

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|--|--------------------------------|
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/1</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 8.17</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.5- 8.6 page 109</p> | <p>“8.6a Some of the consequences of growth in car ownership and use can be summarised as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Economic Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion affecting the ability of firms to obtain and make deliveries and to attract a workforce; • Discouraging inward investment in urban areas. • Increased absenteeism due to traffic related ill health. <p style="text-align: center;">Social Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affecting and limiting choices of non-car transport modes, such as cycling, walking and buses; • Social & health problems (e.g. stress) resulting from long and difficult commuting times; • Safety of vulnerable road users, in particular children and the elderly. • Health problems due to air pollution. <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor and deteriorating air quality and the consequent impact on public health; • Noise & vibration; • Severance and visual impact of transport, both directly and indirectly, on the form and | <p>“8.6a Some of the consequences of growth in car ownership and use can be summarised as follows:</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Economic Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congestion affecting the ability of firms to obtain and make deliveries and to attract a workforce; • Discouraging inward investment in urban areas. • Increased absenteeism due to traffic related ill health. <p style="text-align: center;">Social Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Affecting and limiting choices of non-car transport modes, such as cycling, walking and buses; • Social & health problems (e.g. stress) resulting from long and difficult commuting times; • Safety of vulnerable road users, in particular children and the elderly. • Health problems due to air pollution. <p style="text-align: center;">Environmental Impacts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Poor and deteriorating air quality and the consequent impact on public health; • Noise & vibration; • Severance and visual impact of transport, both directly and indirectly, on the form and | <p>Correct a factual error</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|---|---|--|
| | <p>appearance of places;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of non-renewable resources, e.g. oil; • Effect on global warming through the release of green house gases, such as carbon dioxide. A quarter (28%) of carbon dioxide emissions in the UK comes from road transport.” | <p>appearance of places;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of non-renewable resources, e.g. oil; • Effect on global warming through the release of green house gases, such as carbon dioxide. More than a A-quarter (28%) of carbon dioxide emissions in the UK comes from road transport.” | |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/2</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 8.17</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.5-8.6 page 109</p> | <p>“8.17 The revised PPG13 aims to promote more sustainable transport choices and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The objectives within the guidance require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the UDP and the Council’s Local Transport Plan complement each other; • major generators of travel demand are focused in city, town and centres and near to major public transport interchanges; • day to day facilities are located in local centres where they are accessible by walking and cycling; • parking policies are used to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car; • priority is given to people over traffic in town centres, mixed use areas and local neighbourhoods, giving more space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; • the needs of people with disabilities are taken into account; | <p>“8.17 The revised PPG13 aims to promote more sustainable transport choices and reduce the need to travel, especially by car. The objectives within the guidance require that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the UDP and the Council’s Local Transport Plan complement each other; • major generators of travel demand are focused in city, town and centres and near to major public transport interchanges; • day to day facilities are located in local centres where they are accessible by walking and cycling; • parking policies are used to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car; • priority is given to people over traffic in town centres, mixed use areas and local neighbourhoods, giving more space to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; • the needs of people with disabilities are taken into account; | <p>Reintroduction of paragraph 8.18 from the FDDP, for the reasons set out in the Inspector’s Report</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|--|--|--|
| | <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites and routes critical to developing choices for passenger and freight movements are protected.” | <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • sites and routes critical to developing choices for passenger and freight movements are protected. <p>8.18 Amongst the main planning policies that it promotes are focusing major generators of travel demand in town and district centres and near to major transport interchanges and locating day to day facilities in local centres so that they are accessible by walking and cycling. A key planning objective is to ensure that jobs, shopping, leisure and services are highly accessible by public transport, walking and cycling. It particularly stresses contributing to social inclusion by ensuring that development is accessible by public transport from deprived areas. It requires parking policies, which restrain the overall amount of parking to reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys.”</p> | |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/3</p> <p>UDP - Paragraph 8.25</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.7-</p> | <p>“8.25 Taking into account the district's transport problems mentioned earlier and the various requirements of government policy and guidance, the transport objectives of the Unitary Development Plan are as follows:</p> <p>(1) To improve the environment and reduce air pollution by restricting non-essential traffic particularly in residential areas.</p> <p>(2) To reduce reliance on the private car,</p> | <p>“8.25 Taking into account the district's transport problems mentioned earlier and the various requirements of government policy and guidance, the transport objectives of the Unitary Development Plan are as follows:</p> <p>(1) To improve the environment and reduce air pollution by restricting non-essential traffic particularly in residential areas.</p> <p>(2) To reduce reliance on the private car,</p> | <p>Reinstatement of objective (4) from FDDP, for reasons set out in the Inspector's Report</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| 8.9 pp 109-110 | <p>restrain its use and encourage greater use of alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>(3) To co-ordinate planning and regeneration to achieve transport improvements which enhance the attractiveness of regeneration areas, as well as ensuring that development in regeneration areas is designed and located so that it is attractive to access by public transport, where necessary by securing service improvements.</p> <p>(5) To make better use of existing road space and reduce the environmental impact of traffic by prioritising sustainable modes of transport - such as walking, cycling and buses - in managing traffic. Using this to minimise the amount of road building to that which is essential to secure access to regeneration areas;</p> <p>(6) To improve access to town centres by means of transport other than the car, while continuing to provide a reasonable level of parking for shopping and leisure visits.</p> <p>(7) To improve road safety where opportunities arise through the land use planning process.</p> <p>(8) To ensure that the needs for freight transport and servicing are met - including a greater emphasis on non-road based freight transport.”</p> | <p>restrain its use and encourage greater use of alternative modes of transport.</p> <p>(3) To co-ordinate planning and regeneration to achieve transport improvements which enhance the attractiveness of regeneration areas, as well as ensuring that development in regeneration areas is designed and located so that it is attractive to access by public transport, where necessary by securing service improvements.</p> <p>(4) <i>To provide real choice of transport for the district's residents, workforce and visitors. In particular to improve the quality of accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling</i></p> <p>(5) To make better use of existing road space and reduce the environmental impact of traffic by prioritising sustainable modes of transport - such as walking, cycling and buses - in managing traffic. Using this to minimise the amount of road building to that which is essential to secure access to regeneration areas;</p> <p>(6) To improve access to town centres by means of transport other than the car, while continuing to provide a reasonable level of parking for shopping and leisure visits.</p> <p>(7) To improve road safety where opportunities arise through the land use planning process.</p> <p>(8) To ensure that the needs for freight transport and servicing are met -</p> | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|--|---|
| | | including a greater emphasis on non-road based freight transport.” | |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/4</p> <p>UDP – Policy TM1, Paragraphs 8.32 and 8.32a</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.11-8.18 pp 110-113</p> | <p>“Policy TM1 WHEN CONSIDERING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANT GENERATORS OF TRAVEL THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE THESE TO BE SUPPORTED BY A DETAILED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT (TA). THE TA SHOULD INCORPORATE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REDUCTION MEASURES BY THE DEVELOPER AND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL INCLUDING USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING.”</p> <p>“8.32 Applications for developments likely to have a significant transport impact on the existing transport network should be accompanied a formal Transport Assessment (TA). PPG 13 defines 'significant' by setting thresholds for development size above which a transport assessment will be required. The thresholds are the same as those for maximum parking standards and are given in Appendix C. The TA is a written statement setting out details of transport conditions both with and without a proposed development. The TA should cover all modes of transport including public transport, cycling and</p> | <p>“Policy TM1 WHEN CONSIDERING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR DEVELOPMENTS LIKELY TO BE SIGNIFICANT GENERATORS OF TRAVEL THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE THESE TO BE SUPPORTED BY A DETAILED TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT (TA). THE TA SHOULD INCORPORATE PROPOSED TRAFFIC REDUCTION MEASURES BY THE DEVELOPER AND MEASURES TO PROMOTE SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL INCLUDING USE OF PUBLIC TRANSPORT, WALKING AND CYCLING AS NECESSARY ARISING FROM THE TRAVEL GENERATION REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT.”</p> <p>“8.32 Applications for developments likely to have a significant transport impact on the existing transport network should be accompanied by a formal traffic assessment (TA). PPG 13 defines 'significant' by setting thresholds for development size above which a transport assessment will be required. The thresholds are the same as those for maximum parking standards and are given in Appendix C. Whilst PPG13 does not set thresholds for development size for transport assessments, the Council considers that gross floor space will play a major, but not determinative,</p> | <p>For reasons as set out in the Inspector's report</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|---|---|-------------------------|
| | <p>walking. If a planning application is not accompanied by a full Environmental Statement, then the effect of any additional traffic on air pollution and noise should also be included. The Government is currently preparing good practice advice on the content of Transport Assessments to be submitted alongside planning applications and this section will be revised and updated when this guidance becomes available. It would also be prudent to consult local sustainable transport users when assessing the transport impact of a development.</p> <p>8.32a For smaller developments below the specified thresholds, until further national or regional guidance becomes available, the Institution of Highways and Transportation Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA) should be used. These currently recommend that a TIA should be produced where one or other of the following thresholds are likely to be exceeded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic to and from the development exceeds 10% of the existing two-way traffic flow on the adjoining highway, or | <p><i>factor in the decision-making process.</i> The TA should cover all modes of transport including public transport, cycling and walking. If a planning application is not accompanied by a full Environmental Statement, then the effect of any additional traffic on air pollution and noise should also be included. The Government is currently preparing good practice advice on the contents of transport assessments to be submitted alongside planning applications and this section will be revised and updated when this guidance becomes available. It would also be prudent to consult local sustainable transport users when assessing the transport impact of a development. <i>This can be done by contacting representatives of transport user groups such as Transport 2000, Cycling Action Group, Pedestrian Association, and Disability groups.</i></p> <p>8.32a For smaller developments below the specified thresholds, until further national or regional guidance becomes available, the Institution of Highways and Transportation Guidelines for Traffic Impact Assessments (TIA) should be used. These currently recommend that a TIA should be produced where one or other of the following thresholds are likely to be exceeded:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic to and from the development exceeds 10% of the existing two-way traffic flow on the adjoining highway, or • traffic to and from the | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|---|--|---|
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • traffic to and from the development exceeds 5% of the existing two way traffic flow on the adjoining highway in congested periods.” | <p>development exceeds 5% of the existing two way traffic flow on the adjoining highway in congested periods.</p> <p><i>PPG13 advises that the coverage and detail of the TA should reflect the scale of development and the For smaller schemes the TA should simply outline the transport aspects of the application. For major applications the assessment should illustrate accessibility to the site by all modes and the likely modal split of journeys to and from the site. It should also give details of proposed measures to improve access by public transport, walking and cycling, to reduce the need for parking associated with the proposal and to mitigate transport impacts.</i></p> <p><i>8.32aa Both the Highways Agency and the Council will assess development proposals near trunk roads and the M606 motorway, but developers should bear in mind that in accordance with Department for Transport policy no new direct access to the M606 will be permitted.”</i></p> | |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/5</p> <p>UDP – Paragraphs 8.32b and 8.34</p> | | <p><i>“8.32ab The following factors will be taken into consideration in applying this policy:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>impact on the highway network in terms of increased traffic generated and its ability to cater for any additional demand created;</i> | <p>For reasons as set out in the Inspector’s report</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|---|--|-------------------------|
| <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.19-8.27 pp 114-116</p> | <p>“8.32b Where proposals have a detrimental impact on the transport network, planning permission will not be granted. However, where the Council considers that it would be possible to overcome these problems by implementing appropriate public transport, walking and cycling schemes, contributions will be sought from developers through planning obligations. “</p> <p>“8.34 The Council will seek to reduce the impact of traffic by encouraging appropriate measures within development proposals. This will be primarily through requiring an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Plan’s parking policies, encouraging alternative methods of travel through the provision of a Travel Plan and</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>highway safety and any demand created for on-street parking;</i> • <i>level of existing public transport services and infrastructure serving the site and its capacity to cater for additional demand created; and</i> • <i>pedestrian and cycle movement and facilities in the vicinity of the site and the need to promote these two modes of transport.</i> <p>8.32b Where proposals have a detrimental impact on the transport network, planning permission will not be granted. However, where the Council considers that it would be possible to overcome these problems by implementing appropriate highway network improvements, public transport, walking and cycling schemes, contributions will be sought from developers through planning obligations.</p> <p>“8.34 The Council will seek to reduce the impact of traffic by encouraging appropriate measures within development proposals. This will be primarily through requiring an appropriate level of parking provision in accordance with the Plan’s parking policies, encouraging alternative methods of travel, especially to the</p> | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|---|--|---|
| | seeking contribution to public transport improvements where appropriate.” | <i>private car</i> , through the provision of a Travel Plan and seeking contribution to public transport, walking and cycling improvements where appropriate.” | |
| Mod - Mod/PF/TM/6 UDP – Paragraph 8.42 IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.89- 8.91 pp 133-134 | “8.42 New sites in Bradford as identified in Rail Plan 5 are at Apperley Bridge, Laisterdyke and Low Moor. Apperley Bridge and Low Moor are currently being considered for early implementation as part of Rail Plan 5 programme, whilst Laisterdyke may be considered for implementation during the Plan period” | “8.42 New sites in Bradford as identified in Rail Plan 5 are at Apperley Bridge, Laisterdyke and Low Moor. Apperley Bridge and Low Moor are currently being considered for early implementation as part of Rail Plan 5 programme, whilst Laisterdyke may be considered for implementation during the Plan period. Within Shipley town centre, improvements are being pursued to integrate bus and rail travel more closely. ” | This is an additional sentence related to POM 42. For reasons as set out in the Inspector's report |
| Mod - Mod/PF/TM/7 UDP – Policy TM7 Park and Ride, Paragraph 8.44 IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.41- 8.43 pp 119-120 | “8.44 The UDP seeks to encourage the use of public transport and thereby reduce the need for car parking in the city and town centres. One of the key-ways of achieving this aim is through the development of Park and Ride schemes for both rail and buses.” | “8.44 The UDP seeks to encourage the use of public transport and thereby reduce the need for car parking in the city and town centres. One of the key-ways of achieving this aim is through the development of Park and Ride schemes for both rail and buses, and including facilities for cycle parking. ” | For reasons as set out in the Inspector's report |
| Mod - Mod/PF/TM/8 UDP – Policy TM9, | “8.56 Consent is needed under the Town and Country Planning Act to block or divert a public right of way. The Council maintains a 'definitive map' of public | “8.55a The Council believes that rights of way must be maintained and preferably enhanced when development proposals are | As a result of the deletion of policy NE1 (see SOD XX) consequential amendment to clarify the Councils approach under Policy TM9. |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|--|---|---|
| Protection of Routes, Paragraph 8.56 IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 14.1- 14.5 Pages 180- 181 | rights of way, but in addition to this are 'permissive' rights of way that have been use by the public for many years." | <p><i>considered. Diversions using estate roads will be discouraged, as will narrow paths between high fences which pay insufficient regard to public amenity and safety; preference will be given to the formation of corridors providing through routes within developments.</i></p> <p>8.56 Consent is needed by order (financed by the developer) under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990, to block or divert a public right of way. The Council maintains a 'definitive map' of public rights of way, but in addition to this are 'permissive' unrecorded rights of way that have been use by the public for many years."</p> | |
| MOD - Mod/PF/TM/9 UDP – Policy TM10 National and Local Cycle Network IR - Policy Framework paragraphs 8.51- 8.53 pp 122 | | Amend the proposals map to show the national and local cycle network (See Appendix 2.2) | For reasons as set out in the Inspector's report |
| Mod - Mod/PF/TM/10 UDP – Policy | "Policy TM11 IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR PRIVATE NON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS INCLUDING CHANGES OF USE THE | "Policy TM11 IN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR PRIVATE NON RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS | Bring policy into line with PPG13 and for reasons as set out in the Inspector's report |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| TM11, Paragraph 8.60a IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.56- 8.59 pp 123-125 | COUNCIL WILL: (1) SEEK A LOWER LEVEL OF PARKING IN LOCATIONS WITH GOOD ACCESSIBILITY (SUCH AS CITY AND TOWN CENTRES AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT NODES) THAN THAT SET IN THE COUNCIL'S ADOPTED STANDARDS (SET OUT IN APPENDIX C OF THIS PLAN); (2) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION UP TO THE FULL STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE A NEED FOR PARKING TO THAT LEVEL; AND (3) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION ABOVE THE STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT A HIGHER LEVEL OF PARKING IS NEEDED AND THAT THE PROPOSED PROVISION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL SHORT STAY PUBLIC PARKING." | INCLUDING CHANGES OF USE THE COUNCIL WILL: (1) SEEK A LOWER LEVEL OF PARKING IN LOCATIONS WITH GOOD ACCESSIBILITY (SUCH AS CITY AND TOWN CENTRES AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT NODES) THAN THAT SET IN THE COUNCIL'S ADOPTED STANDARDS (SET OUT IN APPENDIX C OF THIS PLAN) EXCEPT FOR RETAIL AND LEISURE DEVELOPMENTS IN TOWN CENTRES AND EDGE OF CENTRE SITES WHERE ADDITIONAL PARKING ABOVE MAXIMUM WILL BE PERMITTED PROVIDED THAT THIS WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL SHORT STAY PUBLIC PARKING' ; (2) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION UP TO THE FULL STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE A NEED FOR PARKING TO THAT LEVEL; AND (3) ONLY CONSIDER ALLOWING PROVISION ABOVE THE STANDARD WHERE THE DEVELOPER CAN DEMONSTRATE THAT A HIGHER LEVEL OF PARKING IS NEEDED AND THAT THE PROPOSED PROVISION WILL BE MADE AVAILABLE FOR GENERAL SHORT STAY PUBLIC PARKING. HAS TAKEN OTHER MEASURES TO MINIMISE THE | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|---|---|---------------------------------|
| | | <p style="text-align: center;">NEED FOR PARKING.”</p> <p><i>“8.60ba The car parking standards given in Appendix C will be applied as a maximum and a minimum requirement will not normally be imposed unless under provision would result in road safety implications which cannot be resolved through the introduction or enforcement of on-street parking controls. In individual developments a need for parking in excess of the standards in Appendix C should be demonstrated preferably through a Transport Assessment. Applicants must also indicate the measures they are taking in the design, location or implementation of the scheme to minimise the need for parking.”</i></p> | |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/11</p> <p>UDP – Policy TM18 Parking for people with disabilities</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.70- 8.71 Pages 127- 128</p> | <p>“Policy TM18 THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE PARKING ARRANGEMENTS FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND OTHERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS SUCH AS PARENTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AND THE ELDERLY.</p> | <p>“Policy TM18 THE COUNCIL WILL REQUIRE NEW DEVELOPMENTS TO PROVIDE APPROPRIATE PARKING ARRANGEMENTS PROVISION FOR PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES AND OTHERS WITH SPECIAL NEEDS SUCH AS PARENTS WITH YOUNG CHILDREN AND THE ELDERLY IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE GUIDELINES IN APPENDIX C.”</p> | <p>To correct error at RDDP</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS

UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|--|---|--|--|
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/12</p> <p>UDP – Paragraph 8.80</p> <p>IR – Policy Framework Paragraphs 8.72- 8.73 pp 128</p> | <p>“8.80 In determining planning applications for non-residential development the Council will require dedicated car parking provision for people with disabilities and those with restricted mobility. A minimum of 10% of any proposed parking spaces shall be provided to mobility standard (minimum width 3.6 metres). No less than half of these spaces shall be signed as being for the exclusive use of disabled people. Where less than 10 car parking spaces are to be provided, at least one space shall be provided to ‘mobility standard’. These spaces should be provided in a safe and convenient location. This policy should be read in conjunction with Policy D3, which deals with access to buildings and their surroundings for people with disabilities. Developers will also be encouraged to provide conveniently located and signed spaces for single parents with young children and the elderly.”</p> | <p>“8.80 In determining planning applications for non-residential development the Council will require dedicated car parking provision for people with disabilities and those with restricted mobility <i>in accordance with guidance in Appendix C. A minimum of 10% of any proposed parking spaces shall be provided to mobility standard (minimum width 3.6 metres). No less than half of these spaces shall be signed as being for the exclusive use of disabled people. Where less than 10 car parking spaces are to be provided, at least one space shall be provided to ‘mobility standard’. These spaces should be provided in a safe and convenient location.</i> This policy should be read in conjunction with Policy D3, which deals with access to buildings and their surroundings for people with disabilities. Developers will also be encouraged to provide conveniently located and signed spaces for single parents with young children and the elderly.”</p> | <p>Addresses inconsistency between new text in paragraph 8.80 and the guidance in Appendix C</p> |
| <p>Mod - Mod/PF/TM/13</p> <p>UDP – Policy TM23 & Paragraph 8.91 Aircraft Safety</p> <p>IR – N/A</p> | <p>“Policy TM23 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT CREATE A POSSIBLE HAZARD TO THE SAFE OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT, AERODROMES OR AIRCRAFT NAVIGATION FACILITIES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.</p> <p>8.91 There is a need to ensure the safe movement of aircraft in the District, both to the Leeds Bradford Airport and to the</p> | <p>“Policy TM23 DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS THAT CREATE A POSSIBLE HAZARD TO THE SAFE OPERATION OF AIRCRAFT, AERODROMES OR AIRCRAFT NAVIGATION FACILITIES WILL NOT BE PERMITTED.</p> <p>8.91 There is a need to ensure the safe movement of aircraft in the District, both to the Leeds Bradford Airport and to the</p> | <p>To take into account the provisions in the new ODPM Circular “Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: Town and Country Planning (Safeguarding Aerodromes, technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002 and the most up to date Safeguarding area defined by the CAA for Leeds and Bradford International Airport (LBIA).</p> |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|---|--|-------------------------|
| | <p>emergency helicopter landing sites for Bradford Royal Infirmary and Airedale General Hospital. Aircraft safety can be prejudiced by the construction of tall structures such as chimneys, masts or multi-storey buildings, particularly on high ground, whilst even more modest development close to the helicopter landing facilities may pose fatal dangers. Planning applications for development which are located in zones designated in the Town and Country Planning (Aerodromes) Directions 1981 for Leeds Bradford Airport, or close to the helicopter landing facilities mentioned above will be referred to the Civil Aviation Authority for guidance.”</p> | <p>emergency helicopter landing sites for Bradford Royal Infirmary and Airedale General Hospital. Aircraft safety can be prejudiced by the construction of tall structures such as chimneys, masts or multi-storey buildings, particularly on high ground, whilst even more modest development close to the helicopter landing facilities may pose fatal dangers. Planning applications for development which are located in zones designated in the Town and Country Planning (Aerodromes) Directions 1981 for Leeds Bradford Airport, or close to the helicopter landing facilities mentioned above will be referred to the Civil Aviation Authority for guidance.</p> <p>8.91a revised Aerodrome Safeguarding Area for Leeds and Bradford International Airport (LBIA) has been defined by the Civil Aviation Authority (CAA).</p> <p>8.91b Government Circular 01/2003 produced by the ODPM /DfT “Safeguarding Aerodromes, Technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas: Town and Country Planning (Safeguarding Aerodromes, technical Sites and Military Explosives Storage Areas) Direction 2002, places a duty on the Council to consult Leeds and Bradford International Airport on all planning applications falling within the Safeguarding Area and the provisions of the Direction, to ensure that development does not prejudice aircraft safety. In line with the</p> | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|---|-------------------------|
| | | <p><i>requirements of ODPM/DfT Circular 01/2003, the outer boundary of the Aerodrome Safeguarding Area for Leeds and Bradford International Airport is shown on the proposals map. This represents the area where buildings and structures, erections and works over defined heights are deemed to be a potential problem for aviation safety. Within this outer boundary are sub areas defined by the CAA relating to the specific height of development and developments likely to attract birds.</i></p> <p>8.91c <i>A separate Aerodrome Safeguarding Area for Leeds and Bradford International Airport in relation to wind turbine development has also been defined by the CAA. Circular 01/2003 places a duty on the Local Planning Authority to consult LBIA about proposed wind turbine developments within a 30KM radius of the Airport. The Whole of the District lies within this defined area for aerodrome safeguarding in relation to wind turbine development.</i></p> <p>8.91d <i>The LPA may require additional information to be provided by an applicant, in order to fulfil its obligations to consult LBIA effectively under both the Circular and Direction.</i></p> <p>8.91e <i>The LPA and /or LBIA may also request additional information on cranes, lighting and other equipment which may be in use</i></p> | |

LIST OF MODIFICATIONS
UDP – Policy Framework: Chapter 8 Transport and Movement

| Mod Ref UDP Ref Site Ref IR Page No. | Existing UDP Wording – 1st Deposit (June 2001) or Revised Deposit (July 2002) (<i>whichever is the latest approved by Council</i>) | Proposed Modification | Reason for Modification |
|---|--|--|-------------------------|
| | | <i>during the construction period, to ensure aviation safety and developers should be aware of this need.”</i> | |