are relatively new and guidance was first published by the Department for Transport in 2005. There is less evidence on the success of residential travel plans, however, developers claim that a 10% reduction in car trips can be achieved.
- 1.3 Managing the demand for travel by integrating residential development with other land use, such as schools, shops, health and employment, will achieve far more in terms of reducing car trips than trying to manage them once they have been created.
- 1.4 Derby City Council has set out the requirement for a residential travel plan on a number of developments in Derby. This has been achieved by placing certain requirements through S106 Agreements on the development to produce, implement and monitor their residential travel plans
- 1.5 However, the success of residential travel plans remains to be seen in Derby because although a number have been conditioned as part of a planning consent, to date none of these developments have been constructed.
- 1.6 Transport modelling of the potential Core Strategy housing allocations suggests that all of the potential sites tested would benefit from mitigation measures such as traffic management improvements and the promotion of smarter choices to improve the provision and accessibility of pedestrian and cycling facilities and public transport. These can be tailored to each site as appropriate and would be key features of any residential travel plan
- 1.7 For many of the core strategy housing sites, mitigation is limited because the opportunities to provide viable and frequent public transport and travel choice enhancements are constrained both by the peripheral nature of many of the sites and the dispersed pattern of development. The economies of scale required to provide step changes in service provision are less achievable with the proposed pattern of development than if it were possible to focus growth in one or two key areas.
- 1.8 To this end, where a new development requires a completely new bus service it

needs to achieve higher levels of development patronage to become commercially viable. Where existing services can be extended this provides greater possibilities for serving the new developments. This is the case for strategic housing allocations towards the south of the City, which are more sustainable than options considered to the North West of the City, as they have greater opportunities to extend existing bus services and better access to existing amenities.

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 To note the findings of this report and that for new housing sites there are moderate benefits for residential travel plans. However, developments are more likely to achieve higher proportions of none car trips if they are integrated into the existing public transport and mixed land uses such as district centres and schools. Members are also invited to make any appropriate comments and recommendations.

REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 The report on residential travel plans was requested by the board at their February 2014 meeting. The report allows members to be updated on this work and to discuss and make recommendations on the information presented.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 4.1 Workplace travel plans have been around in the UK since the early 1990s and can achieve relatively successful levels of mode shift from single occupancy car trips. Research by the Department of Transport (DfT), has published examples where organisations have experience an 18% reduction in the wake of a travel plan.
- 4.2 Residential Travel Plans are relatively new and guidance was first published by the DfT in 2005. There is less evidence on the success of residential travel plans, however, developers claim that a 10% reduction in car trips can be achieved. This is perhaps academic and depends on the location of sites and their integration with the existing transport and other land uses. For example, if a site has a 90% mode share of car drivers during the morning commuter peak hour (0800-0900), then reducing this to 80% does not make the site sustainable.
- 4.3 Managing the demand for travel by integrating residential development with other land use, such as schools, shops, health and employment, will achieve far more in terms of reducing car trips than trying to manage them once they have been created. For example, the 2011 Census recorded in AM Commuter Peak (0800-0900) for the residents of the Boulton Ward that the percentage of retail trips accounts for around 4% of journey purpose and education escort about 20%. Containing these trips within the development would significantly reduce a large proportion of trip making on the wider network.
- 4.4 The objective of the residential travel plan is to ensure that links to trip attractors are maximised by walking, cycling and public transport through infrastructure design and that these modes of transport are established in residents travel habits by promoting them as soon as people start to occupy the houses. This is a reciprocal relationship and to this end this is why establishing behavioural change initiatives such as LSTF

and public transport improvements such as Better Bus are important for Derby. Indeed, unless there is a travel plan resource within the City Council to assist developers in adopting residential travel plans then there will be no drive to implement them.

- 4.5 **Appendix A** sets out the suggested elements that need to be considered in the design of a development to maximise travel by none car modes, and the areas that a residential travel plan should cover. This is taken from the Department for Transport's Guidance on Making Residential Travel Plans Work: guidelines for new development, 2005.
- 4.6 Derby City Council has set out the requirement for a residential travel plan on a number of developments that include Manor Kingsway and Rykneld Road. This has been achieved by placing certain requirements on the development to produce, implement and monitor their residential travel plans. **Appendix B** outlines an example of the S106 Heads of Terms used to secure a residential travel plan. This is taken from the Manor Kingsway Development and includes a requirement for certain measures to be implemented, a travel plan co-ordinator, a monitoring programme and a £50,000 contingency fund that can be used by the City Council if the travel plan fails.
- 4.4 However, the success of residential travel plans remains to be seen in Derby because although a number have been conditioned as part of a planning consent, to date none of these developments have been constructed.
- 4.5 Transport modelling of the potential Core Strategy housing allocations suggests that all of the potential sites tested would benefit from mitigation measures such as traffic management improvements and the promotion of smarter choices to improve the provision and accessibility of pedestrian and cycling facilities and public transport. These can be tailored to each site as appropriate and would be key features of any residential travel plan. Travel Plans are most effective when implemented early, using smarter choices measures to lock in the benefits of sustainable services and infrastructure and optimise travel habits associated with new developments from the start.
- 4.5 However, the level of mitigation that the modelling indicated would be achievable using smarter choices and public transport interventions was quite moderate. The model predicted that the highway person modal share for new residential developments averaged between 6% and 24% in the AM Peak. Sites with better links to cycling and public transport services tended to perform better. These values should not be taken as absolute and this is really a measure of the potential for smarter choices and public transport.
- 4.6 For many of the core strategy housing sites, mitigation is limited because the opportunities to provide viable and frequent public transport and travel choice enhancements are constrained both by the peripheral nature of many of the sites and the dispersed pattern of development. The economies of scale required to provide step changes in service provision are less achievable with the proposed pattern of development than if it were possible to focus growth in one or two key areas.

- 4.7 In particular, opportunities to provide attractive, high frequency public transport services decrease with increasing journey times and distance to key services. Where a new development requires a completely new bus service it needs to achieve higher levels of development patronage to become commercially viable. Where existing services can be extended this provides greater possibilities for serving the new developments. This is the case for strategic housing allocations towards the south of the City, which are more sustainable than options considered to the North West of the City, as they have greater opportunities to extend existing bus services and better access to existing amenities.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 None, this report is for information only.

This report has been approved by the following officers:

Legal officer Financial officer Human Resources officer Estates/Property officer Service Director(s) Other(s)	N/A N/A N/A N/A Christine Durrant Paul Clarke Rachel Harvey
For more information contact: Background papers: List of appendices:	Andrew Gibbard 01332 641756 andrew.gibbard@derby.gov.uk None

IMPLICATIONS

Financial and Value for Money

1.1 None, this report is for information only.

Legal

2.1 None, this report is for information only.

Personnel

3.1 None, this report is for information only.

IT

4.1 None, this report is for information only.

Equalities Impact

5.1 None, this report is for information only.

Health and Safety

6.1 None, this report is for information only.

Environmental Sustainability

7.1 None, this report is for information only.

Property and Asset Management

8.1 None, this report is for information only.

Risk Management

9.1 None, this report is for information only.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

10.1 None, this report is for information only.

