



OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER

Department for
Transport

Using the planning process to secure travel plans

Appendices to research report



OFFICE OF THE
DEPUTY PRIME MINISTER

Department for
Transport

Using the planning process to secure travel plans

Appendices to research report

July 2002

Department for Transport: London

Following the reorganisation of the government in May 2002, the responsibilities of the former Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (DTLR) relating to travel plans were transferred to the Department for Transport and for planning to the office of the Deputy Prime Minister.

Department for Transport
Eland House
Bressenden Place
London SW1E 5DU
Telephone: 020 7944 3000
Website: www.dft.gov.uk

© Queen's Printer and Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office 2002

Copyright in the typographical arrangement rests with the Crown.

This publication, excluding logos, may be reproduced free of charge in any format or medium for research, private study or for internal circulation within an organisation. This is subject to it being reproduced accurately and not used in a misleading context. The material must be acknowledged as Crown copyright and the title of the publication specified.

For any other use of this material, please write to HMSO, The Copyright Unit, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ Fax: 01603 723000 or e-mail: copyright@hmso.gov.uk.

Applications for reproduction should be made in writing to The Copyright Unit, Her Majesty's Stationery Office, St Clements House, 2-16 Colegate, Norwich NR3 1BQ.

Further copies of this report are available from:

Department for Transport
PO Box 236
Wetherby
West Yorkshire
LS23 7NB
Tel: 0870 1226 236
Fax: 0870 1226 237
Textphone: 0870 1207 405
E-mail: dft@twoten.press.net

Printed in Great Britain on material containing 75% post-consumer waste and 25% ECF pulp.

June 2002

Product code 02TA 00338/f

CONTENTS

APPENDICES

1. Authorities contacted and those that responded to initial survey	5
2. Initial survey questionnaire to local authorities	7
3. Schedule of ten case study authorities – summary of key information	14
4. Interviewees for case studies	15
5. Case study interview questionnaires	17
6. Brainstorming invitees and attendees	31
7. Authorities responding to the initial survey grouped by type of authority	32
8. Authorities responding to the initial survey grouped by geographic category	34
9. Authorities willing to be case studies	36
10. Authorities responding to the initial survey by number of travel plans	37
11. Authorities responding to the initial survey by travel plan elements	40
12. Authorities responding to the initial survey by “best practice” factors	41
13. Authorities responding to the initial survey by types of applications	43
14. Synopsis of each case study	46
15. Strengths, weaknesses and best practice – by case study authority	101
16. Notes of brainstorming meeting	110
17. Glossary	116

APPENDIX 1

Authorities contacted and those that responded to initial survey

(Authorities that responded are in Bold)

Amber Valley Borough Council	Derbyshire County Council
Babergh District Council	Dorset County Council
Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council	Dover District Council
Basildon District Council	Easington District Council
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	Eastleigh Borough Council
Bath and NE Somerset Council	East Riding of Yorkshire Council
Bedfordshire County Council	Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council
Bexley London Borough	Elmbridge Borough Council
Birmingham City Council	Enfield London Borough
Blaby District Council	Epsom and Ewell Borough Council
Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council	Essex County Council
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council	Fareham Borough Council
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Fenland District Council
Brent London Borough	Fylde Borough Council
Brentwood Borough Council	Gloucestershire County Council
Brighton & Hove Council	Gosport Borough Council
Bristol City Council	Greenwich London Borough
Bromley London Borough	Guildford Borough Council
Buckinghamshire County Council	(jointly with Surrey County Council)
Burnley Borough Council	Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough
Bury Metropolitan Borough Council	Hampshire County Council
Calderdale Metropolitan Borough Council	Haringey London Borough
Cambridge City Council	Harlow District Council
Cambridgeshire County Council	Harrow London Borough
Camden London Borough	Harrogate Borough Council
Cannock Chase District Council	Hastings Borough Council
Canterbury City Council	Herefordshire Council
Caradon District Council	Hertfordshire County Council
Castle Point Borough Council	Hertsmere Borough Council
Charnwood Borough Council	High Peak Borough Council
Chelmsford Borough Council	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Cheltenham Borough Council	Hillingdon London Borough
Cherwell District Council	Hounslow London Borough
Cheshire County Council	Huntingdonshire District Council
Chesterfield Borough Council	Kent County Council
Chester-le-Street District Council	Kerrier District Council
Cornwall County Council	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough
Coventry City Council	Council
Crawley Borough Council	Kingston upon Hull City Council
Croydon London Borough	Kirklees Metropolitan Council
Dacorum Borough Council	
Dartford Borough Council	

Lancashire County Council

Lancaster City Council
Leeds City Council
Leicester City Council
Lewes District Council
Lichfield District Council
Macclesfield Borough Council
Manchester City Council
Medway Council
Merton London Borough
Mid Bedfordshire District Council
Mid Sussex District Council
Milton Keynes Council
Newcastle City Council
Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council
Newham London Borough
Norfolk County Council
Northampton Borough Council
Northamptonshire County Council
North East Lincolnshire Council
North Warwickshire Borough Council
North West Leicestershire District Council
North Wiltshire District Council
Norwich City Council
Nottingham City Council
Nottinghamshire County Council
Oldham Metropolitan Borough Council
Oxford City Council
Oxfordshire County Council
Peterborough City Council
Plymouth City Council
Poole Borough and Town Council
Portsmouth City Council
Reading Borough Council
Redbridge London Borough
Redcar and Cleveland Borough Council
Reigate and Banstead Borough Council
Richmond upon Thames London Borough
Rother District Council
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council
Runnymede Borough Council
Salford City Council
Salisbury District Council
Sefton Metropolitan Borough District
Council
Sevenoaks District Council
Sheffield City Council

Shepway District Council
Slough Borough Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council
Somerset County Council
Southampton City Council
South Cambridgeshire District Council
South Gloucestershire Council
South Lakeland District Council
South Oxfordshire District Council
Southwark London Borough
Stafford Borough Council
Staffordshire County Council
Staffordshire Moorlands District Council
St. Albans City and District Council
St. Helens Metropolitan Borough Council
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Stoke on Trent City Council
Suffolk County Council
Surrey County Council
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Tandridge District Council
Teignbridge District Council
Tendring District Council
Thanet District Council
Three Rivers District Council
Thurrock Borough Council
Tonbridge and Malling Borough Council
Torbay Council
Tower Hamlets London Borough
Vale Royal Borough Council
Wakefield Metropolitan District Council
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
Waltham Forest London Borough
Wandsworth London Borough Council
Warrington Borough Council
Waverley Borough Council
West Berkshire Council
West Sussex County Council
West Wiltshire District Council
Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council
Wiltshire County Council
Woking Borough Council
Wokingham District Council
Worcester City Council
Worcestershire County Council
Wycombe District Council

APPENDIX 2

Initial survey questionnaire to local authorities

The use of the planning process for delivering travel plans: Initial survey questionnaire

The Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions has commissioned Transport 2000 and Addison & Associates to produce guidance on best practice in the use of the development planning process to secure travel plans.

This questionnaire is therefore seeking to:

Identify potential case studies

Identify key features of best practice

Clarify key problem areas

Elicit potential best practice information for inclusion in the guidance

This questionnaire is being sent to all those authorities that responded “yes” in a previous questionnaire sent by Steer Davies Gleave (2000) when responding to a question on using the planning process to achieve delivery of travel plans. I very much hope that you will be able to respond to this follow-up work so that we can ensure that the best practice guidance ultimately produced draws on all relevant practical experience and includes the best examples of good practice.

We would be very grateful for your assistance in completing this questionnaire. If you would prefer to complete the questionnaire electronically please do not hesitate to advise me on the email address below. We will acknowledge your support in the documents to be published as well as ensuring that you receive a copy of the Good Practice Guidance.

Should you have any queries please do not hesitate to call Lynda Addison on 020 8997 1914 or email me on – lynda@addison-assoc.demon.co.uk

Response to the questionnaire should be emailed to the above address or posted to:

*Addison & Associates
2 St Stephen's Road
Ealing
London
W13 8 HD*

Please return no later than the 16th August 2001.

Thank you

Travel plans and the planning system:

INITIAL SURVEY

Section A: Base information

Name of local authority:

Name of contact officer:

Position:

Contact details:

 Telephone number:

 Postal address

 Email address:

Please indicate below how you would categorise your area:

- | | |
|---------------------------|---------------|
| <i>Metropolitan</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Mainly urban</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Mainly rural</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |
| <i>Mix of rural/urban</i> | <i>Yes/No</i> |

- In the last 3 years, how many travel plans has your authority asked for, as a requirement for granting planning approval?
- In the matrix below, please complete the total number of each type of application where travel plans have been required.

Use Classes Order	A1 Shops	A2 Financial & professional	A3 Food & Drink	B1 Business Class	C1 Hotels & Guest Houses	C2 Residential Institutions*
Known end user						
Speculative development						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

Use Classes Order	C3 Dwelling houses	D1 Non-residential Institutions*	D2 Assembly & Leisure	Mixed use/other (Please specify)	Mixed use/other (Please specify)	Mixed use/other (Please specify)
Known end user						
Speculative development						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

3. In the matrix below, please complete the number of implemented applications where the travel plans has also been implemented.

Use Classes Order	A1 Shops	A2 Financial & professional	A3 Food & Drink	B1 Business Class	C1 Hotels & Guest Houses	C2 Residential Institutions*
Known end user						
Speculative development						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

Use Classes Order	C3 Dwelling houses	D1 Non-residential Institutions*	D2 Assembly & Leisure	Mixed use/other (Please specify)	Mixed use/other (Please specify)	Mixed use/other (Please specify)
Known end user						
Speculative development						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

4. Which method(s) do you use to secure commitment to a travel plan?

Section 106 Yes/no

Planning condition Yes/no

5. Please indicate what elements you have secured to improve sustainable transport provision as part of a planning permission, and which were part of a travel plan.

	Specific Sec106 Provision	Specific planning condition	Within a travel plan
Public transport measures	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Cycling improvements	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Walking improvements	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Control of parking	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Financial incentives e.g. PT subsidies	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Financial incentives e.g. to users/employee	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Travel awareness/information	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Delivery/servicing plan	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Car sharing scheme	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Modal split targets	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Monitoring	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
Other – please specify			
a)	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
b)	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
c)	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
d)	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no
None of the above	Yes/no	Yes/no	Yes/no

Section B: Best practice & issues

6. Do you have any of the following?

A specific policy on securing travel plans	Yes/no
Supplementary Planning Guidance on travel plans	Yes/no
Generic section 106 agreements for travel plans	Yes/no
Standard conditions on travel plans	Yes/no
Procedures for providing transport information to support specific needs in a travel plan	Yes/no
An established relationship with other suppliers/operators of transport	Yes/no
Enforcement procedures for ensuring the submission of travel plans	Yes/no
Enforcement procedures for checking on travel plan implementation	Yes/no

Innovative approaches to securing travel plan implementation – please specify

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

d) _____

7. Do you do any of the following?

Compile specific transport information for each travel plan Yes/no

Work in cooperation with relevant other authorities/departments Yes/no

Monitor the outcomes of travel plan implementation Yes/no

Evaluate the effectiveness of travel plan implementation Yes/no

If so, how?

a) _____

b) _____

c) _____

Take enforcement action against non-compliance with travel plan approved in a section 106/planning condition? Yes/no

8. Do you have a specified policy on WHEN to seek travel plans? Yes/no

9. If this is related to size of development please specify size below:

Use Classes Order	A1 Shops	A2 Financial & professional	A3 Food & Drink	B1 Business Class	C1 Hotels & Guest Houses	C2 Residential Institutions*
Floorspace/units/ nos. of staff, visitors, pupils etc.						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

Use Classes Order	C3 Dwelling houses	D1 Non-residential Institutions*	D2 Assembly & Leisure	Mixed use/other (Please specify)	Other (Please specify)	Other (Please specify)
Floorspace/units/ nos. of staff, visitors, pupils etc.						

* Please specify use e.g. hospital, school

10. Please tick the factors that have assisted or frustrated you, when trying to secure a travel plan through the planning process.

	Assisted	Frustrated
Attitude of applicants		
Attitudes of local authority officers		
Attitudes of local authority member		
Level of information from applicant		
Level of information held by the local authority		
The existing legal framework		
The existence of PPG 13		
The existence of section 106 agreements		
Presence of a local authority policy on travel plans		
Presence of internal procedures to secure travel plans		
Protocols on when to ask for travel plan		
Attitude of key agencies		
Attitude of key public transport operators		
Elements to be included in the travel plan		
Local authority corporate objectives		
Others – please list		
A		
B		
C		

11. **Would you be willing to be included as one of the case studies?** **Yes/no**
(This will involve forwarding key information and taking part in an interview)

Thank you for completing this questionnaire

Responses to the questionnaire should be emailed to lynda@addison-assoc.demon.co.uk or posted to:

*Addison & Associates
2 St Stephen's Road
Ealing
London
W13 8 HD*

Please return no later than the 16th August 2001

APPENDIX 3

Schedule of ten case study authorities – summary of key information

No.	Local Authority	Type of Authority	Geographic Category	Region of UK	Number of Travel Plans	Best Practice Factors	Range of Land Uses where Travel Plan Required	Enforcement Action	Taken
1.	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	District Council	Mix of rural/urban	South East	41	6	A3, B1, C1, D1, B2/B8, M/U incl. leisure	YES	YES
2.	Birmingham City Council	Metropolitan Authority	Metropolitan	West Midlands	70	6	A1, A2, A3, B1, C1, C2 (incl Hospital)	NO	NO
3.	Bristol City Council	Unitary Authority	Mainly urban	South West	25-30	12	A1, B1, D1, D2, B2/B8, M/U, D1 (College)	YES	YES
4.	London Borough of Camden	London Borough	Metropolitan	London	30	5	B1, C2 (Hospital), D1, D2	NO	NO
5.	Eastleigh Borough Council	District Council	Mainly urban	South East	10+	9	A2, B1, D1 (Schools), C3, D2 (Stadium)	NO	NO
6.	Lancashire County Council	County Council	Mix of rural/urban	North West	17	10	A1, B1, C2 (Hospitals), D2, Ind. Estate, M/U	NO	NO
7.	Oxfordshire County Council	County Council	Mix of rural/urban	South East	30+	7	A1, B1, D1 (Schools), C2 (Hospitals)	YES	YES
8.	Sheffield City Council	Metropolitan Authority	Metropolitan	Yorks & Humber	20-25	7	A1, B1, B2/B8, C2, D1, M/U and residential	YES	YES
9.	Stoke-on-Trent City Council	Unitary Authority	Mainly urban	West Midlands	46	5	A1, A2, A3, B1, D1 (School), C2, D2, B8, B2/B8, M/U	YES	YES
10.	Surrey County Council	County Council	Mix of rural/urban	South East	65	7	B1, C1, C2 (Hospital), D1 (Schools, college), D2	NO	NO
A1 – Shops									
A2 – Financial & Professional									
A3 – Food & Drink									
B1 – Business, incl. offices									
C1 – Hotels & Guesthouses									
C2 – Residential Institutions (including hospitals)									
D1 – Non-residential institutions (including schools, colleges)									
D2 – Assembly & Leisure									
M/U – Mixed Use									
B8 – Warehousing									

APPENDIX 4

Interviewees for case studies

Case Studies	Local Authority Officers	Private sector
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	<p>Jon Wheeler – Senior Transport Planner</p> <p>Dominic McGrath – Transport Strategy Team Leader</p> <p>Robert Jackson – Enforcement Manager, Development Control</p> <p>Ian Thompson – Head of Planning and Development Services</p> <p>Chris Guy – Chief Solicitor</p> <p>Cllr. Ron Hussey</p>	Mark Younger – MEPC
Birmingham City Council	<p>Mike Cooper – Project Leader, Travel Plans</p> <p>Reddy Nallamilli – Senior Constituency Planner, Development Control</p> <p>Warren Bellamy – Development Control, Highways</p>	Philip Smith – Transport West Midlands
Bristol City Council	<p>Mike Ginger – Co-ordinator, Transport Planning Team</p> <p>Abdul Harb – Transport Planning, Development Control</p> <p>Ian Collinson – Development Control Case Officer</p> <p>Jim Cliffe – Transport Planning (major sites)</p> <p>Cllr. Richard Pyle – Chair of Development Control (Central) Committee</p> <p>Wendy Batley – Solicitor</p>	Andrew Maltby – Deeley Freed (developer)
London Borough of Camden	<p>Richard Finch – Principal Transport Planner, Transport Planning Team</p> <p>Stephen Burke – Senior Transport Planner, Transport Planning Team</p> <p>Alice Leach – Planner, S106 Co-ordinator, Site Development Team</p> <p>Sue Foster – Area Manager, Development Control Service</p> <p>Aiden Brookes – Legal Department</p>	<p>Miles Price – British Land</p> <p>Mr Elliot – The Royal School, Hampstead</p>

Case Studies	Local Authority Officers	Private sector
Eastleigh Borough Council	Rhod MacLeod – Transport Policy & Development Control Manager Steve Carrington – Senior Planner Colin Peters – Head of Development Control Richard Ward – Principle Solicitor	Peter Rogers – Marlin Investments
Lancashire County Council	George Davies – Business Travel Plan Co-ordinator	Howard Jackson and Carole McKay – Royal Preston Hospital
Oxfordshire County Council	Rachel Gover – TravelWise Officer Howard Cox – Principal Planning Officer, Development Control (S106 negotiations) Peter Mann – Group Manager, Transport Planning Celia Jones – Travel-for-Work Officer David Young – Director of Environmental Services Chris Cousins – Assistant Director, Land Use	John R Ormston, Finance Director – H R Wallingford Group Deborah Ceadel – Boodle Hatfield (Solicitors)
Sheffield City Council	Rachel Harvey – Travel Plan Project Officer Brian Armstrong – Principal Engineer, Highways Development Ian Wheeldon – Assistant Principal Engineer, Highways Development	
Stoke on Trent City Council	Sue Baddeley, Travel Plan Coordinator Louise Robinson, Planning Officer David Guntripp, Highways Development Austin Knott – Senior Transportation Officer Paul Lucas – Passenger Transport Manager Rachel Goodman	Euan Lindsay – St. Modwen Development Limited Dave Astill – Area Manager for PMT Ron Renshaw – Royal Doulton
Surrey County Council	Philip Townsend – Travel Plan Officer Mike Green – Transportation Impact Group Leader Nancy El-Shatoury – Principal Solicitor	Daniel Bausor – Avaya

APPENDIX 5

Case study interview questionnaires

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions study: Travel plans and the development planning process

CASE STUDY INTERVIEW QUESTIONS

LOCAL AUTHORITY: _____

A. Interview base data (to be filled in prior to the interview)

No.	Key Information	
A1	Date of Interview	
A2	Interviewee	Name: Title:
A3	Contact details	Tel: Fax: e-mail
A4	Address	
A5	Names and contact details for other interviewees	

B. Information contained in the Survey Response (to be filled in prior to the interview)

No.	Information (fill in from Quest. Response)	Items to Follow Up/Cross Ref w/other Questions
B1	How many TPs asked for in last 3 yrs?	
	Types of applic. where TP req'd: Non-spec: Speculative:	
B2	Implemented TPs:	
B3	Use conditions?	Modal split targets? Financial incentives or subsidies?
B4	Use S106?	Other?
B5	Best Practice?	
B6	Enforcement?	
B7	Policy on when to seek TPs?	
B8	Main item of assistance:	
B9	Main item of frustration:	

C. Information sent in advance by the LA (listed in same order as in letter)(fill in prior to interview)

No.	Items Requested	Information Received/Link to Other Question
C1	Copies of T&P policies that promote effective Travel Plans.	
C2	Copies of other policies that have helped secure effective Travel Plans	
C3	Copies of SPGs that promote effective Travel Plans.	
C4	Internal procedures/guidance/practice notes for officers to negotiate and implement TPs as part of the DC process?	
C5	Suggested planning applications to discuss	
C6	Copies of relevant committee reports in relation to the suggested planning applications	
C7	Copies of relevant planning conditions, S106 agreements in terms of applications	
C8	A note on the process/methodology used for calculating travel plan requirements including any financial contributions	
C9	A copy of key travel plans for applications	
C10	A description of the monitoring information sought &/or obtained and copies of what has been received where relevant	
C11	Any information on enforcement action, when it is triggered, what will happen, where relevant	

D. Overall Approach to securing Travel Plans? (About the Local Authority as a whole)

No.	Question	Prompts
D1	What are the objectives of the authority in seeking travel plans and of others in participating?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Traffic, environment, changing behaviour, etc/</i> • <i>Is the objective wider than DC?</i>
D2	How effective are your current actions through travel plans in achieving these objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Implementation of Travel Plans?</i> • <i>Reduction in car use/increase in PT use?</i> • <i>Any conflicts with other objectives e.g. regeneration?</i>
D3	What are the attitudes of members, senior and other officers?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do members show any interest in the TP – What are their main concerns?</i> • <i>Do members require any monitoring information to be presented to Committee?</i> • <i>Have members expressed an informal/formal interest in enforcement issues?</i> • <i>Is Travel Plan work member or officer led?</i> • <i>What level of support is provided by Development Control managers/Senior planning officers/members?</i> • <i>What level of support is available from other officers?</i>
D4	What is the public perception of the importance of Travel Plans, and their expectation of the authority?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What level of importance are TPs to wider public/local residents?</i> • <i>Do residents show an interest in whether a Travel Plan was required/submitted in relation to applications? If so, what particular issues do they raise?</i>

D. Overall Approach to securing Travel Plans? (About the Local Authority as a whole) (continued)

No.	Question	Prompts
D5	What agencies and authorities were important in achieving Travel Plans through the development planning process? (Transport operators – see next question)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highways Agency? • Other authorities? • Other agencies such as Chambers of Commerce, Business Partnerships, Travel Plan Network, Employee forums • Schools/Hospitals/Partnerships? • Benefits? Difficulties that were overcome?
D6	How important is the relationship with transport operators; and what problems have been experienced?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What was the relationship/commitment of transport operators to the Travel Plan requirements?

E. General DC procedures re Travel Plans

No.	Question	Prompts	“X”
E1	When are Travel Plans required, and how does this relate to your policies and PPG13?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What land uses, floorspace proposals (or increase in floorspace), c. p. levels (or increase in c. p.) or other factor determines whether a TP is required or not? • Do you clarify PPG13 in relation to local issues and small schemes (para 89) • If you target a particular type of application, what and why? 	
E2	What determines the choice of Travel Plan elements required in relation to an application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Most authorities focus on the promotion of alternatives to the car – what do you require over and above that? • Does the nature, scale, land use(s), and/or complexity of the development affect the requirements of the TP? • How do you assess whether a submitted Travel Plan is acceptable/adequate? 	
E3	What transport information re a Travel Plan is provided/required by all parties before submission of an application, or as part of the application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How does this relate to the request for a Transport Assessment? • What steps are taken to ensure the LA has adequate information? • Is this used to calculate modal split targets (see next question) and/or to monitor effectiveness? 	
E4	How do you calculate modal split targets and is this consistently applied?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do you use other research or LA work to establish what is reasonable or credible? • What about particular circumstances (eg of high public transport use already) when a low modal shift would be acceptable? 	
E5	Do you have model conditions/S106 clauses for use by planning officers for securing Travel Plans or elements of Travel Plans and/or ensuring that Travel Plans are effectively implemented?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would use of such a standardised approach vary in relation to scale/type of development? • Have these ever been challenged legally? • To what extent dependent on PPG13? or other legal/policy framework that has been investigated • Are they considered effective? 	
E6	Who takes the lead on S106 negotiations?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Role of legal advisors? • Role of Transport engineers? • Role of Travel Plan Officers (if any)? • Do the current arrangements work? 	

E. General DC procedures re Travel Plans (continued)

No.	Question	Prompts	“X”
E7	Is there a standard method for calculating developer contributions to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Public transport provision or other TP initiatives? Incentives to employers or users to use PT (eg discounted tickets)? Other financial/non-financial initiatives (excl. penalties for failure to meet targets – see question E8) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How are these separated from other contributions such as towards infrastructure and facilities? Was the method constrained by Circular 1/97? How is the issue of annual revenue costs/subsidies approached? Do you try and ensure consistency in particular areas and/or with other authorities? Provide examples where you think this is “best practice” or innovative. 	
E8	How do you assess whether an implemented Travel Plan has been effective in achieving its intended objectives?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> How will any modal split targets be measured? Who will carry out the monitoring? What enforcement sought to ensure objectives are achieved? Have you considered financial or other penalties? 	
E9	Do you require applicants to join “Travelwise” schemes or similar?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Are representatives from “Travelwise” (or similar Travel Plan “experts”) involved in the development planning process where Travel Plans are involved If so, have applicants been willing to join? 	
E10	To what extent do local residents get involved in Travel Plan DC issues?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> What involvement/consultation approach is adopted? Are residents interested in monitoring details and any penalties for failure? Is it general practice to give residents feedback and what was the outcome of this dialogue? 	

F. Negotiation of Travel Plan Conditions and S106 Clauses re a specific application

Planning application used as example:

Information received in advance:

No.	Question	Prompts
F1	Why was a Travel Plan requested in relation to this application?	
F2	How did you decide what elements of a Travel Plan were appropriate for this application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Process of decision-making? What were the key elements? Any “Best Practice”? How did you assess whether a submitted Travel Plan was acceptable/adequate?
F3	How did you decide to include elements of the Travel Plan as a planning condition or planning obligation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Did you take into account the extent to which the Travel Plan materially affects the acceptability of the proposed development? How did guidance in Circular 11/95, 1/97 and PPG13 impact on the decision?

F. Negotiation of Travel Plan Conditions and S106 Clauses re a specific application (*continued*)

No.	Question	Prompts
F4	<p>What were the attitudes of private sector in general and in respect of the specific case study application, and what issues does this raise with suggestions for possible solutions?</p> <p>(With particular ref. to Conditions/S106 headings)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Did they discuss the approach they were planning to take (vis a vis planning conditions/S106 to tie down elements of the Travel Plan) with the developer?</i> • <i>If they discussed their intentions re conditions/S106 for elements of the Travel Plan with the developer in advance, what was the response/outcome? Link to:</i> • <i>Did you change your approach as a result of discussions with the developer or legal advisors (see below)? (Specify)</i> • <i>Did the developer suggest that any planning conditions or planning obligations (in connection with the TP) would affect the financial viability of the project? [Give details and advise how these issues were resolved]</i> • <i>Is there evidence that the developer accepted the idea of the Travel Plan just to get the application approved, and that commitment is weak?</i>
F5	<p>How were modal split targets determined and agreed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What basis was used for calculating any modal split targets for this application?</i> • <i>Was adequate information available?</i> • <i>If it was for a speculative development, what assumptions were made?</i>
F6	<p>How did you negotiate substantive (having substantial financial implications) matters potentially covered by S106 clauses?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial contributions or subsidies to PT (both one-off and recurring)</i> • <i>Information on how they arrive at developer's financial contributions in connection with TP initiatives?</i> • <i>Financial incentives to third parties other than PT operators (eg employers/occupiers)</i> • <i>Timing these so that even early phases will trigger TP measures (developers will seek to delay to minimise subsidy) and will continue long enough to establish new travel patterns (3-5 years)</i> • <i>Were the transport operators or other third parties involved in the negotiations; and legally linked?</i> • <i>Disincentives to use of cars, particularly reduction of car park spaces or control of those spaces provided</i>
F7	<p>How did you deal with the further legal complexities involved in securing Travel Plans in relation to subsequent occupiers and speculative development proposals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Was the issue of a subsequent occupier being bound by the terms of a S106 Travel Plan legal agreement considered?</i> • <i>If the development was speculative, did this affect your approach to the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>If the development was speculative, what issues were raised by the developer in relation to the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>(Any issues in relation to substantive issues and/or penalties of targets not achieved?)</i>
F8	<p>How do you decide what monitoring process should be incorporated?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If the TP included monitoring targets, were these issues discussed with the developer? If so, what was the developer's response to monitoring issues and did the developer's response change the approach to the Travel Plan?[If so, provide details]</i> • <i>Especially where penalties have been included if targets are not met, how do you ensure the verity of monitoring information?</i> • <i>What were the resource implications of the monitoring the TP?</i> • <i>Do they rely on third parties for monitoring? If so, give details. How effective are these monitoring arrangements?</i>

F. Negotiation of Travel Plan Conditions and S106 Clauses re a specific application (*continued*)

No.	Question	Prompts
F9	What negotiations took place around the question of any failure to meet agreed targets, including the issue of up-front payments and linking of targets to occupation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Was the developer fully informed/aware of the consequences of any failure to meet TP targets? • What penalties were incorporated and how would they be applied? For example: • Long stop payments (Bond) (Failsafe contribution)?/How much? • Resubmit revised Travel Plan? • Additional expense/contributions for necessary infrastructure, car parking controls, and/or non-car means of transport? • Removal of car parking spaces? • Further phases dependent on achievement of targets. • How would these be applied if the developer/occupier changed?
F10	Did the inclusion of a Travel Plan affect the length of time required for determination of the planning application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If added to the timescale, how could this be reduced? • Is this an issue?
F11	How important was the Travel Plan aspect of the negotiations to the overall acceptability of the application?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What weight was given to the Travel Plan in determining the planning application? • To what extent is it likely that enforcement will be pursued if targets are not met?

G. Overall assessment of the effectiveness of their approach?

No.	Question	Prompts
G1	What are your views on the current legal & policy framework, including PPG 13; where are there difficulties and what is your suggested resolution for them?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In achieving <u>effective</u> Travel Plans?
G2	Does the overall process followed within your authority “work” – key successes and any difficulties?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Your views on key issues involved in the successful negotiation and implementation of Travel Plans. • Your views on successful monitoring of Travel Plans and if necessary taking enforcement action/remedying failure? • Does the Travel Plan process materially delay the resolution to grant planning permission or to sign a S106 agreement?
G3	What are considered to be the changes that are or should be made to policy, practice or approach?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Are you aware of other examples of “Best Practice” that you would like to see introduced in your LA?
G4	What are the resource implications of the approach you have taken towards Travel Plans?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have you received/will you receive Department for Transport funding for a Travel Plan advisory post? • What are the resource implications of your approach and will you be able to meet the resource needs? • If you anticipate substantial resource requirements, where will you be looking for funding? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LA budget • Cross-subsidisation is used or will be used • Need for government or other assistance
G5	What aspects of the approach that you have adopted would you recommend to another LA as Best Practice?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • What aspects of your approach would you hold up as examples of “Best Practice” in this field?

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions study: Travel plans and the development planning process

GENERIC QUESTIONS FOR LOCAL AUTHORITY MEMBERS, OTHER OFFICERS INCLUDING LEGAL ADVISORS

Name and Title of Interviewee: _____

Planning application: _____

Date and Place of Interview: _____

No.	Question	Prompts
S1	Which specific aspects of Travel Plan policy and practice do you become involved with directly and how?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Let them speak first/then what information do you require in order to play this role</i> • <i>Any conflicts created by this involvement or the Council's policies and practices?</i> • <i>Involvement in formulating Travel Plan requirements and links to other transport policies/relationship to Transport Assessments</i> • <i>Involvement in monitoring/enforcement?</i> • <i>Who affects/influences your involvement e.g. residents, schools, developers/applicants, occupiers, third parties- and how?</i> • <i>Is this arrangement working; if not, why?</i>
S2	Do you think the Council's overall current policy and practice achieves the implementation of effective Travel Plans and how/why?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>(This question mainly here to open up discussion)</i> • <i>Views on key issues involved in the successful negotiation and implementation of Travel Plans.</i> • <i>Are there any policies/practices that need to be strengthened/improved to secure successful Travel Plans? If so please describe</i>
S3	What do you consider to be the critical success factors and main problem areas associated with the overall process followed by your authority?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Legal mechanisms?</i> • <i>Particular Council approach or requirements?</i> • <i>Resource implications?</i> • <i>Relationship with third parties (e.g. travel operators, Travelwise Schemes)</i> • <i>Clarity of objectives/lack of clarity</i> • <i>Measurable targets/lack of measurable targets</i> • <i>Recognition that enforcement action is unlikely to take place/will take place</i>
S4	How were you involved in the determination and/or associated negotiations on the XXXX planning application, and highlight aspects which you feel worked well and/or areas where you think changes would be helpful.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Communication with or attitudes of developer /occupier if known?</i> • <i>The resources put into the determination of the application and the desired outcomes?</i> • <i>Importance of the Travel Plan to the acceptability of the proposal?</i> • <i>Information provided and Assessment of submitted Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Setting of targets?</i> • <i>Monitoring/enforcement issues? (hard or soft)</i> • <i>Financial incentives/contributions (e.g. how calculated?)</i> • <i>Financial penalties for failure to meet targets?</i> • <i>Involvement of third parties (e.g. transport operators, Travelwise, monitoring agencies) in the negotiations?</i> • <i>Timetable for determining the application?</i> • <i>Other?</i>

No.	Question	Prompts
S5	<p>What issues have been raised by the private sector in general and in respect of the specific case study, and how were these addressed?</p> <p>And do you have any suggestions for how these might be resolved?</p> <p>(With particular ref. to Conditions/S106 headings)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Timing of discussion with developers regarding form of Travel Plan and form of Conditions/S106?</i> • <i>Any particular problems/issues in regard to speculative developments?</i> • <i>Any problems/issues raised by known occupier?</i> • <i>In relation to substantive enforcement issues and/or penalties if targets not achieved?</i> • <i>Impact (e.g. amounts/timing of financial contributions (one –off and continuing/ subsidies/long stop payments/penalties) on financial viability of the proposal? (Give details)</i> • <i>Impact of disincentives (egg car parking restrictions/other)</i> • <i>What were the resource implications of the monitoring the TP?</i> • <i>Possibility that the developer accepted the Travel Plan just to get the application approved, and that commitment is weak?</i>
S6	<p>Regarding the Travel Plan negotiated as part of this application, do you think it will be effective? and if so, why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>How effective are the monitoring arrangements?</i> • <i>How do you assess whether the implemented Travel Plan has been effective in achieving its intended objectives?</i> • <i>To what extent is it likely that enforcement will be pursued if targets are not met?</i> • <i>Effectiveness of any financial penalties?</i> • <i>Any other views on successful monitoring of the Travel Plan and enforcement action/remedying failure e.g. resource implications?</i>
S7	<p><i>(if needed)</i></p> <p>What aspects of the approach you have adopted, either generally or in relation to this specific application, would you recommend to another LA as Best Practice?</p>	

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions study: Travel plans and the development planning process

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR DEVELOPERS AND APPLICANTS

Name/title/company of Interviewee: _____

Planning application: _____

Date and Place of Interview: _____

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
T1	<p>Do you feel the requirement for a Travel Plan was reasonable and justified by planning policy?</p> <p><i>(Important to understand the weight they attach to the Travel Plan)</i></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Did you acknowledge the importance of Travel Plans from the local authorities viewpoint and national planning guidance?</i> • <i>In your view, how important was the Travel Plan to the acceptability of the proposal and why was it necessary to submit a Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Did you feel it was necessary to accept the idea of the Travel Plan to get the application approved? If yes why? If no why?</i>
T2	<p>What is your view of the overall process followed by the Council in securing the Travel Plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>At what stage were you involved in discussions on the need to submit a Travel Plan? (Detail in T4)</i> • <i>Was there clarity as to the information that was necessary to be included in the Travel Plan and the Council's objectives?</i> • <i>Was there any particular Council approach or requirement that you considered useful/changed the way you approached the planning application and/or the proposed Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Best Practice evident?</i> • <i>How does the process compare with other authorities?</i> • <i>Are you aware of any best practice in other authorities?</i>
T3	<p>What issues did you consider to be the most problematic?</p> <p>Were there any areas where it worked well?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What do you think are the key issues for the successful negotiation and implementation of Travel Plans?</i> • <i>Clarity of information to be included in Travel Plans and expected outcomes? i.e. modal split targets.</i> • <i>Communication and attitudes of with the Council officers- (particularly transport, planning or legal officers) and advisors? Any other relevant parties – member involvement?</i> • <i>The time and resources put into the negotiation of the application in relation to the desired outcomes?</i> • <i>Legal mechanisms? Conditions vs S106 Agreement?</i> • <i>Involvement of third parties (e.g. transport operators, Travelwise, monitoring agencies) in the negotiations?</i> • <i>Any problems/issues raised by known occupier? How were these dealt with?</i>

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
T4	<p>If you submitted a Travel Plan with your planning application, how did you determine what elements were to be included?</p> <p>In regard to modal split and other targets, how were these determined and agreed?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Were you involved in discussions over what elements to include in any Travel Plan? If so, at what stage?</i> • <i>What was your approach to this issue/decision?</i> • <i>What did you consider to be the main requirements of the local authority when compiling the Travel Plan</i> • <i>Did you receive any information from the local authority when compiling your travel plan?</i> • <i>Would you have found it helpful to have received further advice from the Council about the detail required to include in a Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Were you involved in discussions over what targets to include in any Travel Plan? If so, at what stage?</i> • <i>What basis was used for calculating any modal split and other targets for this application?</i> • <i>Was adequate information available?</i> • <i>If it was for a speculative development, what assumptions were made?</i>
T5	<p>What is your view of the legal mechanisms employed to secure the Travel Plan and its implementation?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What were the main areas of the legal agreement that you had no difficulty in agreeing?</i> • <i>What were the main elements of the legal agreement that concerned you and how did you respond to such concerns?</i> • <i>Did the Council discuss with you the approach they were planning to take (vis a vis planning conditions/S106) to tie down elements of the Travel Plan)? When?</i> • <i>Any issues in relation to financial incentives/contributions (e.g. how calculated?)</i> • <i>Any issues in relation to financial penalties for failure to meet targets?</i> • <i>Any particular issues eg re disincentives?</i> • <i>Any particular issues re long-stop payments, bonds or similar if they were required?</i> • <i>Monitoring/enforcement issues and mechanisms? (hard or soft approach)</i>
T6	<p>How did you deal with the further legal complexities involved in securing Travel Plans in relation to subsequent occupiers and speculative development proposals?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any particular problems/issues in regard to known occupier/subsequent occupiers and speculative developments?</i> • <i>Was the issue of a subsequent occupier being bound by the terms of a S106 Travel Plan legal agreement considered?</i> • <i>Did this affect your approach to the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>What issues did you raise? (in relation to the Travel Plan?)</i> • <i>Were there any issues arising in relation to financial issues and/or penalties of targets not achieved?)</i>
T7	<p>What did you consider were the future implications for the proposed development of committing to and implementing the agreed Travel Plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Impact (e.g. amounts/timing of financial contributions (one –off and continuing/ subsidies/long stop payments/penalties) on financial viability of the proposal? (Give details)</i> • <i>If speculative, did you see any problems with future occupiers in relation to the Travel Plan? (Give details)</i> • <i>How do you consider the development industry will respond in the future to the increasing requirement for Travel Plans with clear targets including enforcement measures and penalties?</i>

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
T8	<p>What was your negotiating approach to substantive (having substantial financial implications) matters potentially covered by S106 clauses relating to the Travel Plan?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Financial contributions or subsidies to PT (both one-off and recurring)?</i> • <i>Financial incentives to third parties other than PT operators (eg employers/occupiers)</i> • <i>Timing of financial aspects in relation to the occupation of the development?</i> • <i>In relation to substantive enforcement issues and/or penalties if targets not achieved?</i> • <i>Disincentives to use of cars, particularly reduction of car park spaces or control of those spaces provided?</i> • <i>Relationship with transport operators or other third parties involved in the negotiations?</i>
T9	<p>What was your negotiating approach to the question of what monitoring process should be incorporated?</p> <p>Who do you consider to be the most appropriate party to carry out the monitoring process?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do you think the Travel Plan will meet the agreed targets? (or if no targets, will be effective?)</i> • <i>What were the resource implications of the monitoring the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>If the Travel Plan included specific targets, were these issues discussed with you? If so, what was your response to monitoring issues?</i> • <i>Especially where penalties have been included if targets are not met, how do you ensure the verity of monitoring information?</i> • <i>What were the resource implications of the monitoring the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Do you rely on third parties for monitoring? If so, give details. How effective are these monitoring arrangements?</i>
T10	<p>Did negotiations take place around the question of any failure to meet agreed Travel Plan targets?</p> <p>Did the negotiations include the issue of up-front payments and linking of targets to occupation or any requirement?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Were you fully informed/aware of the consequences of any failure to meet TP targets?</i> • <i>What was your attitude towards the incorporation of penalties such as:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – <i>Long stop payments (Bond) (Failsafe contribution)?/How much?</i> – <i>Resubmit revised Travel Plan?</i> – <i>Additional expense/contributions for necessary infrastructure, car parking controls, and/or non-car means of transport?</i> – <i>Removal of car parking spaces?</i> – <i>Further phases dependent on achievement of targets.</i>
T11	<p>Do you consider that the agreed Travel Plan will effectively meet the agreed targets, and if so why?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>If there are no targets, are there other ways to measure its effectiveness and do you consider it will be effective?</i> • <i>How effective are the monitoring arrangements?</i> • <i>Do you think it is likely that enforcement will be pursued if targets are not met?</i> • <i>Effectiveness of any financial penalties?</i> • <i>Any other views on successful monitoring of the Travel Plan and enforcement action/remedying failure e.g. resource implications?</i>
T12	<p>Is there any advice you would suggest local authorities should take into account when negotiating and agreeing effective travel plans?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The final open question to allow private sector to advise what they consider local authorities should/shouldn't take into account when developing effective Travel Plans.</i>

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions study: Travel plans and the development planning process

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR OCCUPIERS/COMPANIES

Name/title/company of Interviewee: _____

Planning application: _____

Date and Place of Interview: _____

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
W1	How and when did you become involved in the planning negotiations for this proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Were you the intended occupier of the development?</i> • <i>What did you think the main issues would be?</i> • <i>Was your involvement after planning permission had been granted subject to a Travel Plan – Again what did you think the main issues would be?</i> • <i>What is your relationship to the various parties?</i> • <i>What reservations (if any) did you have about getting involved?</i> • <i>Are you involved in a Travelwise (or similar) scheme?</i>
W2	What is your view of the overall process followed by the Council in securing the Travel Plan and its effective implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Were you involved in the discussions at an early stage?</i> • <i>Was there clarity of Council objectives?</i> • <i>Was there any particular Council approach or requirement that you considered particularly positive or negative in this context?</i> • <i>Were you involved in the Council's process for determining elements/requirements/targets?</i> • <i>Did you receive adequate information advice from your professional advisor/would you have liked to receive more information from your advisor – if so what type of information – Could the local authority have helped you with this issue?</i>
W3	What issues – from your viewpoint – did you consider to be the most problematic in the negotiation of the Travel Plan and associated elements and financial arrangements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is your role in implementing elements within the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>What is your role in monitoring any aspects of the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Your relationship with the developer in future?</i> • <i>Nature of communication and attitudes of with the Council officers and applicants (and their advisors)?</i> • <i>Resource, financial and other implications?</i>
W4	What aspects of the Travel Plan affect your business and what do you think could undermine the effective implementation of the Travel Plan?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Do any of the Travel Plan elements (such as number of car parking spaces) have an adverse impact on your business?</i> • <i>What is your view of the capital and revenue implications of the Travel Plan in relation to your business?</i> • <i>What mechanisms have you put in place to ensure you can contribute to the implementation/monitoring of these aspects of the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Staffing issues – attitude to Travel Plan requirements/any indication that Travel Plan requirements had a negative influence on recruiting/retaining staff?</i> • <i>Any other aspects?</i>

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
W5	What is your view of the legal mechanisms employed to secure the Travel Plan and its implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is your legal position in relation to the development and application?</i> • <i>Did the Council discuss with you the approach they were planning to take (vis a vis planning conditions/S106) to tie down elements of the Travel Plan that relate to you? When?</i> • <i>Does the question of tenants/ turnover in tenants apply and if so, what issues have arisen?</i> • <i>Any concerns about what might happen if the targets fail to be met?</i> • <i>What legal constraints apply to you and your company?</i>
W6	Were there any lessons that you could pass on based on your experience with this case?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any innovative approaches developed?</i> • <i>Any aspects recommended as "Best Practice"?</i> • <i>Problems to avoid?</i>

Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions study: Travel plans and the development planning process

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PUBLIC TRANSPORT OPERATORS

Name/title/company of Interviewee: _____

Planning application: _____

Date and Place of Interview: _____

No.	Question	Issues to be addressed
V1	How and when did you become involved in the planning negotiations for this proposal?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is your relationship to the various parties?</i> • <i>What reservations (if any) did you have about getting involved?</i> • <i>Did you see it as an opportunity – if so what were your objectives?</i>
V2	What is your view of the overall process followed by the Council in securing the Travel Plan and its effective implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Were you involved in the discussions at an early stage?</i> • <i>Was there clarity of Council objectives?</i> • <i>Was there any particular Council approach or requirement that you considered particularly positive or negative in this context?</i> • <i>Were you involved in the Council's process for determining required PT elements or financial contributions?</i> • <i>How does the Council compare with other authorities you have worked with?</i>
V3	What issues – from your viewpoint -did you consider to be the most problematic in the negotiation of the Travel Plan and associated elements and financial arrangements?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What do you think were the key issues for the successful negotiation and implementation of the Public Transport aspects of the Travel Plan?</i> • <i>Nature of communication and attitudes of with the Council officers and applicants (and their advisors)?</i> • <i>Resource and financial implications?</i>
V4	What aspects of the Travel Plan are crucial to your operation and what do you think could undermine its success?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>What is your view of the capital and revenue implications of the Travel Plan in relation to your operation?</i> • <i>Do you have any concerns about whether the occupiers/management of the development change? (or if speculative, the unknown nature of the future occupiers)</i> • <i>Any other issues re. implementation of the Travel Plan?</i>
V5	What is your view of the legal mechanisms employed to secure the Travel Plan and its implementation?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Did the Council discuss with you the approach they were planning to take (vis a vis planning conditions/S106) to tie down elements of the Travel Plan that relate to you? When?</i> • <i>Do you have confidence in the Council's ability to enforce in the event the targets are not met or the Travel Plan is otherwise not effective?</i>
V6	Were there any lessons that you could pass on based on your experience with this case?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Any aspects recommended as "Best Practice"?</i> • <i>Positive suggestions/requirements of local authorities?</i> • <i>Positive suggestions/requirements of the developer/occupier?</i> • <i>Positive suggestions from them as operators</i>

APPENDIX 6

Brainstorming invitees and attendees

Name	L.A./Company	Attended
Rodger Madelin	Argent	N
Tom Farnsworth	Association for Commuter Transport	N
<i>Laura Hirst</i>	<i>Pool Borough and Town Council</i>	Y
<i>Mike Ginger</i>	<i>Bristol City Council</i>	Y
<i>Miles Price</i>	<i>British Land</i>	Y
<i>William McKee</i>	<i>British Property Federation</i>	Y
David Merson	Broxbourne Borough Council & Planning Law Forum	N
<i>Graham Hughes</i>	<i>Cambridgeshire County Council</i>	Y
Alastair Duff	Chair of Association for Commuter Transport	N
<i>Robert Spriggs</i>	<i>Colin Buchanan and Partners</i>	Y
<i>Patrick Allcorn</i>	<i>Croydon London Borough</i>	Y
<i>Mrs Noele Pope</i>	<i>Dacorum Borough Council</i>	Y
<i>Anthea Nicholson</i>	<i>Department for Transport</i>	Y
Chris Pagdin	Office of the Deputy Prime Minister	N
<i>Kenneth Cameron</i>	<i>Office of the Deputy Prime Minister</i>	Y
Margaret Longes	Department for Transport – School Travel Adviser	N
John Whitelegg	Eco-Logica	N
<i>Carl Fitzgerald</i>	<i>English Partnership</i>	Y
<i>John Ormston</i>	<i>H.R. Wallingford Group Ltd.</i>	Y
<i>John Foley</i>	<i>Hampshire County Council</i>	Y
Andy Elmer	Local Government Association	N
<i>Robert Vale</i>	<i>Brent London Borough</i>	Y
<i>Mike Turner</i>	<i>Mayer Brown Ltd.</i>	Y
<i>Vivien Williams</i>	<i>Mid Sussex District Council & Planning Law Forum</i>	Y
<i>Geoff Brown</i>	<i>Nottingham City Council</i>	Y
<i>Howard Cox</i>	<i>Oxfordshire County Council</i>	Y
<i>Jonathan Powell</i>	<i>Planning Law Forum</i>	Y
<i>Paul Clark</i>	<i>Planning Officer Society representative, Redbridge London Borough</i>	Y
<i>Simon Birch</i>	<i>Royal Town Planning Institute representative, Swindon Borough Council</i>	Y
<i>Derek Palmer</i>	<i>Steer Davies Gleare</i>	Y
<i>John Harrison</i>	<i>Sharpe Pritchard</i>	Y
<i>Matt Beale Collins</i>	<i>Surrey County Council</i>	Y
Carey Newson	Transport 2000	N
Carlton Robert-James	The Institution of Highways & Transportation	N
Prof. Robert Lane	University of Westminster Transport Studies Group	N
<i>Bob Bruce</i>	<i>Westminster City Council</i>	Y
<i>Adrian Taylor</i>	<i>WS Atkins</i>	Y
John Callaghan	Wycombe District Council	N
<i>Lynda Addison</i>	<i>Addison & Associates</i>	Y
<i>Jean Fraser</i>	<i>Addison & Associates</i>	Y

APPENDIX 7

Authorities responding to the initial survey grouped by type of authority

County Council

Bedfordshire	Hertfordshire
Buckinghamshire	Lancashire
Cheshire	Norfolk
Cornwall	Oxfordshire
Derbyshire	Surrey
Dorset County	Worcestershire

District Council

Amber Valley	Fylde
Basildon	Guildford
Basingstoke and Deane	Harlow
Blaby	Hastings
Brentwood	High Peak
Burnley	Hinckley and Bosworth
Cambridge	Newcastle-under-Lyme
Canterbury	North Warwickshire
Charnwood Borough	North West Leicestershire
Cheltenham	North Wiltshire
Cherwell	Norwich
Chester-le-Street	Rother
Chesterfield	Runnymede
Crawley	South Lakeland
Dacorum	Tendring
Dartford	Thanet
Easington	Vale Royal
Eastleigh	West Wiltshire
Ellesmere Port and Neston	Woking
Elmbridge	Wycombe

London Borough Council

Bromley
Camden
Hammersmith and Fulham

Hounslow
Waltham Forest

Metropolitan Authority

Birmingham
Bolton
Coventry
Newcastle
Rotherham

Sheffield
Stockport
Tameside
Walsall
Wigan

Unitary Authority

Blackburn with Darwen
Bracknell Forest
Bristol
Herefordshire
Kingston upon Hull
Milton Keynes

North East Lincolnshire
Poole
South Gloucestershire
Stockton-on-Tees
Stoke-on-Trent
Warrington

APPENDIX 8

Authorities responding to the initial survey grouped by geographic category

Mainly rural

Cornwall County Council
Dorset County Council
Herefordshire County Council
Norfolk County Council

North Warwickshire Borough Council
North Wiltshire District Council
South Lakeland District Council
Woking Borough Council

Mainly urban

Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council
Borough of Poole
Bracknell Forest Borough Council
Bristol City Council
Cambridge City Council
Cheltenham Borough Council
Chesterfield Borough Council
Crawley Borough Council
Eastleigh Borough Council

Harlow Council
Harrow London Borough
Hastings Borough Council
High Peak Borough Council
Hillingdon London Borough
Kingston upon Hull
Norwich City Council
Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Thanet District Council

Metropolitan

Birmingham City Council
Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council
Camden London Borough
Coventry City Council
Easington District Council
Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough
Hounslow London Borough
Newcastle City Council
Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council

Sheffield City Council
Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council
Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council
Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
Waltham Forest London Borough
Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council

Mix of rural/urban

Amber Valley District Council	Hertfordshire County Council
Basildon District Council	Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
Bedfordshire County Council	Lancashire County Council
Blaby District Council	Milton Keynes Council
Brentwood Borough Council	Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council
Bromley	North East Lincolnshire Council
Buckinghamshire County Council	North West Leicestershire District Council
Burnley Borough Council	Oxfordshire County Council
Canterbury City Council	Rother District Council
Charnwood Borough Council	Runnymede Borough Council
Cherwell District Council	South Gloucestershire Council
Cheshire County Council	Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council
Chester-le-Street District Council	Surrey County Council
Dacorum Borough Council	Tendring District Council
Dartford Borough Council	Vale Royal Borough Council
Derbyshire County Council	Warrington Borough Council
Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council	West Wiltshire District Council
Elmbridge Borough Council	Worcestershire County Council
Fylde Borough Council	Wycombe District Council
Guildford Borough Council (jointly with Surrey County Council)	

APPENDIX 9

Authorities willing to be case studies

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	Hertfordshire County Council
Birmingham City Council	Hillingdon London Borough
Bracknell Forest Borough Council	Hounslow London Borough
Brentwood Borough Council	King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council
Bristol City Council	Lancashire County Council
Bromley London Borough	Newcastle City Council
Buckinghamshire County Council	North East Lincolnshire Council
Burnley Borough Council	Oxfordshire County Council
Cambridge City Council	Runnymede Borough Council
Canterbury City Council	Sheffield City Council
Charnwood Borough Council	South Lakeland District Council
Cheltenham Borough Council	Stoke-on-Trent City Council
Chesterfield Borough Council	Surrey County Council
Coventry City Council	Tendring District Council
Crawley Borough Council	Thanet District Council
Easington District Council	Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council
Eastleigh Borough Council	Worcestershire County Council
Elmbridge Borough Council	Wycombe District Council
Guildford Borough Council (jointly with Surrey County Council)	
Harlow District Council	
Hastings Borough Council	

Number of authorities willing to participate in a case study: 39%

APPENDIX 10

Authorities responding to the initial survey by no. of travel plans

No. of travel plans	No. of Authorities	Authority name
0	7	Basildon District Council Cheshire County Council Dacorum Borough Council Derbyshire County Council Easington District Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Wigan Metropolitan Borough Council
1	10	Amber Valley District Council Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council Cornwall County Council Hastings Borough Council King's Lynn and West Norfolk Borough Council Kingston upon Hull City Council Norwich City Council South Lakeland District Council Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Tendring District Council
2	9	Blackburn with Darwen Borough Council Burnley Borough Council Canterbury City Council Cherwell District Council Chester-le-Street District Council Fylde Borough Council North East Lincolnshire Council North West Leicestershire District Council Wycombe District Council
3	6	Dorset County Council North Wiltshire District Council Rother District Council Tameside Metropolitan Borough Council Thanet District Council Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council

No. of travel plans	No. of Authorities	Authority name
4	3	Brentwood Borough Council Chesterfield Borough Council North Warwickshire Borough Council
5	4	Blaby District Council High Peak Borough Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Hounslow London Borough
6	10	Charnwood Borough Council Coventry City Council Crawley Borough Council Harrow London Borough Norfolk County Council Poole Borough and Town Council Runnymede Borough Council Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Waltham Forest London Borough West Wiltshire District Council
7	2	Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Newcastle City Council
8	4	Bedfordshire County Council Bromley London Borough Hillingdon London Borough Vale Royal Borough Council
9	4	Dartford Borough Council Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council Elmbridge Borough Council Herefordshire County Council
10	3	Buckinghamshire County Council Eastleigh Borough Council Woking Borough Council
11	1	Milton Keynes Council
12	2	Cheltenham Borough Council Harlow District Council
13	2	Bracknell Forest Borough Council Worcestershire County Council
14	2	Cambridge City Council Warrington Borough Council

No. of travel plans	No. of Authorities	Authority name
17	2	Lancashire County Council South Gloucestershire Council
20	1	Sheffield City Council
25	1	Bristol City Council
28	2	Guildford Borough Council (jointly with Surrey County Council) Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council
30	2	Camden London Borough Oxfordshire County Council
41	1	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council
46	1	Stoke on Trent City Council
48	1	Hertfordshire County Council
65	1	Surrey County Council
70	1	Birmingham City Council
Total 804	Total 82	

APPENDIX 11

Authorities responding to the initial survey by travel plan elements

Planning element	Number of Authorities	Percentage of returns
Cycling improvements	69	84.1
Public transport measures	64	78.0
Travel awareness/information	61	74.4
Control of parking	60	73.2
Walking improvements	58	70.7
Car sharing scheme	52	63.4
Monitoring	46	56.1
Modal split targets	42	51.2
Financial incentives e.g. PT subsidies	40	48.8
Financial incentives e.g. to users/employees	30	36.6
Delivery/servicing plan	29	35.4
Annual report and review	1	1.2
Appoint Travel Plan Co-ordinator	1	1.2
Appointment of a green TP co-ordinator & formulation	1	1.2
Appointment of travel co-ordinator	1	1.2
Bridleway improvements	1	1.2
Co-ordination	1	1.2
Contribution to Transport Strategy	1	1.2
Contribution towards parking, PT, cycling, walking	1	1.2
Cycle support facilities: showers etc,	1	1.2
Encouraging bus use	1	1.2
Encouraging Car sharing	1	1.2
Encouraging co-operation with other local business	1	1.2
Encouraging walking/ cycling	1	1.2
Free minibus to and from local stations	1	1.2
Free or subsidised taxi for employees who work unsociable hours	1	1.2
Management of car parking supply	1	1.2
Marketing Travel Plans	1	1.2
Monitoring by applicant	1	1.2
Nominated traffic officer	1	1.2
Non-car access road for bike, pedestrians/ buses	1	1.2
Phasing of stages of TP (survey, plan, actions)	1	1.2
Pool cars	1	1.2
Regular liaison meetings with local authority	1	1.2
Showers/ changing room for cyclists	1	1.2
Subsidy of park and ride service	1	1.2
Taxi/ bus shuttle to railway station	1	1.2
Timetable for implementation of travel plan	1	1.2

APPENDIX 12

Authorities responding to the initial survey by “best practice” factors

Number of Best Practice factors	Authority name
12	Bristol City Council
10	Lancashire County Council
9	Bromley London Borough Eastleigh Borough Council Hertfordshire County Council Runnymede Borough Council
8	Easington District Council
7	Buckinghamshire County Council Cheshire County Council Newcastle City Council Oxfordshire County Council Sheffield City Council Surrey County Council
6	Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council Birmingham City Council Hastings Borough Council South Gloucestershire Council Thanet District Council
5	Cambridge City Council Coventry City Council Stockport Metropolitan Borough Council Stoke-on-Trent City Council Wycombe District Council
4	Burnley Borough Council Camden London Borough Herefordshire County Council Kingston upon Hull Walsall Metropolitan Borough Council

Number of Best Practice factors	Authority name
3	Canterbury City Council Charnwood Borough Council Chesterfield Borough Council Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council Guildford Borough Council (jointly with Surrey County Council) Harlow Council Hinckley and Bosworth Borough Council Hounslow Norfolk County Council Poole Borough and Town Council South Lakeland District Council Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council Waltham Forest London Borough
2	Bedfordshire County Council Bolton Metropolitan Borough Council Bracknell Forest Borough Council Brentwood Borough Council Cheltenham Borough Council Cherwell District Council Cornwall County Council Crawley Borough Council Dacorum Borough Council Dorset County Council Hammersmith and Fulham London Borough Harrow London Borough Norwich City Council Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council Warrington Borough Council West Wiltshire District Council Worcestershire County Council
1	Amber Valley District Council Basildon District Council Chester-le-Street District Council Elmbridge Borough Council Flyde Borough Council High Peak Borough Council Milton Keynes Council Newcastle-under-Lyme Borough Council Vale Royal Borough Council Woking Borough Council
0	North Warwickshire Borough Council

APPENDIX 13

Authorities responding to the initial survey by types of applications

No. of applications by use class				
Use class	Known end-user	Known end-user	Speculative development	Speculative development
Application/Implementation	Application	Implementation	Application	Implementation
Total of number of applications	554	121	243	13
A1, A3, B8, B2, B1			1	
A1, leisure, B2 + B8	1			
A1/A2/A3			3	
A1/A3	1			
A1/A3/B1/C3			1	
A1/B1/A3/C3	1			
Airport	1			
Assembly & leisure	17	2	1	
Assembly & leisure – Community centres	3			
Assembly & leisure – football stadia	1			
Assembly & leisure – health club	1			
Assembly & leisure – health clubs	2			
Assembly & leisure – mosque	1			
Assembly & leisure – visitor centre	1			
Assembly & leisure – youth café	1			
B1 & B1 (c), B1, A1, A3, D2, C3, B1 & C3			3	
B1, B2 & B8			1	
B1, B2, B8	2		11	3
B1, B2, B8, A3			1	
B1, B2, B8, C1			1	
B1, B8 + car parking			1	
B1/B2/B8	2			
B1/C1/A2/A3			1	
B1/C1/A3/D2	1			
B1/A3	1			
B2	11	4	2	1
B2 – luxury boat builder	1			
B2/B8	4	3	10	1
B8	3		4	

No. of applications by use class (continued)				
Use class	Known end-user	Known end-user	Speculative development	Speculative development
Application/Implementation	Application	Implementation	Application	Implementation
Business class	173	42	158	6
C1/A3	1	1		
C3, B1, B2			1	
Car Park	1			
Car sales and repairs	2	1		
D2, A1			1	
Distribution Centre and warehouse			4	
Dwelling houses	6	1		
Factory outlet	1			
Financial & professional	30	6	3	1
Financial & professional – schools	10	10		
Food & drink	43		7	
Food/non food + petrol station			1	
Football Club	1			
Football Stadia	1	1		
Football stadium and employment	1			
Hotels & guest houses	16	2	1	
Industrial Estate	1			
Industrial/business park	1			
Leisure/commercial/residential	1			
Mixed employment	1		9	
Mixed employment plus hotel			1	
Mixed employment, campus, hotel, retail & leisure			1	
Mixed use			3	
Multi Religious Centre	1			
Newborn Riverside Development	1			
Newcastle Great Park Development	1			
Non-residential institutions	10	10		
Non-residential institutions – 2 storey extension			1	
Non-residential institutions – blood donor clinic	1			
Non-residential institutions – clinical science pa	1			
Non-residential institutions – college	7	2		
Non-residential institutions – college of FE	1			
Non-residential institutions – day nursery	1	1		
Non-residential institutions – exercise and rehab	1			
Non-residential institutions – health trusts	1			

No. of applications by use class (continued)				
Use class	Known end-user	Known end-user	Speculative development	Speculative development
Application/Implementation	Application	Implementation	Application	Implementation
Non-residential institutions – hospital	6	2		
Non-residential institutions – inland revenue office	1			
Non-residential institutions – medical school	1			
Non-residential institutions – nursery	1			
Non-residential institutions – SAGE	1			
Non-residential institutions – schools	58	4		
Non-residential institutions – university	2			
Non-residential institutions – university campus	1			
Offices/Housing			1	
Residential institutions	2			
Residential institutions – convalescent homes		1		
Residential institutions – hospital	27	3	1	
Residential institutions – hotel	1			
Residential institutions – housing devel.	1	1		
Residential institutions – school/hospital/convalescent	18			
Residential institutions – schools	15	18	1	
Residential institutions – student residential	1			
Residential institutions – university	1			
Retail and Leisure			1	
Shops	39	6	7	
Town centre leisure and retail development	1			
University development	2			
Warehouses	2			
Zoo	1			

APPENDIX 14

Synopsis of each case study

Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council

Type of authority:	District Council
Geographic Category:	Mix of urban/rural
Region of UK:	South East
Number of Travel Plans:	41
Best Practice Factors:	6
Range of Land Uses where Travel Plan required:	All business class uses over 1,000sqm or 50+ staff, hotels and leisure/assembly, education establishments. For smaller developments depends on cumulative impact & whether applicants seeking to avoid TP requirement.
Interviewees:	Head of Planning and Development Services, Principal Transport Planner, Senior Transport Planner, Enforcement Manager, Chief Solicitor, Cabinet Member for Environmental Sustainability, Developer.

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The rationale behind seeking travel plans through the planning process flows from the Council's transport policy – The Basingstoke Environmental Strategy for Transport – BEST. The policies in BEST have been developed in association with Hampshire County Council's "Headstart" Transport Awareness Community Involvement Programme and seek to reduce congestion, the level of car use and improve transport choice. The district council and county council jointly produced BEST.

The strategy has an overall target for reducing the number of car trips as a proportion of all journeys by 20% before 2020 from 1991 figures. Although setting out a vision and policies for sustainable transport it does not include a specific policy on travel plans or refer to them. However reference is explicitly made to the requirement for staff commuter plans in relation to all new major developments in Hampshire CC's report Transport in Hampshire. The county council has also developed the Draft Hampshire Parking Strategy and Standards which explicitly sets out the relationship between parking standards, transport

assessments, accessibility levels and the requirement for travel plans in relation to all land uses. It will be used by Basingstoke once finalised. In this document all developments for land uses, except residential, over 500sqm require a travel plan which is a lower figure than is currently applied by the district council. They generally use a floor space trigger of 1,000sqm or 50+ jobs as the basis on which they seek travel plans. For smaller applications the cumulative impact is used as a guide as to whether or not to require a travel plan and advice is taken from the county council if it is not clear.

The initial drive for the requirement for travel plans came from transport officers and there was concern originally about the potential impact on businesses but now senior managers and members support the policy and are convinced that “it is good for business”. The effectiveness of travel plans in delivering policy objectives cannot be judged as yet, as only a few plans have actively started and as yet there is no formal system in place to test effectiveness by either the district council or county council.

The approach taken is pro-active but based on persuasion and finding a mutually acceptable scheme. However sanctions can be imposed through the section 106 agreements, for failure to deliver the required improvements through a ‘bond’. Improvements for transport infrastructure are not included normally within the travel plan but alongside it and are directly related to BEST proposals, the Hampshire Local Transport Strategy proposals or to the outcome from the transport assessment where these are provided.

There is no published information on what is required in a travel plan but an informal guidance note is available on the issues the district council believes should be considered. This includes:

- Commitment to carry out a staff travel survey
- Commitment to provide information on alternative modes of travel to the site
- Outline of modal split targets to provide basis for monitoring
- A named coordinator
- An action plan with clear milestones
- Financial implications and funding
- Cycle facilities and routes to be provided or available
- Public transport requirements in relation to current provision
- Public transport interest free loans
- Car sharing database and emergency home ride facility
- Internet access for travel information.

These are not prescriptive and adjusted to the circumstances in each case. Particularly in relation to speculative developments, the section 106 agreement does not necessarily include the details of any travel plan but there is requirement that it be produced, agreed and implemented to the satisfaction of the district council. If it is not, a financial payment is required (referred to in this note as a 'bond'). In other situations, the contents of the Green Travel Plan Preliminary Statement are included in the section 106 agreement and the arrangements for the timing and preparation of the travel plan. If these are not complied with, then a 'bond' may again be used. A Basingstoke Business Travel Forum has been set up, which comprises a network of local employers working on developing their own green travel initiatives.

THE PROCESS

The council uses either a section 106 agreement or a condition although the former is more likely to be used than the latter. Legal advice prefers the former as it is more enforceable but some DC officers prefer the simplicity of the latter: the choice is made in relation to the simplicity of the case, what other factors are involved which are likely to warrant a legal agreement and whether there are financial requirements. For the latter a section 106 is always used, especially where a 'bond' is imposed which is increasingly likely. Model conditions and a section 106 are available and made public to assist the process.

Officers from the development control section lead the process but with support from and in conjunction with the transport team, together, in relation to section 106 agreements, with legal advice. Where a section 106 agreement is to be involved, initial scoping meetings are held via the Legal Services Practice to identify and agree council requirements. The solicitor is closely involved in the drafting and negotiation of any agreement. There have been no major challenges to the agreement or conditions so far.

The process varies in respect of speculative or non-speculative applications. In the former there is a 2-stage process involving a preliminary travel plan statement that is followed by a detailed travel plan. Normally required as part of the application, it includes targets in relation to current traffic patterns and modal split based on staff survey information. For speculative applications, a travel plan is usually produced once the occupier is known. Neither incorporates a requirement that is on going in terms of future occupiers or changes following the monitoring of the plan. Assessments for funding are based on an approximation of what would be the cost of providing the full parking provision on a demand basis if that were permissible other than where specific scheme costs are known and directly related to the site. Public transport revenue costs are rarely required, most funding being for cycle and walking improvements other than contributions to BEST.

There is no formal system in place to test the effectiveness of travel plans nor built into the section 106 agreement although there is a requirement in the section 106 for Chineham Business Park to include a monitoring and review process within the travel plan for approval. This has yet to be submitted so the contents are not known. Monitoring of compliance with the section 106 agreements is the responsibility of the Programme Monitoring Officer and for planning condition, the compliance officer, but neither monitors the actual travel plan.

As yet the council has not had to take enforcement action but will if necessary. They do not believe this will be easy as at the present time, Green Travel Plans and associated documentation tend to be regarded more as statements of intent. However, the council believes the documents are as tight as they can be at present but are developing the process and

will review it annually as it evolves. Given this situation the travel plans and associated legal documentation need to be realistic and achievable as a principle. The resource implications of seeking and negotiating travel plans are considerable and no Department for Transport finance is received.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Published best practice note on community infrastructure requirements and procedures including a model section 106 agreement;
- The establishment of a scoping meeting with all key parties at the beginning of the process and documented audit trail;
- The payment of a 'bond' equivalent to the cost of the council undertaking works in the event of the applicant defaulting on the provisions of the section 106 agreement;
- There are dedicated officers for ensuring compliance with planning conditions and approvals including section 106 agreements, and the mechanisms for ensuring compliance is partly built into the section 106 agreement;
- A model planning condition;
- Joint working with Hampshire County Council including joint transport policies;
- Draft guidance on the Hampshire County Council parking strategy in relation to transport assessments, accessibility levels and the need for travel plans; and
- A pro-active approach linked to the environmental transport strategy to seeking travel plans.

The key weaknesses are:

- The publication best practice note and model section 106 agreement do not explicitly cover travel plans but only contributions to BEST and cycle or walking contributions;
- The model section 106 agreement focuses on financial payments in terms of transport including the framework for the bond but does not identify other aspects of a travel plan;
- The guidance on the possible contents of a travel plan is not made public;
- Although there is a mechanism within the s.106 to ensure compliance on future occupiers, the council lacks enforcement resources and mechanisms;
- The methodology for calculating financial contributions is not public;
- No system has been established for monitoring the effectiveness of the travel plans approved; and
- The transport strategy does not explicitly set down a policy on neither travel plans nor the criteria for seeking them.

PLANNING APPLICATION: CHINEHAM BUSINESS PARK

Description:	Three speculative office developments within wider development
Current status:	Development underway but not yet occupied, preliminary statement and full travel plan have recently been submitted
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 agreement requiring a green travel plan preliminary statement prior to commencement of the development and following approval of the preliminary statement the submission of a detailed green transport plan to be implemented by the owner to the satisfaction of the council.
Nature of travel plan:	Preliminary statement to include statement of transport problems; statement of objectives for achievement and promotion of reduction of environmental impact of transport; timetable and work programme for the detailed travel plan; specific measures to be used including increased use of non-car modes, car sharing, teleworking, walking and cycling; procedures for implementing monitoring reviewing and updating measures; targets for the basis of monitoring.
Financial obligations:	Enhanced bus service to be operated and implemented for a period of 3 years, £70,000 and £30,000 towards BEST schemes.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	No specific targets or sanctions
Private sector view:	General support for the principal but concerns about the timescale and processes involved

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered best practice:

- The Best Practice Guidance Note on Community Infrastructure, Section 106 Agreements and the planning application process;
- The two-stage process for seeking travel plans in relation to speculative developments;
- The requirement within the travel plan to have targets, milestones, monitoring and review process;
- The scoping process meeting;
- The requirement for a 'bond' in the case of a default in the delivery of the travel plan; and
- Establishment of Basingstoke Business Travel Forum.

Birmingham City Council

Type of authority:	Unitary
Geographic Category:	Metropolitan
Region of UK:	West Midlands
Number of Travel Plans:	60 – focus is on membership of TravelWise (see below)
Best Practice Factors:	6
Range of land uses where Travel Plan required:	All land uses other than residential where there are 50+ employees or smaller if there is likely to be a transport impact
Interviewees:	Travel plan project leader, senior constituency planner, DC highways and representative of Transport West Midlands.

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Birmingham’s transport strategy sets out a wide range of policies on sustainable transport that includes explicitly using the planning system to effect change.

The need to implement a scheme to help employers move away from car dependency arose through the council’s concern with increasing traffic congestion, pollution and the need to promote sustainable transport as part of its transport strategy. It was agreed to launch “Company TravelWise in Birmingham” in 1998 as a way of supporting employers to develop new approaches to travel, with the initial focus on existing businesses. Subsequently it was agreed that new development should be considered as well as concern grew about the potential for additional traffic growth, with the result that the TravelWise process was integrated into the planning system. Members, officers and applicants saw it as a way of responding to potential refusals of application because of traffic generation concerns.

The target strategy sets out car use modal split targets for 20 years for work, shopping and leisure trips which distinguish between city centre and outer areas and include reducing current levels for work from 50% to 40% in the centre and from 70% to 60% in outer areas. The council does not have a current adopted policy on when to seek travel plans but is proposing a new policy in their UDP to be put on deposit in January 2002. This will make explicit the requirement for all applications above the PPG 13 thresholds to include a transport assessment to show how the overall transport strategy target will be met. Within this policy the council states that it will also promote alternative modes through TravelWise but does not state that it will require relevant occupiers to join the scheme.

In practice officers are seeking to impose on applicants of developments that will have more than 50 employees (or, if smaller, will generate significant trips), a requirement that they affiliate to Company TravelWise in Birmingham. This excludes residential developments. There is not a requirement for a travel plan as such. Once affiliated, companies are required to sign a pledge stating that they will work towards reducing the environmental and congestion impacts of their organisation's transport activities with particular reference to employee travel.

The overall approach is pro-active and once the condition has been imposed, over which there is little flexibility, it works on the basis of Company TravelWise working in support of the company to help them identify actions. These include information on staff travel surveys; how to reduce car use and the use of company cars, encourage bus and rail travel, improve public transport services to help employees, promote cycling use. The Company TravelWise Pack is provided to all those who affiliate but the outcomes of the process will then be unique to each company as they develop, with officer support, a package of measures to suit their needs.

A key part of the overall approach is the close working relationship with the West Midlands Passenger Executive and key operator. This partnership is critical to the success of Birmingham's approach as it enables financial incentives to be given to employers and employees in relation to the use of sustainable transport and its promotion, and close working on public transport service provision. Improvements to transport infrastructure or services, which are required by the council as part of the approval of the application, are considered separately normally within a section 106 agreement, which would run alongside but not be included in the planning condition requiring affiliation to Company TravelWise.

THE PROCESS

The process is relatively simple from the planning perspective as the council does not require the preparation of a travel plan per se but requires occupiers to join the TravelWise scheme as a condition of planning approval. Once the condition has been imposed the responsibility for ensuring it is implemented rests with the TravelWise Co-ordinator who also assesses subsequently the acceptability of actions proposed. Through this process applicants are encouraged and supported to develop a set of initiatives that are equivalent to a travel plan. The overall target for all schemes is a 10% reduction in car commuting over a five-year period. There have been no cases where enforcement against failure to comply with the condition has arisen as yet. The actual preparation of an action plan can take some considerable time; it is more of a continuous process and dialogue than a specific plan.

Birmingham has chosen to pursue a planning condition approach rather than a section 106 because:

- It is quick and simple to apply
- It reinforces the objectives of Company TravelWise and spreads its influence
- Applicants like it again because of simplicity and speed plus the benefits they receive through Company TravelWise.

The process was initially established by the travel plan coordinator who subsequently set up training sessions for DC staff to enable them to effectively impose the planning condition. The requirements for information are limited unless related to the transport assessments, which is separately handled and based on the PPG 13 requirements. In relation to the TravelWise scheme the focus is on undertaking an audit of staff travel patterns, locations and facilities. There are no requirements in relation to modal split figures or targets other than the overall reduction in car usage sought. Birmingham focuses more on a change of attitudes and culture of which the planning process on applications is a small part rather than relying on targets.

Where travel plans are submitted as part of an application these are assessed by the highways DC team in relation to the proposals for different modes but not against any specific target figures other than those set out above.

The monitoring of the fulfilment of the condition is via the travel plan coordinator who is notified of all applications where the condition has been imposed. He will then notify the enforcement team if, following the occupation of the building, the condition has not been complied with. As the numbers of conditions increase this is becoming increasingly difficult to maintain. Once complied with all further actions are voluntary and subject to agreement. Monitoring in terms of effectiveness is carried out through the information that should be provided by the business and Birmingham are also currently undertaking an evaluation of the overall effectiveness of the Company TravelWise scheme in terms of changing levels of car use.

Birmingham are firmly of the view that the establishment of a Company TravelWise scheme is preferable to a specific company travel plan.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Ease and speed of the process initially with the use of the planning condition and ability to enforce failure to comply with condition;
- Standard planning condition although wording and emphasis may vary to suit application;
- Standard staff travel survey package which the authority can map for the company using postcodes;
- Clear publications on Company TravelWise including obligations of members, ideas for promoting sustainable transport and elements to include and financial and other benefits available;
- Overall process clearly linked into transport policy and objectives;
- Business community is supportive of overall Company TravelWise and welcomes close working relationship with public transport operators, financial benefits package and technical support from officers;
- Very good linkages with Passenger Transport Executive and a key operator;

- Personal support given to companies by bus operator to develop improved public transport network;
- Planning conditions validity has been tested through appeal; and
- Monitoring requirements built into Company TravelWise package on six-monthly basis and required by the local authority to check on effectiveness.

The key weaknesses are:

- Separation of travel plan contents in practice from transport infrastructure requirements and improvements;
- Inability to control elements of the travel plan produced, and secure or enforce its effectiveness through the planning system;
- Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process;
- Lack of explicit policy on when to seek the planning condition in relation to an application;
- Only works where there is the equivalent organisation to Company TravelWise Birmingham to support and pursue the action;
- Resource intensive after approval of planning application; and
- The planning condition only relates to the initial occupier and there is no requirement for subsequent occupiers to be party to the scheme.

PLANNING APPLICATION: BELLVIEW MEDICAL CENTRE

Description:	Redevelopment of a medical centre to extend services but with limited parking
Current status:	Approved and in operation
How travel plan secured:	Through a planning condition requiring that the applicant affiliate to Company TravelWise
Nature of travel plan:	Focus was on undertaking a staff travel survey as small scale development with only 20/30 staff and then using this as a basis to suggest ideas for action and as a basis for monitoring. Action included provision of public transport information, the concessions available though Company TravelWise.
Financial obligations:	None
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	None

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered as best practice:

- The establishment of a city-wide Company TravelWise scheme which has engaged substantial business support, and would appear to be successful in influencing changing patterns of travel
- A very good and close working relationship with the public transport coordinating body, Centro, and the key bus operator Travel West Midlands, to provide financial benefits to companies and personal support
- The simplicity of the planning condition and consequential speed of the process
- The quality of the published information provided to companies
- The personal support given to companies to help them through the travel survey and subsequent identification of actions, including survey proformas and mapping
- The establishment of city-wide targets in terms of car use as a basis for developing action.

Bristol City Council

Type of authority:	Unitary Authority
Geographic Category:	Mainly urban
Region of UK:	South West
Number of Travel Plans:	25-30 (over 3-4 years)
Best Practice Factors:	12
Range of Land Uses where Travel Plan required:	All land uses meeting PPG13 thresholds, except for hotels/guesthouses and residential institutions
Interviewees:	Chair of Central Planning Committee; Co-ordinator, Transport Planning Team; Officers in Planning Development Control and Transport Development Control; S106 Solicitor, developer.

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The council has a coherent policy approach ranging from a mention in the Structure Plan, through to targets and secondary targets in the Local Transport Plan to a draft supplementary planning guidance note that is informally being applied. The SPG seeks to clarify where Travel Plans should be required as a matter of Good Practice as against where it may be essential, and to indicate an approach for both speculative and known end-use applications. The Local Plan policy framework is currently being updated and strengthened to reflect national policy guidance, local political thinking, the council's experience with travel plan implementation, and recent consultations.

The central area of Bristol already sees relatively high levels of public transport use/low car parking provision (resulting in a 30% use of car for commuting). Securing of travel plans is seen mainly as a part of a package of measures aimed at widening choice, reducing traffic levels and improving air quality, though separate and "extra" to public transport and park and ride measures and related contributions within planning obligations. The travel plan is seen as essential in central and non-central locations, but achievement of targets is seen as being more essential in out of centre locations, where direct traffic generation is more likely to be an issue.

Generally travel plans are requested where PPG13 thresholds apply, though all schools that submit an application are required to prepare a travel plan. Most large developments already trigger the requirement for contributions to public transport and park and ride, so the travel plan objectives and content depend on the scope for achieving a reduction in car use.

The draft SPG "*Securing Travel Plans as part of New Development*" sets out the detailed approach to dealing with travel plans, covering when it should be required, how to secure

(normally through a section 106 agreement), what a section 106 agreement should include and monitoring/enforcement. An associated “*Framework for Travel Plan*” document sets out the headings for the content of travel plans and includes:

- Nomination of travel co-ordinator
- Promotion of a car sharing scheme
- Encouragement of cycling
- Provision of a travel notice board
- Provision of future travel surveys and
- Promotion of public transport.

The requirement for nomination of a travel co-ordinator is the source of some legal reservations, but is normally included in section 106 agreements as a way of ensuring the process of travel plans is progressed into the future within developments.

As a contribution to reducing car usage a travel plan is considered valuable, but regeneration is seen as an over-riding objective; officers and members are hesitant to impose unreasonable costs on developers. The council also wishes to avoid the potential conflict that could arise where a travel plan limits car parking and leads to increased parking pressure on the surrounding area; CPZs are unlikely to be a solution due to local sensitivities. Considerable resources are devoted to establishing local “Travel Forums” wherein a group of adjacent businesses/developers work together to achieve lower car use (already have City-wide Forum). A contribution to establish a “Travel Forum” for the area local to the application site has recently been successfully negotiated as part of section 106 agreement heads of terms for Canons Marsh.

Bristol’s general approach is to be pro-active and practical, emphasising process rather than mode share targets in the central area. Members and officers seek to “get the developer on board” but officers consider the travel plan as an essential requirement for applications above PPG13 thresholds. Officers have developed Grant Schemes for Voluntary Travel Plans and Award Schemes for progress to encourage travel plan implementation. The work on travel plan promotion and the involvement in planning application travel plan negotiations are both within the Transport Planning section which helps ensure close integration, with officers continually seeking to develop and improve practice.

Developers seem generally accepting of the council’s approach, as the travel plan is separate from transport contributions and does not involve any substantial financial liability nor sanctions. Developers indicated strong resistance to commitments involving ongoing and burdensome administration costs. Some have suggested that travel plans should be legally required via other legislation such as Environmental Health (re Air Pollution- AQMAs) and Employment Law.

THE PROCESS

The Council normally secures travel plans through a section 106 agreement for the following reasons:

- It allows greater clarity of what we wish to achieve;
- It can be comprehensive in scope;
- It is likely to be more effective in ensuring a travel plan is prepared if this has to be done after a development is occupied;
- It provides a mechanism whereby, if after a 12 month period, the travel plan is not meeting targets, additional measures for off-site measure can be triggered;
- It is binding on successive owners as lessees of the land; and
- It provides greater control than a condition, especially where obligations are complex or multi-staged.

The emphasis in travel plan/section 106 negotiations is on securing an agreed set of measures and ensuring applicants “use their best endeavours” to achieve these, with the underlying assumption that some modal shift will be achieved. Standard section 106 clauses have been developed (and are still being revised) which specify travel plan stages and associated time-scales, with two versions for speculative and known end user cases which are modified to reflect particular circumstances of the proposal, location etc. Where the end-user is known, the travel plan survey is required prior to occupation. The current wording of standard clauses begs the question over failure to meet targets- it implies the developer/occupier would be asked to fund further measures (to achieve modal split targets) but it is not clear who would implement further measures and there is no limit on further costs.

Regarding enforcement, officers follow legal advice that in situations where the travel plan measures are being implemented but the mode share targets are not being met, it is the implementation that should be the test for compliance. The exception to this is where the travel plan is seen as a key tool to overcome possible objections in terms of local traffic generation, and in these cases the targets are seen as the test.

The issue of submitting/implementation of a travel plan is brought up early in the negotiations, though normally the applicant is given encouragement and support and information about local opportunities through a “pack” of information and practical advice including *Changing Journeys to Work*. Officers expect submitted travel plans to include modal split targets, with a 10% traffic reduction considered as a reasonable target (over 4-5 years). This target links into traffic reduction targets in the Local Transport Plan, though may be modified to reflect particular local circumstances. The council offers to help carry out surveys at lower cost so that more funds can go towards travel plan measures.

Bristol handles a large number of applications for speculative developments and about half of all applications where a travel plan is pursued are speculative B1/B2/B8. Here the council adopts a two-stage approach, with the section 106 agreement requiring the applicant to agree to the “Travel Plan Framework” described above, and to time-scales specifying when certain stages of travel plan preparation are to be carried out. These

normally relate to occupation of the development i.e. two months after for employee surveys and four months after for preparing and submitting a travel plan. The travel plan must be implemented with six months of the receipt of approval, and monitoring must take place within 12 months of the implementation of the travel plan and annually for a further four years. Following approval of the travel plan by Bristol City Council the applicant ensures full implementation and is expected to use “reasonable endeavours” to manage the site in accordance with the travel plan, including monitoring. Officers have recently attempted to calculate interim modal split targets based on existing businesses in the area, and have referred to these in the section 106 agreements for speculative developments to give an indication of the scale of measures required.

Public transport contributions have not been tied in with travel plans in past but now the importance of doing so has been recognised. In the context of regeneration, financial implications of travel plan must be carefully considered against other high costs of developing sites and competition from other cities for large employers. While open to the idea of financial sanctions if only rarely invoked, both the Member interviewed and officers agreed that some developers would treat up-front bonds or financial sanctions as a way of buying their way out of commitment to actually implement travel plans. Previous attempts by the council to secure up-front funding for implementation of travel plans where occupiers were unknown were found to be cumbersome and problematic.

Monitoring is the responsibility of developer/owner. As of yet the council has not faced the possibility of enforcement as there are few completed developments involving travel plans. Given the overall approach currently adopted by the council, enforcement would be most likely where a developer/owner showed total disregard of travel plan requirements.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Proactive, positive “partnership” approach which balances travel plan objectives with wider regeneration objectives;
- Working to educate developers and “get them on board”;
- Pre-application discussions and Information Pack for Developers;
- Draft Supplementary Planning guidance that acts as a practice note;
- Standard Clauses for section 106;
- Mechanism for speculative developments, with clear “Framework” Document and interim targets in some cases;
- Promotion of “Travel Forums” for businesses to pool information and resources, with section 106 contributions where possible; and
- Awards/Grants Schemes and officer support.

The key weaknesses are:

- Section 106 Clauses still being perfected in relation to situation where travel plan measures have failed to achieve modal split targets; vagueness may be of concern to applicants;
- Uncertainty over what is reasonable to expect of developers/occupiers in terms of aspects of travel plan implementation e.g. any requirement for travel plan co-ordinators, and explicit financial sanctions for failure to meet targets; and
- Some development control officers consider travel plans “marginal”.

PLANNING APPLICATION: BATH STREET SITE (FORMERLY COURAGE BREWERY SITE)

Description:	Speculative mixed use city centre development; 726 m2 B1, 1562m2 A3, 29 residential units
Current status:	Being implemented (first one where travel plan)
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 agreement requiring adherence to stages/timescales for submission and implementation as outlined above. Includes annual monitoring reports.
Nature of travel plan:	Travel plan not yet prepared
Financial obligations:	Park and ride.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	None at this stage
Private sector views:	Process good, with early dialogue; the developer supported the idea of the travel plan. Main concerns were the burden of administration (f/t travel co-ordinator), subsequent occupiers and control over visitors’ employees. Consider that enforcement of targets should be by discussion and liaison rather than financial penalties (which would delay agreement and lose co-operative attitude) and prefer financial contributions to schemes which encourage modal shift over ongoing and burdensome travel plans.

PLANNING APPLICATION: CANONS MARSH, CENTRAL BRISTOL

Description:	Large scale mixed use city centre development, part speculative, comprising residential, offices, leisure, retail, food and drink, public and private open space, waterside amenities and car parking/access.
Current status:	Just received consent; section 106 under negotiation, but seek this to be a “good example” of how to secure a travel plan
How travel plan secured:	Section 106 requiring adherence to stages/timescales for submission and implementation of travel plans; occupier

	expected to be known in advance of construction; may tighten up on standard section 106 clause.
Nature of travel plan:	Not yet prepared.
Financial obligations:	£100,000 for public transport improvements; £10,000 towards setting up a Travel Forum re travel plans in vicinity of application; in addition to over £500,000 for highway works, VMS and affordable housing.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Not yet finalised.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered as best practice:

- City –wide local travel forums, with funding from section 106 where possible (eg Canons Marsh);
- Pro-active and partnership approach, including grant schemes for voluntary travel plans and award schemes for progress;
- Information pack for developers;
- Framework approach re speculative applications, with detailed requirements including Travel Plan co-ordinator;
- Standard clauses for section 106; and
- Interim or preliminary modal split targets referenced in section 106 for some speculative developments.

Camden London Borough

Type of authority:	Unitary Authority
Geographic Category:	Metropolitan
Region of UK:	South East/London
Number of Travel Plans:	30 (over last 3 years)
Best Practice Factors:	4
Range of Land Uses where Travel Plan required:	Commercial, residential institutions, schools, assembly/leisure – all activities involving 10+ employees or 20+ trips
Interviewees:	Officers in transport planning team, area manager/development control team, S106 co-ordinator. Legal advisor, applicant (case study 1), occupier (case study 2).

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The council has a strong policy approach to the requirement for travel plans as part of its overall transport policy and sees the development of travel plans as a key part of its drive to seek a modal shift away from car use for journeys to work. Within its Interim Local Transport Plan the Council's target for road traffic reduction is 30% by 2010 from the level in 1998 and this provides the context for the seeking of travel plans and is set out as the overall target in Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG). The nature of the policy approach is illustrated in a wide range of strategies and initiatives, including: the Green Transport Strategy, Camden's Walking and Cycling Strategies, the Interim Local Implementation Plan, SPG on Section 106 agreements and Travel Plans, the UDP transport policies in general (adopted March 2000), Camden's own Green Travel Plan for staff, and Camden's Green Travel Network – for employers developing travel plans.

The requirement for a reduction in road traffic is linked to concerns over air quality, traffic congestion as well as national and regional policy. As yet there are no specific UDP policies on when to require a travel plan but they are required in principle for all applications that need a transport assessment as based on PPG13. In practice, the Council seek them for applications with 10+ employees or generating 20+ trips per day, excluding residential schemes. There are no explicit targets for the number of travel plans to be sought. There have been no real objections to the requirement from applicants and Camden seek to make the process positive.

Initially the rationale for seeking a travel plan was promoted by residents and members in relation to a particular application for the extension to a school. There were significant parking and traffic generation and pollution concerns and the development of a travel plan was seen as a way of overcoming the problems. It was successful in overcoming the problems and meeting the targets for trips set out. This process has now been formalised

and extended and is nearly wholly driven at officer level. However all applications involving a section 106 agreement go to committee therefore members are aware of the process.

The overall approach is pro-active but it is based on finding a mutually acceptable scheme with the applicant. So far the focus has been on known-end user applications although some speculative applications have now been processed but this is seen as more difficult. In the latter cases the obligation to produce a travel plan rests with the owner but they are legally obliged to ensure compliance by occupiers and there is a time lag for submission of the travel plan, which relates to occupation.

The elements to be included in the travel plan itself assume that there is a known end user as they are seen more effective if promoted by the organisation and include:

- Staff travel surveys – baseline and monitoring
- Targets
- Appointment of a travel co-ordinator
- Promotion of the package to staff
- Reduced workplace car parking
- Public transport information for staff and visitors, and initiatives including interest free season ticket/travelcard loans
- Financial benefits for cyclists
- Review of car allowances
- Green pool vehicles
- Information and facilities for cycling and walking
- Increased tele-working & tele-conferencing
- Vehicle emissions reduction policies.

These are adjusted to suit the particular application. The SPG information is provided to all applicants where there is the potential need for a travel plan and section 106. Items such as improvements to public transport, cycling networks or walking facilities requiring financial capital are separated out from the travel plan in the section 106 agreement unless an integral part of the site.

THE PROCESS

The council has chosen to use section 106 agreements rather than a planning condition as in the light of experience they believe these are more effective because:

- They are more secure in terms of implementation;
- Easier to enforce through an injunction rather than enforcement notice;
- Based on a mutually acceptable position and agreement;
- They can more effectively include financial requirements and matters outside the site boundary; and
- The complexities of the requirements for a travel plan, including monitoring and targets did not fit with the framework of planning conditions.

The whole process is led by the case officers but supported by the transport planning team who assess the travel plan and advise on its key elements as well as advising on other transport improvements required. There has to be a compelling reason to depart from the elements highlighted in the SPG. Currently the processes for the transport assessment and the requirements of the travel plan are treated separately. The Council do not undertake surveys or prepare travel plans for applicants.

Applicants are encouraged to join the Camden Green Travel network but this is not compulsory.

Modal split or other targets are not necessarily used, depending on the nature of the application. The primary target is a general one – to reduce trips by car over a period of three years based on either the current situation or an assessment of it. Information should be provided to the Council annually on the results of a staff survey.

As yet the Council has not taken any enforcement action and is unsure how effective this would be in practice. They have a process in place for ensuring the submission of travel plans in accordance with the section 106 agreement through their section 106 team who have established a data base but have not yet assessed the travel plans' effectiveness nor have any process as yet for redress if they are not effective in meeting targets. There are some problems being experienced in ensuring compliance in the submission of travel plans where they relate to sensitive permissions and where other policies are important. Insufficient time has elapsed to assess how developers will comply with the monitoring requirements in the section 106 agreements.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths of the Camden approach are:

- The need for travel plans delivered through the planning system is integrated with the wider transport and environmental agenda, the Council's own travel plan, the promotion of school travel plans, car free housing and the development of a support network for businesses in promoting their own staff travel plans;

- The publication of supplementary planning guidance on all aspects of planning obligations including the securing of travel plans with a description of the key elements of the travel plan, measures to consider, a step-by-step guide to including one in the planning process, useful other sources of information and a specimen section 106 agreement for any planning obligations;
- A standard format for section 106 agreements for travel plans;
- The requirement for payment for the monitoring of any section 106 agreement from the applicant;
- The comprehensiveness of the approach in terms of range of applications considered;
- The availability of advice from the council's specialists; and
- Existence of support network through the Camden Green Travel Network.

The key weaknesses are:

- The content of the actual travel plan does not necessarily directly relate to the transport needs as identified through the policy documents or transport assessment;
- There is no monitoring taking place as yet on travel plans required through the section 106 process or their effectiveness and this problem is growing as the number of travel plans increases, although the monitoring requirements are set out in the section 106 agreement; there is concern about the resource implications of the process; and
- There is no default measure in place in the event of the travel plan not delivering changes in the way people access the site or travel; the scheme is based on "using best endeavours" and good will.

PLANNING APPLICATION: TRITON SQUARE, EUSTON: BRITISH LAND

Description:	Three concurrent applications for office use, public open space and ancillary retail and service uses, part speculative.
Current status:	Built in part and travel plan submitted
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 agreement requiring submission of a preliminary travel plan to include specified matters by fixed date; to be followed by submission of draft travel plan by further fixed date; following approval by Camden of travel plan then to ensure full implementation & use "reasonable endeavours" to manage site in accordance with it: to regularly review.
Nature of travel plan:	Extremely comprehensive plan approved including real time public transport information on travel internet site; travel survey information as baseline; travel principles; appointment of travel co-ordinator; establishment of a

travel forum; marketing of the travel plan; travel information booklet on local public transport, cycling and walking routes; display screens; bicycle user group and facilities; servicing plan; annual monitoring through staff travel survey until 2004 reported to Camden.

Financial obligations:	None in respect of the travel plan
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	No targets or timescales other than the submissions and no sanctions.
Private sector view:	Considerable support from company's travel plan section and from on-site coordinator. PR and economic benefits of green image recognised.

PLANNING APPLICATION: THE ROYAL SCHOOL, HAMPSTEAD

Description:	Extension of number of day pupils in relation to boarders at school
Current status:	Approved for three years and implemented including the travel plan
How travel plan secured:	Through a planning condition, travel plan submitted as part of the application and amended following negotiations
Nature of travel plan:	Sets out objective of reducing proportion of trips to school by car by 30% over three years and maintain it relating to staff and pupils; covers car sharing, minibus service, public transport information pack, cycling in respect of staff, car parking control on and off site, education, establishment of co-ordinator; annual monitoring over three years.
Financial obligations:	None in respect of the travel plan
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Target as above. No compliance will result in withdrawal or non-renewal of permission at expiry of three years.
Private sector view:	General support for Camden's overall approach

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered as best practice:

- The integration of travel plans very visibly into the wider transport agenda through publications and policy;
- The publication of a SPG explicitly setting out travel requirements and a draft section 106 agreement to aid staff and applicants and speed up the process;

- The focus on seeking a positive and negotiated agreement;
- The travel plan for the Triton Square site in respect of overall site management and the range and quality of information available in published and internet form; and
- The explicit targets and monitoring arrangements included in The Royal School travel plan.

Eastleigh Borough Council

Type of authority:	District Council
Geographic Category:	Mainly urban
Region of UK:	South East
Number of Travel Plans:	10+
Best Practice Factors:	9
Range of land uses where Travel Plan required:	All land uses over 500sqm, or smaller depending on location and traffic generation characteristics; in respect of residential this is just being initiated
Interviewees:	Transport & development control manager and senior planner, development control. Legal adviser, applicant

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Hampshire County Council has a policy of seeking to reduce overall traffic congestion and to improve transport choice. It has an overall target for reducing traffic growth overall by 50% by 2020, although this is increased to 75% in the wider Southampton area, which includes Eastleigh. The county has also developed a scheme called the Transport Awareness Community Investment programme, known as Headstart, which promotes traffic reduction measures, but its impact is relatively limited on local policies.

The highway authority for Eastleigh District Council, Hampshire County Council, has prepared a new consultative draft of its Parking Strategy and Standards which sets out the requirements for transport assessments, travel plans and the level of parking permissible together with public transport accessibility levels. All applications for developments over 500 sq.m., apart from residential, are required to submit a travel plan alongside their transport assessment. Consideration is given to the outcome of the assessments and accessibility levels to inform the travel plan. For residential uses, the process is still evolving and it is not yet clear how a travel plan is going to be used and what it will contain.

The District Council is seeking to use travel plans as part of its commitment to reduce the costs of development on the environment. It has an explicit policy in the Deposit draft local Plan that states that travel plans will be required as part of the consideration of all major applications, where significant traffic would be generated or where they would help to resolve a local problem. In addition the council has prepared supplementary planning guidance on transport strategy that explicitly requires travel plans. Travel plans are therefore perceived as an integral part of the process, but there is no direct link to the Headstart scheme.

The policy has been officer driven as a way of resolving the conflict between development pressures and the need to control the growth of car use. Increasingly members and other officers have taken up the process and support has grown. The policy drivers have been approved by members who are now actively seeking travel plans although they are less convinced about reduced parking standards given previous problems with on-street parking. They are concerned to ensure effective enforcement. The relatively recent growth in the requirement for travel plans, although not in conflict with other policies directly has created some internal conflict in practice in terms of “competition” between different planning obligations as to which are more important. Initially there was concern that there may be conflict with economic development policies but this has not materialised and in practice the process has been seen as supportive to the economy.

Although the requirement for a travel plan is clear, whether speculative or not, the approach is still one of negotiation and seeking agreement itself through partnership working. There is no published advice on the requirements for the travel plan and the elements included from a standard list based on PPG 13 are negotiated on their merits for each application. The aim is to reduce single occupancy cars as the main feature and if possible achieve a 15/17% shift in modal split away from cars. The list includes:

- Appointment of member of staff to act as coordinator for travel matters;
- Promotion and coordination of alternative means of travel such as car sharing, public transport, cycling and walking;
- Allocation of car park spaces to give priority to car sharers;
- All staff to receive full details of GTP within a reasonable time of commencing employment;
- Provision of cycle facilities;
- Provision of car sharing database and exploration of linkages to neighbouring employers;
- Provision and use of pool cars where possible;
- Liaison with local bus and rail companies about availability of season ticket discounts;
- Information on local traffic and public transport services;
- Information boards giving all relevant information on alternative means of transport;
- Review of green travel plan at relevant intervals; and
- Provision to the local authority of a database of car registration numbers updated at regular intervals.

The actual contents of travel plans are expected to relate clearly to the transport assessment and the contents of the Local Implementation Plan, Eastleigh Transport Strategy and corridor strategies, and they are assessed on this basis. Where capital or revenue contributions are required to improve transport infrastructure these are not included within the actual travel plan but alongside it in the section 106 agreement.

They are taken into account in the context of the bond that is sought to secure the effective implementation of the travel plan. They are seen as off-site improvements and are required irrespective of green travel plan targets as well as providing wider community benefits.

Apart from close working with officers at the county council, where appropriate, officers work with public transport providers in relation to particular schemes for improvements to public transport.

THE PROCESS

The council has determined to use section 106 agreements rather than conditions, for the following reasons:

- It is felt to be easier to enforce;
- The requirement for a bond, which is a key element of their process for ensuring an effective travel plan, could not be included in a planning condition;
- Members have more confidence in the section 106 delivering the required outcomes; and
- It is based on negotiation and agreement between the developers and the council.

Their section 106 agreements, which are in a standard format for either speculative or non-speculative development, make explicit reference to the obligations being passed on to subsequent lessees. They include a clear specification of what should be included in the travel plan; a period of 15 years over which the owner and lessees will be required to formulate a travel plan, payment to cover the costs of monitoring the impact of the travel plan, and payment of a bond (or cash) to be kept for five years calculated to cover the cost of remedial works should the travel plan not be effective. There is no requirement to join Hampshire County Council's Headstart Scheme.

The effectiveness of the travel plan is judged by monitoring the surrounding area to the application site to check whether or not a predetermined number of staff cars of the occupier are parked in the specified area with an annual period e.g. more than 12 cars for more than two hours on any five working days. If, as a result of monitoring during the first five years following occupation, parking in excess of that identified as the trigger is found then the bond will be activated to provide for the implementation of a residents parking scheme. If not called in over the five years then the owner will cease to have any liability.

The whole process is led by the development control case officer but in close association with the District Council's Transport Policy and Development Control Manager, and in the case of referrals to the county council, in association with the development control and highways team. Where the need arises, support will be given to applicants, to prepare travel plans, but in principle applicants are expected to produce them. A travel plan coordinator has recently been appointed at the county council (via Department for Transport funding) who can provide expert advice. The Transport Policy and Development Control Manager will assess their appropriateness against the information in the transport assessment, policy and professional judgement. In principle it is not considered that requiring the travel plan adds to the time required to deal with major applications that will require a section 106 agreement for a variety of reasons but it is important that scoping meetings are held as early as possible with the applicant and if possible at pre application stage. These meetings involve all key officers at the district council and county council.

There are no standard formulas for calculating financial contributions apart from:

- In respect of the monitoring of the impact of the travel plan – where this is based on the assessed cost of the service by the county council;
- The size of the bond – where this relates to the cost of an alternative parking control scheme; and
- Infrastructure improvements – where it is the actual cost of the scheme/s.

Monitoring of the section 106 compliance rests with the district council development control officers but as yet this has not been tested as the process is still at an early phase. There are no targets or monitoring of modal split assumptions at present but the council have initiated some baseline monitoring in relation to a speculative scheme to be able in future to assess effectiveness and changes.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Very effective partnership working with the county council resulting in cooperative working but no overlap of work in order to deliver common objective of road traffic reduction;
- Jointly owned policies between the district council and county council on parking, transport assessments and travel plans which are wholly integrated and publicly available;
- A clear legal mechanism for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default;
- Clear monitoring requirements;
- Clear and explicit policies in statutory documents that set out the situations when travel plans will be required;
- A clear link between travel plans and transport assessments together with transport infrastructure improvements sought;
- Ownership by members, senior officers and development control case officers of the policy and process to be followed;
- A working relationship with some transport operators; and
- A standard format for section 106 agreements including travel plans.

The key weaknesses are:

- No cross local authority working other than a recent initiative;
- Lack of linkage to Hampshire County Council's Headstart scheme;

- No publicly available information on the requirements in the travel plan or other advisory material for the private sector;
- The standard format for section 106 agreements is not publicly available; and
- The potential problem of resourcing the enforcement of compliance with section 106 agreements given the scale and length of time they are to be operative and subsequently the effectiveness of the travel plans.

PLANNING APPLICATION: CHESTNUT FARM, MARLIN INVESTMENTS, EASTLEIGH

Description:	Erection of three office blocks with car parking, speculative
Current status:	Planning approval granted and section 106 agreements signed, development under construction and travel plan yet to be produced.
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 agreement
Nature of travel plan:	Yet to be produced but section 106 agreement lists components to be included – see above
Financial obligations:	£16,000 contribution for monitoring; a bond of £137,500; £12,000 for two new bus shelters; £180,000 towards new cycle way; £50,000 towards improvement of pedestrian links.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	The timetable, targets and sanctions are as set out above.
Private sector view:	Overall the private sector has been receptive to the concept of travel plans. However, there are concerns about knowing what is likely to be required as soon as possible and the lack of clarity about the process. Initial concerns about impact on letability have proved to be unfounded.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered best practice:

- The section 106 agreement setting out explicitly:
 - The requirement for a bond to cover default costs;
 - The monitoring arrangements and requiring the financing of the to ensure independence of the information;
 - The specific elements of the travel plan;

- The requirement for subsequent owners and lessees/occupiers to be tied into the requirements for a period of 15 years;
- The production of complementary and integrated policies across the district council and county council;
- The partnership approach to discussions and negotiations on travel plans between the district council and the county council with applicants; and
- The integration in public documents of the transport assessment requirements, parking standards, accessibility levels and request for travel plans as related to all developments.

Lancashire County Council

Type of authority:	County Council
Geographic Category:	mix urban/rural
Region of UK:	North West
Number of Travel Plans:	35
Best Practice Factors:	10
Range of land uses where travel plan required:	All land uses where floorspace above PPG 13 figures, or if smaller, where seeking reduction in traffic most if not all of Lancs., plus all schools
Interviewees:	County Council Business Travel Co-ordinator, representatives from NHS Trust. Development control officers

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The county council is seeking travel plans primarily to reduce the number of single occupancy vehicles as part of their Local Transport Plan. Traffic congestion is a key problem in Lancashire so the council is aiming for better utilisation of vehicles without being anti-car. It sees the control of traffic generation from new development as an essential part of this process and therefore supports the promotion of travel plans. The county, which has produced its own travel plan is seeking travel plans for all major employers or traffic generators and sees them as critical for new large developments.

Within their Local Transport Plans, the district councils of Lancaster, Fylde and Chorley have stated their requirement for the preparation of travel plans into the planning process. Not all the district councils are pursuing this approach. There is a specific policy in the county's local transport plan about explicitly seeking travel plans with an application, but this is not yet contained in most local plans in the county.

The whole policy is at an early stage in its development with most officers committed. The policy has been officer driven from within the Environment Department of the county council but it has member support, as there are substantial transport problems in the area. Members do not get involved in the issue on a detailed basis. The focus so far has been on supporting and educating staff both within the county and district councils, and businesses, to ensure that they understand the need. Residents are not aware of or involved in the policy.

Travel plans are sought by the county council for all applications over the Government's thresholds as set out in PPG 13, for all land uses except residential, all school applications, and for smaller schemes if there are congestion problems locally e.g. including car park extensions. However the situation does vary across the districts e.g. Lancaster requires travel plans for developments that would increase the number of employees by 100+. Some districts do not ask for travel plans but if the application is referred to the county then,

one would be sought if it was felt to have a highway impact. There are no specific referral thresholds, and they are judged primarily on their impact on the highway network. It is too early to say whether the process is being successful as it has yet to result in implemented travel plans. The requirement is made to the district council as an integral part of the county's highway advice. However the county's approach is one of support, persuasion and advice rather than compulsion.

There have been some difficulties with the private sector and concerns about the onerous nature of the requirement, and the resource and time implications. The on-going support and advice given by the county is a key part of gaining acceptance. As the travel plan requirement is applicable to the whole county this has ensured that the need for them has not generated a differential between different parts of the county. For hospital developments there are particular problems around the lack of relationship between the short term funding process for hospital trusts and the more long-term requirements of the planning process.

The county does publish advice on travel plans and has established a County TravelWise service, which is available to provide support and advice to district councils and the private sector. They will provide free help with questionnaire development and analysis including mapping. A key requirement of the TravelWise service is that those preparing a travel plan must undertake an audit of commuter travel and site provisions. The focus is about getting management ownership of the preparation of a travel plan, identifying options for shared or non-car travel, producing an action plan, agreeing targets and the monitoring process. Options that they expect to be explored include:

- Car sharing 1 – 5 days
- Public transport improvements including information dissemination
- Cycling facilities
- Walking improvements
- Teleconferencing
- Teleworking
- Review of delivery arrangements
- Parking review.

However, each situation is considered separately and a personalised travel plan agreed through the travel plan coordinator with the applicant. The content will vary depending on whether the application is speculative or not. In addition, where improvements to public transport are required, the county will facilitate discussions with the bus operators with whom they have a good working relationship. The county council recognises efforts to promote sustainable transport by organisations through an awards system.

THE PROCESS

As the county council is not normally the planning authority, the district council leads the initiation of the process in most instances but following clear guidance from the

county council as highway authority as to when they would expect travel plans to be submitted. Some district councils are more proactive and interested than others. All applications potentially requiring a travel plan or where travel plans are submitted with the application are referred to the travel plan co-ordinator for advice about how to produce one and for comments on drafts. A key element of the assessment is whether it includes a measurable output.

The county promotes the use of either a planning condition or a section 106 agreement depending on the outcome from the transport assessment. If financial resources are required a section 106 agreement is always used or if there are off-site improvements required. There is a model section 106 agreement, but a model condition has been developed. The agreement will be issued by the district council as planning authority in most instances but with the county council as party to it. Officers are required to check the enforceability of either the planning condition or section 106 agreement prior to finalising it.

All negotiations on the travel plan are carried out at county level by the travel plan co-ordinator, directly with the applicant. This is undertaken in close co-operation with the county highways and development control team. Where possible pre-application discussions are preferred to clarify both the transport assessment and any requirement for a travel plan. The focus of elements in the travel plan is on the “softer” elements with items requiring e.g. capital resources, outside the travel plan but alongside the section 106 agreement.

In the case of known end user applications the travel plan is expected prior to approval but for speculative developments a framework travel plan is expected. The plan is judged in terms of acceptability in relation to the transport assessment, if it contains all key elements, has timed actions and whose responsible, it correlates with measurable outputs e.g. modal shift, number of trips. There is currently no mechanism for enforcing against a travel plan, which does not achieve its targets as the approach being taken is of support not policing. However a monitoring system has been established to check that travel plans are submitted when required and there are regular audits on travel plan progress undertaken by the travel plan co-ordinator. It is hoped that the process will be self-enforcing in as far as future planning applications by the applicant in the county could be adversely affected if they have failed to fulfil their obligations.

There is no standard method of calculating financial contributions; they are assessed on a case-by-case basis. The approach is that for any infrastructure improvements the cost should be met in whole but it is not the norm to obtain funding for improvements to public transport. There are no financial penalties imposed for non-compliance. The approach is based on “best endeavours”.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Staff induction to travel plans for the district council and county council;
- Close working relations between the county council and most district councils;
- Substantial support and advice given – a consultancy role, support for organisations inexperienced in travel plans and facilitation in relation to key meetings;

- Awards system recognises organisations activities on delivering “intelligent transport”;
- Working relationship of county council with the bus company good and used to facilitate dialogue in respect of travel plans and improvements to public transport; and
- Councils still promoting travel plans notwithstanding economic pressures.

The key weaknesses are:

- Not all the district councils have adopted the same approach to seeking travel plans;
- Information is not public on requirements for travel plans;
- Some district councils not “on-board”;
- Although there is no explicit published policy on when to seek travel plans, national guidance and impact on highways makes the need clear;
- Travel plans and any targets will be difficult to enforce;
- Outside TravelWise team no county support network for organisations;
- No model section 106 agreement available; and
- Potential time delay in determining planning applications where travel plans are involved, although they are requested where there is any doubt.

PLANNING APPLICATION: RE-DEVELOPMENT AND EXTENSION OF ROYAL PRESTON ACUTE HOSPITAL

Description:	Substantial redevelopment to upgrade facilities and accommodate relocation of another hospital to site.
Current status:	Subject to on-going discussion, permission not yet as travel plan not agreed
How travel plan secured:	Planning condition
Nature of travel plan:	Draft produced for combined Preston Acute Hospital and Chorley Hospital Trusts i.e. two hospitals. Aims to reduce single occupancy commuter trips and encourage access by alternative modes. Draft includes establishment of working group, audit of existing transport situation, staff and patient surveys, reviewing options to include car sharing database, cycle facilities, public transport discounts, public transport information, home working if possible, consideration of bus services, management of all car parking, monitoring targets and action plan
Financial obligations:	Under discussion but likely to include £10,000 for improvements for pedestrians plus a contribution to the quality bus initiative, highway improvements e.g.

improvements to signals to assist pedestrians

Targets/timescales/sanctions: Targets under discussion are for each mode of travel and a % improvement e.g. reducing SOV by 1.5% within 12 months, together with a reduction of car parking provision of 10% following implementation of travel plan

PLANNING APPLICATION: EXTENSION OF CAR PARKING AT CHORLEY HOSPITAL

Description: Seeking permanent approval for temporary additional car parking

Current status: Under negotiation

How travel plan secured: Under negotiation

Nature of travel plan: Draft plan produced but awaiting outcome from staff survey and is being produced to cover both Preston and Chorley sites as same Hospital Trust

Financial obligations: Not determined

Targets/timescales/sanctions: Targets and timescales will be required but not yet clear. No sanctions will be imposed other than potential refusal of planning permission required.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered best practice:

- Staff induction and training both within the county council and district councils
- Substantial support given to organisations developing travel plans
- Standardised survey questionnaires, analysis and mapping service provided by the county
- Good relationship with some districts and the bus operator.

Oxfordshire County Council

Type of authority:	County Council
Geographic Category:	Mix of rural/urban
Region of UK:	South East
Number of Travel Plans:	30+
Best Practice Factors:	7
Range of land uses where Travel Plan required:	Primarily B1 and schools/hospitals with major transport implications/where sustainable travel policies have not been met
Interviewees:	Director Environmental Services, (in lieu of member); Assistant Director, Land Use; Principal Planning Officer, Development Control; Group Manager, Transport Planning; TravelWise Officer; Travel-for-Work Officer; legal adviser; developer.

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The County Structure Plan contains a clear policy to encourage measures that reduce the dependence on private motorised transport and give greater priority to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport; it is currently under review and it is likely the wording will be strengthened. The *Oxfordshire Local Transport Plan 2001-2006* includes a separate section “Better Ways to Work” which addresses the high level of car commuting, with between 60 and 70% (1991 census) of residents travelling to work by car. The *Local Transport Plan* sets out objectives to promote the adoption of travel plans by employers to reduce the adverse impacts of travel, and to increase the proportion of trips to, from and at work made by walking, cycling or public transport. A Strategy and clear targets are set out, including linkages with:

- Establishment of a travel plan network
- Development control, including guidelines for planning agreements
- Integrated Transport Strategies
- The council’s own travel plan targets.

The district councils are the local planning authorities for the majority of proposals where a travel plan might be requested. The county is a statutory consultee (both as highway and structure plan authorities) to the districts, and as such it may raise objections where sustainable travel objectives have not been met, and often becomes directly involved in

negotiations. The district councils generally share the county objectives in relation to travel plans, subject to local issues – they are particularly sensitive to the risk of major employers locating elsewhere if they are pressed too hard. Some officers considered that travel plan co-ordination could be achieved more effectively if powers of direction were returned to the counties. Such powers were considered desirable to help ensure a more consistent and effective strategy for achieving travel plans with “teeth”. There was some frustration at the limited impact that travel plans can make to achieving a shift away from car use – investment in the rail service, equitable pricing as between car travel and public transport, and prevention of implementation of planning consents for retail units with large numbers of free car parking were cited as more effective means.

The framework for requiring travel plans, their content, and other section 106 headings is generally established through the Local Transport Plan and Integrated Transport Strategies. The latter have/are being prepared for major towns and most urban areas but as of yet do not incorporate modal split targets, though do address traffic capacity and access issues, public transport improvements, and sometimes car parking limits. However, there is some confusion over what elements of the overall package should be called a “travel plan”- a fairly narrow definition tends to apply i.e. covering only those aspects that the employer/applicant can control. In practice the section 106 agreements include all elements and the linkages are clear because the agreement includes modal split targets and sanctions (schedules of payments) if modal shift targets are not achieved. There is no requirement to “join” TravelWise as in Oxfordshire it is a county-wide local authority initiative which does not have the resources to get involved in the detail of every planning application and associated travel plan.

The county has recently produced a consultation draft Guidelines For Developers and Landowners; it is anticipated to outline the likely planning obligation requirements in respect of different types and scale of application, including references to the need for Transport Assessments and possible off-site measures for public transport, car park management and travel plans. This is expected to help co-ordination with the districts and achieve better understanding with developers, as well as clarify the approach for officers and legal advisers.

The policy context and TravelWise work has helped increase awareness of the need for travel plans by applicants and the council has developed a strong negotiating approach in relation to planning agreements. These primarily address the impact of development by large employers, particularly those where a high level of car use is evident or anticipated (eg retail park located near a motorway). The emphasis has been on securing public transport improvements to serve the site (with contributions from the applicant), with the travel plan an integral tool to ensuring that the available public transport is utilised by staff instead of car commuting. The initiative has largely been with officers, supported by committed management and legal advisers, with a few interested members.

Promotion of voluntary travel plans has been achieved through the TravelWise initiative set up within the county council six years ago, which has moved from awareness raising to an ambitious and increasingly effective programme of “travel to school” measures. Many schools have been submitting planning applications and for these the county is the local planning authority; securing and implementing travel plans in these cases has had a dramatic impact on modal split. The “Better Ways to Work” initiative is more recent and meeting with mixed reactions from employers- it includes a well-written “Guide to Green Commuter Plans for Oxfordshire’s Businesses” and dedicated officer resources, though currently priority is being given to the council’s own travel plans affecting 16,000

employees. This guide is the main source of published information available to prospective applicants but focuses on the travel plan itself rather than the process or requirements that may apply to a planning application. The TravelWise team work closely with development and transport planning to ensure a consistency of approach and to provide technical support for planning officers and applicants.

Generally developers have been very supportive of the principle of implementing a travel plan though some are less familiar with the concept of sustainable transport and need more persuasion and justification. In some cases legal advisers or consultants may have created barriers by basing advice on existing cases rather than developing new principles. Many developers are concerned that commitments related to the travel plan will compromise the commercial viability of the development because potential occupiers will be wary of any additional “burdens” – attitudes vary considerably between businesses and occupiers. In one of the featured applications the developer has passed on to lessees the low-cost travel plan obligations but the developer will pick up costs of monitoring and any payments if targets are not achieved.

THE PROCESS

The council has determined to use section 106 agreements rather than conditions in view of the importance of the travel plan measures in achieving effective transfer to available public transport, and to enable inclusion of clear targets and payments in the event that targets are not met. Several section 106 agreements have introduced relatively “tough” requirements with clear targets and sanctions – the council has been persistent in its objectives re sustainable transport and adopted a pragmatic and bold approach which makes the most of the circumstances. With these agreements in place in respect of a number of sites, it is expected to be easier to insist on similar agreements in relation to other sites and there will be section 106 principles to build upon.

It is the view of officers and their legal advisors that despite the build up of experience it is not helpful to develop a standard or model section 106 agreement. They see each agreement as relating to the specific circumstances of the site, the proposals, the location, the linkages with public transport improvements- and therefore there cannot be a single approach. Some section 106 agreements are very sophisticated and incorporate the travel plan within them. When seeking travel plans in relation to a smaller scheme that contributes to the cumulative impact of car use, the section 106 approach has been less helpful because of the Circular 1/97 test of “fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the proposed development”. If a scheme could not bear the whole cost of (say) public transport improvements to complement a travel plan, the level of contributions are more difficult to justify as they relate to potential contributions from future developments.

The section 106 agreements do generally make explicit reference to obligations being passed on to subsequent lessees/occupiers (by requiring the freeholder to make compliance with the planning obligations/travel plan a term of all leases and to draw it to tenants attention) and clarify responsibilities. Bonds are used regarding major public transport contributions but not in respect of possible payments for further travel plan measures to remedy failure to meet targets. They feel there is a tension between the objective that travel plans should be flexible and enforceable- their approach is to make the targets realistic and achievable, eg. the stepped targets outlined below, so that success or failure is not “all or nothing”.

Contributions to improved rail or bus services and contributions to physical improvements such as bus lanes, station improvements etc are included in the section 106, generally based on costs and a pro-rata calculation. Contributions to recurrent expenditure (eg. Public transport funding) have also been successfully secured. In some cases contributions have been secured towards the entire cost of a public transport improvement that will benefit other as yet undeveloped sites nearby- in these cases the council has covenanted to return the contributions by the amount of any other developer contributions during an agreed period (12 years in one case). Officers recognise that the scope for this kind of approach may be affected by the overall economic climate.

Developers were aware early on in the discussions of the council's requirements, and received information via the TravelWise guide mentioned above. In the case of speculative developments, efforts are made to determine interim targets and review these later rather than depend entirely on an occupiers first staff survey to set what may be an inflated baseline. In one case the Planning Agreement was between the county (highway authority) and the applicant, and did not include the district. In another (Bicester Village) some of the objectives required the co-operation of third parties eg Railtrack and it was a relatively long-term package. Railtrack has been involved directly in negotiations the past, but currently little progress can be made on rail service improvements.

Targets have been developed in at least three different ways, which relate to the circumstances of the planning application. The point at which targets are specified varies, depending on the extent of speculative development or multi-occupation/phasing. The requirement to appoint a travel plan co-ordinator can help address these situations.

- *Howbery Park*: Termed "Modal Transfer Objectives" in one section 106, this was 20% after five years. This was calculated by looking at 1991 census for that area and comparing to car use by existing employees on part of the site- the latter was 20% higher and (after also looking at where employees lived and access to public transport) the objective was to bring car use to that level. As car use was very high in first place (circa 90%) the 20% target was felt to be realistic.
- *Bicester Village*: Targets over five years aimed at maintaining absolute traffic levels at the base level, with payments linked to the percentage increases. Also targets of increasing rail patronage, doubling over a five-year period.
- *Radcliffe Infirmary*: Target comprised an absolute limit on car parking (combined with contributions to a car parking scheme for the surrounding area); it was left to the hospital to determine modal split targets which would result in reduced pressure for staff car parking.

The travel plan is included with the aim to achieve agreed targets. The principle of "failsafe" contributions is generally applied, which are payments related to achieving stepped modal shift targets at two monitoring points- one at three years from signing the section 106 and then at four to five years. Payments are based on a very sophisticated and complex framework requiring monitoring in order to establish a base ratio of vehicle to overall person trips and then to establish percentage reductions over the base ratio. At both points failure to meet targets trigger payments (called travel mode payments in one section 106) that are graduated in relation to the extent the targets have not been met. This two-stage approach is designed to encourage early progress and commitment. Monitoring is carried out annually/biannually by the developer/county at the developer's cost and results shared. The monitoring uses both manual surveys and automatic traffic counts (ATC) to cross check data.

The negotiation process is lead by the principal planning officer with support and input from other officers in transport and TravelWise. Although this is working well it does rely on working relationships between individuals and procedures are informal. The absence of an SPG nor standard section 106 covenants mean the process requires substantial officer time. Both issues will be addressed by the recent establishment of a new team to better secure/co-ordinate/monitor planning obligations, including travel plans, the forthcoming internal practice note to improve integration in relation to planning applications, and by the *Guidelines For Developers and Landowners* (re planning obligations) for district councils. These may also help identify resource needs as the complexity and technical support required is growing- in this context they were disappointed not to get Department for Transport funding for additional travel plan officers within the TravelWise team. Another resource issue is that having successfully secured contributions to capital works (eg bus lanes, bus corridors), they are having difficulty in finding staff/consultants to implement these schemes.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Clear legal mechanisms for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default (robust legal advice);
- Strong policy and officer-level commitment to improvement of public transport, in conjunction with travel plans;
- Mechanism for seeking contributions to public transport improvements from all developments within a defined area;
- Sophisticated system of financial sanctions related to targets;
- A clear link between travel plans and integrated transport strategies, particularly in terms of setting car parking targets/management and identifying public transport improvements;
- Guidance Note on planning obligations includes reference to travel plans;
- TravelWise documents and resources which contribute to the planning process by supporting both applicants and planning officers; and
- Use of automatic and manual traffic counts to cross check monitoring information.

The key weaknesses are:

- County/district co-ordination good and improving but not yet formalised;
- Absence of public and published information on what will be required regarding travel plans through the planning system- but these are being addressed;
- Highly resource- intensive as each negotiation entails varied or new principles to address circumstances of planning application;

- Internal procedures and integration of TravelWise and planning still evolving; and
- Inconsistent definition of travel plan.

PLANNING APPLICATION: HOWBERY PARK (HR WALLINGFORD)

Description:	Speculative and phased expansion and development of ex-government research station, with three new B1 buildings
Current status:	Planning approval granted and section 106 signed in 1999; recently renegotiated section 106 as revised floor space and employment; draft section 106 circulated Jan. 2002
How travel plan secured:	Section 106 Agreement
Nature of travel plan:	Travel plan is Schedule 1 of section 106 and includes pedestrian and cycle facilities, Shuttle Bus Service; Car Park Management; appointment of travel plan co-ordinator
Financial obligations:	“Public Transport contribution” (enhanced bus service) of £195,000 over 5 years (less up to £45,000 if other contributions obtained by the council); Transportation contribution £101,300 to ped/cycle/highway provision. c£5,000 monitoring costs
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Key ratio is number of drivers to number of person trips. Payment of £22,000 if first monitoring ratio (at three years from implementation of development) does not show a reduction of 10% or more over base ratio. Schedule of payments from £10,000 if reduction is 19% or more but less than 20%, up to £33,000 if reduction is 11% or less at second monitoring point (five years from implementation)
Private sector views:	Comfortable with the principle and supportive of the travel plan objectives. Initial section 106 negotiations took a year and would help if could be streamlined. Targets and scale of public transportation contributions were most difficult areas of negotiation.

PLANNING APPLICATION: BICESTER VILLAGE

Description:	Extension (29 units to 43) of existing retail outlet park
Current status:	Planning approval granted and section 106 agreements signed
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 agreement

Nature of travel plan:	No travel plan as termed; section 106 included: rail infrastructure/ footway/cycleway improvements; railway station upgrade; public transport awareness scheme; regular shuttle bus to town and stations.
Financial obligations:	£100,000 footway and cycleway works; £25,000 Bicester station upgrade; £20,000 public transport awareness scheme; £20,000 Shuttle Bus; £30,000 public transport promotion. Also bonded contribution of £1m (phased) towards improved rail infrastructure and improved rail service (up to £0.8m refundable if other contributions obtained).
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	“Travel Mode Payments” (a) road vehicles: £2000 per 1% over base year vehicle flow at first monitoring point after four years (Max payment £20,000); of £10,000 per 1% above base year vehicle flow five years from date of section 106 (Max payment £100,000). (b) rail: up to £100,000 if rail passenger journeys are less than 50% greater than the base year flow £0 if 100% increase) in fifth year after rail service improved. Gradual reduction of car parking used to encourage action.

PLANNING APPLICATION: RADCLIFFE INFIRMARY

Description:	Relocation of hospital from central Oxford to Headington
Current status:	Section 106 almost completed
How travel plan secured:	Annexed to section 106, though car park maximum number and management are also explicitly included in the section 106
Nature of travel plan:	Travel plan is for entire hospital complex with its own co-ordinator (see Transport 2000 case study)
Financial obligations:	£1,878,000 anticipated for bus service contribution; bus priority measures; cycle/pedestrian measures; park and ride contribution; and on street parking control contribution.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Still under negotiation
Private sector views:	See Transport 2000 case study summaries

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered best practice:

- Clear legal mechanisms for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default (robust legal advice);

- The section 106 agreement setting out explicitly:
 - The requirement for subsequent owners and lessees/occupiers to be tied into the requirements;
 - Stepped and sophisticated “failsafe” payments related to clear modal split targets to cover further measures to achieve targets;
 - Monitoring arrangements and responsibilities;
 - The specific elements of the travel plan;
- Mechanism for seeking contributions to public transport improvements from all developments within a defined area;
- A clear link between travel plans and integrated transport strategies, particularly in terms of setting car parking targets/management and identifying public transport improvements;
- Travelwise documents and resources which contribute to the planning process by supporting both applicants and planning officers; and
- Use of automatic and manual traffic counts to cross check monitoring information.

Sheffield City Council

Type of authority:	Metropolitan authority
Geographic Category:	Metropolitan
Region of UK:	Yorkshire and Humber
Number of Travel Plans:	20-25
Best Practice Factors:	8
Range of Land Uses where Travel Plan required:	All land uses over a threshold of 2,500sqm for employment uses and for other non-residential uses, over 1,000sqm. For residential they are considered in association with a transport assessment if over 80 units.
Interviewees:	Travel plan project officer, highways development principal engineer (team leader), assistant principal engineer

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Travel plans in Sheffield are sought to meet the objectives of the South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan, in particular the need to improve choice of travel mode, to improve transport to areas of poor accessibility thereby assisting regeneration, and to improve the environment. The aim is to reduce the number of single occupancy car commuting trips to town centres and major work sites. In the lower Don Valley the concern is particularly to enable development to proceed given the severe problems of traffic congestion. There is a local transport plan target to contain traffic to 1999 levels and ensure new business generates no greater than 60% car usage. The overall policy framework in Sheffield is similar to that for South Yorkshire.

No specific travel plan policies are included in the unitary development plan published in 1998 but the Council adopted Supplementary Planning Guidance "Guidelines for the Preparation of Transport Assessments and Travel Plans" in June 2001. These set out explicitly the transport and planning policy background, the scope of both the transport assessment and travel plan, the priorities and trigger criteria for a transport assessment and useful contacts and references. Travel plans are required alongside transport assessments for applications for developments for employment uses of over 2,500sq.m and for all other schemes over a floorspace of 1,000sq.m. In the former case a request could also be made for a number of smaller employers where the overall impact would be significant in terms of traffic and there is a need to provide choice. For residential schemes a travel plan as such is not required but the developer is expected to promote travel choice if it is larger than 80 units, as part of a transport assessment. The use of travel plans in new development has been raised as a major issue in the current review of the Unitary Development Plan.

The SPG includes an explicit list of potential requirements for inclusion in a travel plan for different land uses but with the clear statement that not all measures will be suitable to all sites and that the list is not exhaustive. The aim is to achieve the local plan traffic reduction and modal split targets. The items include:

- Promotion of improved public transport services including information;
- Provision of a range of facilities for cyclists and motorcyclists;
- Possible provision of free transport to public transport connections;
- Interest free loans and/or subsidy of season tickets;
- Organisation of database for car sharing and linked to free taxi/lift for cover of problems;
- Car pooling;
- Interest free loans for cycle purchase or season tickets;
- Flexible working or home working;
- IT information for public transport, use in relation to home working;
- Establishment of user groups;
- The setting of annual targets for % of trips by each mode;
- Appointment of a travel co-ordinator;
- Annual staff surveys;
- Review of the travel plan in the light of survey outputs;
- For leisure/retail uses – home shopping, discounted public transport tickets, prioritisation of car parking space or charging; and
- For residential uses – safe and secure cycle parking, free or subsidised cycles for purchasers, IT links for home working, intranet site for travel information, public transport/cycle/walking information in buyers pack, free first year public transport season ticket, car pooling or sharing scheme (if over 200 units).

The council policy has been officer led from the transportation and highways side. Members have approved the SPG although they are still cautious about travel plans given the need for regeneration, and views vary across the different political groups. The key concern is to be seen as pro choice rather than “anti-car”. Planning officers have left the issue primarily to transport planning although are becoming more involved following PPG 13.

Private sector applicants are still somewhat sceptical about the policy although confidence is growing. The council’s approach is focused on getting agreement and ensuring that the applicant is not discouraged from developing. The public have not been involved in the policy seeking travel plans.

Officers in Transportation and Road Safety where the highways and development team and the travel plan project officer are also located work closely with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (PTE) and a partnership agreement has been formed. They operate a Travel Options Planning Service (TOPS), which supports the existing public transport service and provides advice to businesses. This relationship is very important, as they have established quantitative systems, which Sheffield can use to plug in new developments to assess the transport impact and which currently provides a baseline for modal split in terms of travel patterns.

THE PROCESS

The council has determined to use planning conditions primarily and has only one case where a section 106 has been used. Planning officers prefer the use of the condition, as it is simpler and quicker and are reluctant to enter into a section 106 unless it is essential for other matters. They are not used often in any circumstances. There is no standard format but this is evolving; each planning condition is currently separately drafted for each relevant application. Work is underway on the preparation of guidance looking specifically at speculative developments to establish the minimum requirements and the need for key commitments. This includes a draft model condition which has not yet been finalised but seeks to ensure both developers and subsequent occupiers are required to submit a travel plan which has to include – statements of commitment, objectives, targets, action plan, monitoring and review arrangements. There is no requirement for applicants to join any TravelWise or equivalent scheme but they are encouraged to join TOPS.

The effectiveness of the submissions is assessed by the transport team, in relation to the overall transport targets and its coverage, as judged against the SPG. It is too early in the process to say how effective the actual travel plans will be. Travel plans tend to focus on the elements excluding investment in infrastructure, which, if required as a result of the transport assessment, will be covered alongside the travel plan although monitored with it.

The development control team and the case officer lead the whole process, but the council operates a development team approach for large developments and this is the focus for travel plans. The development team includes the travel plan project officer and highways development officers and the former leads on discussions and provides advice on the travel plan. Requirements are closely linked to the outcome of the transport assessment as well as the SPG elements. Potential applicants are encouraged to have pre-application meetings to agree the scope of the transport assessment and travel plan. Although the local transport plan has targets for modal split and Sheffield has developed a generic survey with the PTE to establish a baseline for travel patterns and modal share, this is just starting to be used in relation to travel plans. There is no specific methodology used at present.

Where the council seek financial contributions, these are for infrastructure improvements, public transport services or real time information. The scale of these contributions is assessed by the development team in conjunction with the PTE who are part of the development team approach. The scale is individually assessed in relation to the application and kept outside the travel plan. Monitoring is carried out by the developer or occupier based on an agreed methodology that is required as part of the travel plan. This has not taken place, as the travel plans have not yet been finalised.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- The inter-relationship of the transport policies at county and city level with the planning process, travel plans and the transport assessment;
- The close working relationship with the PTE and the support given to applicants through TOPS, including joint working protocol in relation to travel plans;
- The setting up of a baseline survey to establish existing travel patterns and modal share as a basis for future assessments of travel plans and evaluation;
- The adoption and publication of supplementary planning guidance on transport assessments and travel plan requirements clearly stating when and what is required;
- The integration of the travel plan process into the development team approach involving all key parties;
- The promotion of pre-application discussions to scope the transport assessment and travel plan requirements;
- The simplicity of the use of planning conditions to minimise the time taken and cost of obtaining planning permission;
- The development of specific planning guidance for different types of applications e.g. speculative;
- The establishment of a travel plan database to assist monitoring of compliance with the planning condition; and
- The promotion of travel plans in an area of economic problems as a component aiding regeneration.

The key weaknesses are:

- The use of a planning condition which limits the scope for ensuring an effective travel plan once it has been approved at the outset;
- Officers and developers are reluctant to use section 106 agreements;
- The lack of methodology for calculating modal split; and
- No monitoring has yet been done.

PLANNING APPLICATION: DIXON'S GROUP RETAIL PROPERTY LTD CONTACT CENTRE

Description:	Application for additional 53 car parking spaces
Current status:	Application approved but not yet implemented
How travel plan secured:	Planning condition
Nature of travel plan:	After much negotiation, a travel plan has been agreed. Key elements include improving information and awareness, improving public transport accessibility, improving walking and cycling access and more efficient car use, together with a target to reduce parking to a level consistent with council guidelines, and establishing a monitoring process to assess the reduction in demand for parking.
Financial obligations:	Not applicable
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Specific modal shift targets and timescales have been agreed within the travel plan. The proposed sanctions to be applied relates to the removal of temporary car parking spaces linked to the action plan and its review.
Private sector views:	No problems with the principle, by the developer or occupier to the condition, and a satisfactory travel plan has been approved to discharge the condition.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered as best practice:

- The production and publication of supplementary planning guidance on travel plans
- The integrated working with the PTE and TOPS, and the agreed protocol
- The close relationship between transport policy targets and travel plan requirements
- The establishment of baseline information on travel patterns and modal share
- The setting up of a monitoring database for checking compliance with conditions.

Stoke-on-Trent City Council

Type of authority:	Unitary Authority
Geographic Category:	Mainly urban
Region of UK:	West Midlands
Number of Travel Plans:	46
Best Practice Factors:	5
Range of land uses where Travel Plan required:	All land uses meeting PPG13 thresholds
Interviewees:	Senior Transportation Officer, Travel Plan Officer, Planning Officer, Highways Development, Passenger Transport Manager, Developer, Public Transport Operator, Occupier

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

Stoke-on-Trent is at an early stage in travel plan policy development as the travel plan policies in the current draft local plan have not yet been adopted. Objectives are largely driven by PPG13 and include reduction in single occupancy car trips, promotion of sustainable transport and links to health, walking and cycling. Members recognise the importance of travel plans and the growing recognition that there is a need to address the reliance on the car but are very concerned to ensure enough parking is provided for development because of the job opportunities. A council-wide green travel plan was adopted in May 2001 although some elements had been in place for several years. The council has been an active member of the TravelWise scheme since 1996.

Officers have been developing the policy approach within a difficult economic climate, with the need for regeneration to counter the loss of manufacturing jobs. Reliance on PPG13 helps support objectives and requests for travel plans; they feel they are on stronger ground in requesting travel plans in relation to large developments, though they try to negotiate travel plans on smaller developments.

The regeneration focus is illustrated by the way public transport is managed. Public transport provision is seen as an important contribution to regeneration of the area, and the council seeks to improve public transport to attract development commitment. This is undertaken by the council's Passenger Transport Manager who "buys in" transport, including small subsidies to particular routes. He is asked to comment on travel plan proposals in respect of public transport and sustainability, how improved bus provision can be secured (particularly in the area of planning applications where commercial public transport operators may not want to get involved). There is a limited budget to provide a subsidy to the bus operator. In the case of Doultons Head Office and outlet development, the Passenger Transport Group saw an opportunity and stepped in but this was not linked to a travel plan. In addition, no bus subsidy was used in this case. The bus operator, together with the council is involved in the "Employment Monitoring Task Force" and

gets briefed on key developments, which allows them to consider altering routes to take in commercial developments. Route changes in this instance became an integral part of the travel plan.

Discussions regarding co-ordination of travel plans (e.g. with Chamber of Commerce) indicate that they feel travel plans should be voluntary, but the council supports membership of the TravelWise scheme. A TravelWise award scheme was launched in March 2002.

Officers consider that travel plans have to be site-specific and the content is triggered by staff surveys. The choice of measures will sometimes be determined by the outcome of the transport assessment and relates also to the scale of the development. However, not all transport assessments are seen by the travel plan coordinators. Overall officers consider the process works now as knowledge and experience has built up and although close working relationships have developed, there are still some inconsistencies within the process. They see their role as “explaining” the issue to developers and financial sanctions are not considered appropriate, but the travel plan coordinators do get involved where applications are subject to conditions.

THE PROCESS

The council has generally secured travel plans with conditions, which are binding on subsequent occupiers. This is based on legal advice but also a result of resource constraints. Officers feel these are effective if they include a monitoring and review element. There are no standard conditions, although as experience has built up conditions have been improved. They would use a section 106 agreement in cases where there were financial provisions or specific modal split targets.

Officers seek to include modal split targets in the travel plans and assistance is offered in analysing data. Other circumstances (e.g. parking) particular to the site and development are also taken into account and linked to the transport assessment. The targets are seen as something to work towards, as stated practice at the moment is only to insert a planning condition requesting a travel plan. The preferred contents of travel plans are set out in documentation available.

In the case of Doultons, a travel plan co-ordinator was appointed by Doultons to sort out requirements of staff and develop the travel plan. A timetable was specified including a staff travel survey within 6 months of occupation; and every 6 months thereafter. Surveys will be used to set targets for trip reductions. A 10% reduction in sole occupancy driving was set by the travel plan co-ordinator at Doultons, and this is the normal figure used by the council.

Once the details of the travel plan condition have been agreed, monitoring will be carried out by the on-site travel plan co-ordinator. In the case study example the developer had nothing to do with agreeing the details of the travel plan condition. For future examples it would be for the applicant/occupier to decide if they wanted advice on discharging the condition. None of the agreed travel plans have reached the stage of monitoring against targets yet. If the travel plan were not achieving targets, officers would have to consider whether they were unrealistically high or look at different measures to achieve the targets, or set put an action plan if the targets were felt to be unrealistic.

The developer involved in the case study considered that there needs to be a balance between job opportunities/car parking and travel plan. He felt the request for a travel plan was justified and accepted that the planning process should be used to promote alternative ways of getting to work. Concerns were expressed about the difficulty of setting and measuring targets, and how financial sanctions might be used.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Pursuing travel plans even though regeneration issues are important;
- Travel plan promotion is complemented by strong public transport initiatives;
- Use of conditions *may* be a reasonable mechanism in light of the economic climate and role of targets;
- Use of data to help calculate modal split targets;
- Proactive council travel plan co-ordinator;
- Council has encouraged integration of commercial public transport operators into planning system to facilitate identification of opportunities (Employment Monitoring Task Group); and
- Active TravelWise partnership and award scheme.

The key weaknesses are

- Procedures and travel plan “framework” not documented;
- Lack of standard conditions;
- Only use section 106 agreements if travel plan includes financial provisions or if a phased development; and
- Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process.

PLANNING APPLICATION: ROYAL DOULTON HEADQUARTERS, FORGE LANE

Description:	Company headquarters and factory outlet
Current status:	Development completed; details of travel plan being finalised
How travel plan secured:	Conditions

Nature of travel plan:	Travel plan to address pressure for parking- Doultons was part of a large site which would generate bus users and this sparked involvement of private bus operator; operator took a commercial decision to get business with Doultons, including offer of discounted annual travel cards.
Financial obligations:	None.
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	None.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered best practice:

- Travel plan promotion is complemented by strong public transport initiatives e.g. Council subsidies;
- Proactive travel plan co-ordinator involved at Doulton site; and
- Council has encouraged integration of commercial public transport operators into planning system to facilitate identification of opportunities (Employment Monitoring Task Group).

Surrey County Council

Type of authority:	County
Geographic Category:	Mix of rural/urban
Region of UK:	South East
Number of Development Related Travel Plans:	65
Best Practice Factors:	7
Range of land uses where Travel Plan required:	Mostly speculative business uses; all other uses except retail and residential
Range of uses where Travel Plan offered	Retail and residential, by applicant
Interviewees:	Travel plan officer, transportation impact group leader, planning solicitor, applicant

POLICY AND STRATEGIC CONTEXT

The county, as highway authority, has a well-developed transport planning framework and specific policies requiring travel plans are included in the Deposit Draft Structure Plan as well as the Surrey Local Transport Plan. Transport planning officers have developed the approach over the last few years, seeing travel plans as a tool to achieve less reliance on the car (one of the targets in the LTP), particularly single-occupancy trips, with the secondary benefits of less pollution and fewer car accidents. Emphasis has been on requiring travel plans on large schemes poorly served by public transport (often the relocation of large organisations), concentrating on encouraging car sharing which officers feel offers the most potential. In cases where public transport is limited with little hope of improvement, also seek mechanisms to encourage employees to relocate close to the site. A TravelWise scheme is being developed in relation to voluntary travel plans, though resources are directed more at support for the establishment of area-based travel plan partnerships in conjunction with (for example) the Chamber of Commerce. The council employs a travel plan officer who is more directly involved with planning applications, with contributions to funding the post from section 106 agreements.

Significant importance is attached to ensuring the development is in the right place and that parking levels are controlled in accordance with planning policies/standards, and the travel plan is seen as playing an important mitigating role where this cannot or has not been fully achieved. The Highways Agency is seen as not implementing an approach to land use policy that promotes sustainable transport. There was some concern that the travel plan requirements and restrictions on off-street parking in particular may prejudice applicants commercially. Some county members and officers are not fully supportive although district members are more committed. This may be because there are only two implemented travel plans that have been secured through the planning system that have so far been monitored and these are skeletal with no modal split targets. It is not yet known whether travel plans as negotiated will be effective, although the county's approach

is to be positive and encouraging in the hope that this will ensure greater commitment to achieving real change. To support this approach the county has prepared its own travel plan and is conscious of the need to get more businesses (not submitting planning applications) to implement voluntary travel plans.

Travel plans are required for all uses where thresholds in PPG13 are exceeded and in extensions to existing uses in locations where travel plans offer potential to reduce car use. Officers seek to tailor the travel plan to the site and development and local circumstances and negotiate a mutually acceptable range of measures based in the Transport Assessment. Travel plans are seen as the means to introduce a process to reduce reliance on the car and do not include public transport improvements nor site-based physical works. In most cases the key objective is to get the developer to subscribe to the principles and objectives of a travel plan rather than worry about a precise modal split shift. The choice of measures in the travel plan is guided by the Transport Assessment which will take into account other factors e.g. if a development is well-located (e.g. in a town centre) then the travel plan would be less “onerous”. Officers confirm that they would not refuse an application solely on the basis of an unacceptable travel plan.

The detailed approach is spelt out in a Supplementary Planning Guidance Note *A Guide to Development Related Travel Plans* (July 2001). This document is very thorough, covering when a travel plan will be required, measures to be included in a travel plan, establishing targets, standard conditions and section 106 clauses, and objectives in relation to certain types/locations of development. The choice of measures will depend on a combination of factors: location of site; size of development; previous use; the proposed land use; known occupier or not; existence of public transport facilities; awareness and knowledge of all parties involved. From this the objective is to select a package of measures that will alter modal split away from single occupancy cars.

All matters related to the travel plan are incorporated in a S106 agreement (though it is accepted that for smaller schemes a condition may be suitable), but separate from public transport contributions. The council do not believe that sanctions or payments, if targets are not achieved, are the right approach to achieving effective implementation (partly based on legal advice after having included financial sanctions in one case). Where targets have been agreed but not met, the council would prefer to review the travel plan and/or revise the targets than enforce. Speculative development does not require a different approach, except that modal split targets would be agreed later in the process and agreed with the occupier (or if developer submitted targets these would be reviewed with the occupier), the approach being to guide and encourage. The SPG includes standard covenants and definitions for speculative developments that address the need for obligations to be passed on to subsequent occupiers.

THE PROCESS

This broad approach generally means that the council does not wish to be prescriptive and applicants submit the travel plan and suggest modal split targets that are considered appropriate for the particular site. Surrey has developed an evaluation tool *Assessment Method for Individual Travel Plans* for guiding developers as they prepare travel plans and for assisting the local authority to assess any submitted travel plans. This evaluation tool sets out minimum requirements for green travel plans under three categories: for small scale developments below 1,500 sq m.; for larger scale developments, and measures which will add significantly to the effectiveness and comprehensiveness of any travel plan (such as

company bus, car parking controls). Although in practice this is not used as methodically now (the person who developed it has left the council and the guidance is still in its draft form, as it has not yet had formal council approval), it is considered a useful tool.

The transport assessment is used as the basis for calculating/assessing a submitted modal split and/or car parking targets and any contributions, with input from the Surrey travel plan officer (who has data from various travel plan co-ordinators in the county). So far there are not enough implemented travel plans and associated travel surveys to provide reliable base information upon which to feel confident about modal split targets. However, if the scheme is in accordance with highway policies and capacity measures then modal split targets are requested and agreed in relation to non-speculative development, though accepting they may be revised at a later date.

The SPG lists a number of reasons for using section 106 agreements to secure the travel plan:

- Promotes the application of high standards;
- Ensures increased internal consistency;
- Will accelerate the development of best practice;
- “Focuses the mind” of all those involved;
- Gives the organisation a strong argument in detailed negotiations with staff concerning difficult issues such as car parking charges;
- Helps to ensure that travel plans do not work to the disadvantage of one area compared to another or are more restrictive on one applicant than the other; and
- The use of a section 106 agreement will also heighten the importance of clearly set targets and it will formalise the role of the local authority in working in partnership with the organisation concerned.

The appropriate Surrey County Council development control engineer leads the section 106 agreement negotiations (one for each of 11 districts). The travel plan officers become involved as necessary and solicitors take an active role in advising on the way to secure travel plan requirements. This approach is “working” but constantly evolving. There are model section 106 agreement clauses and definitions and model conditions which require the implementation of travel plans prior to either commencement of development or prior to occupation; other aspects are drafted individually in relation to specific travel plans. In practice conditions tend to be used to cover elements such as shower facilities, secure bicycle parking etc. while the “process” aspects of the travel plan are in a section 106 agreement.

Monitoring in relation to modal split targets is the responsibility of the travel plan officer who also would supervise the achievement of other terms of the planning agreement (the SPG clarifies responsibilities). There are no standard clauses regarding sanctions or what would happen if targets are not achieved, and further financial payments are seen to be too onerous. They consider enforcement is in reality very difficult – for example in relation to schools. Planning agreements have included arrangements for bus provision or “walking bus” (certain pick-up points en route to school) and then set targets for modal split. Where targets are not achieved are unable to say pupils can not go to school and can’t see how school can stop parents from driving pupils to school – so are looking at resolution through negotiating amended travel plans.

STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES

The key strengths are:

- Closely integrated with transport assessment process;
- Well developed and widely used Supplementary Planning Guidance Note;
- Partnership (with developer) approach to achieving effective implementation of agreed travel plans;
- Evaluation tool for assessing submitted travel plans (and to guide applicants);
- Standard conditions and section 106 clauses re requirement for implementation of a travel plan;
- Model skeletal section 106 agreement for travel plans;
- Incorporate modal split and car parking targets;
- Clear responsibilities for stages of travel plan negotiation, including monitoring; and
- TravelWise information package.

The key weaknesses are:

- Narrowly defined travel plan – separate from public transport as have accepted that in areas where high car use its unrealistic to expect much improvement in public transport and concentrate on car sharing and staff moving closer to workplace;
- Uneven commitment across whole of the authority- have not seen any real impact on car usage yet;
- Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process;
- Effectiveness depends on staff resources to support and encourage implementation of planning agreement; and
- Flexibility on modal split and other targets weakens incentive and may discourage some occupiers who see neighbours with different targets.

PLANNING APPLICATION: AXA EQUITY AND LAW INVESTMENT MANAGERS LTD.

Description:	Redevelopment of an industrial site for three office buildings of approx 15,000 sq. m. near town centre but poor public transport and near the A3 Trunk Road and 10 minutes from the M25
Current status:	Approved and section 106 signed but development not implemented. The travel plan was implemented in October 2001.
How travel plan secured:	Through a section 106 planning agreement; applicant concerned that this would prejudice their commercial competitiveness.
Nature of travel plan:	Focus was on physical measures; applicant prepared travel plan. Linked to parking restraints. Shuttle bus in operation and proving successful- independent bus operator of shuttle service and this was outside the travel plan.
Financial obligations:	None
Targets/timescales/sanctions:	Already at 65% single occupancy vehicles (SOV); target of 5-10% reduction of SOV over next three years. Occupier to provide modal share information then meet county to agree reasonable targets for year and review in a year's time. No sanctions- failure to meet targets would lead to request for a revised travel plan with reduced travel plan targets.

POTENTIAL AREAS OF BEST PRACTICE

The following aspects could be considered as best practice:

- Supplementary Planning Guidance and clear procedures and responsibilities, along with model skeletal section 106 agreement for travel plans;
- Partnership (with developer) approach to achieving effective implementation of agreed travel plans;
- Evaluation tool for assessing submitted travel plans; and
- Pro-active approach to encouraging voluntary travel plans not linked to planning applications.

APPENDIX 15

Strengths, weaknesses and best practice – by case study authority

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Basingstoke and Deane Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Published best practice note on community infrastructure requirements and procedures including a model section 106 agreement Establishment of a scoping meeting with all key parties at the beginning of the process and documented audit trail The payment of a 'bond' equivalent to the cost of the council undertaking works in the event of the applicant defaulting on the provisions of the section 106 agreement Dedicated officers for ensuring compliance with planning conditions and approvals including section 106 agreements and the mechanisms for ensuring compliance is partly built into the section 106 agreement. A model planning condition Joint working with Hampshire County Council including joint transport policies Draft guidance on the Hampshire County Council parking strategy in relation to transport assessments, accessibility levels and the need for travel plans A pro-active approach linked to the environmental transport strategy to seeking travel plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The publication best practice note and model section 106 agreement do not explicitly cover travel plans but only contributions to BEST and cycle or walking contributions The model section 106 agreement focuses on financial payments in terms of transport including the framework for the bond but does not identify other aspects of a travel plan The guidance on the possible contents of a travel plan is not made public Although there is a mechanism within the s.106 to ensure compliance on future occupiers, the council lacks enforcement resources and mechanisms The methodology for calculating financial contributions is not public No system has been established for monitoring the effectiveness of the travel plans approved The transport strategy does not explicitly set down a policy on either travel plans or the criteria for seeking them 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Best Practice Guidance Note on community infrastructure, section 106 Agreements and the planning application process The two-stage process for seeking travel plans in relation to speculative developments The requirement within the travel plan to have targets, milestones, monitoring and review process The scoping process meeting The requirement for a 'bond' in the case of a default in the delivery of the travel plan Establishment of Basingstoke Business Travel Forum

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Birmingham City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Ease and speed of the process initially with the use of the planning condition and ability to enforce failure to comply with condition ● Standard planning condition ● Standard staff travel survey package which the authority can map for the company using postcodes ● Clear publications on Birmingham Business TravelWise Company including obligations of members, ideas for promoting sustainable transport and elements to include and financial and other benefits available ● Overall process clearly linked into transport policy and objectives ● Business community is supportive of overall Business TravelWise Company and welcomes close working relationship with public transport operators, financial benefits package and technical support from officers ● Very good linkages with PTE and a key operator ● Personal support given to companies by bus operator to develop improved public transport network ● Planning conditions validity has been tested through appeal ● Monitoring requirements built into Company TravelWise package on six monthly basis and required by the local authority to check on effectiveness 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Separation of travel plan contents in practice from transport infrastructure requirements and improvements ● Inability to control elements of the travel plan produced, and secure or enforce its effectiveness through the planning system ● Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process ● Lack of explicit policy on when to seek the planning condition in relation to an application ● Only works where there is the equivalent organisation to Company TravelWise Birmingham ● Resource intensive after approval of planning application ● The planning condition only relates to the initial occupier and there is no requirement for subsequent occupiers to be party to the scheme 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The establishment of a city wide Company TravelWise scheme which has engaged substantial business support, and would appear to be successful in influencing changing patterns of travel ● A very good and close working relationship with the public transport coordinating body, Centro, and key bus operator to provide financial benefits to companies and personal support ● The simplicity of the planning condition and consequential speed of the process ● The quality of the published information provided to companies ● The personal support given to companies to help them through the travel survey and subsequent identification of actions, including survey proformas and mapping ● The establishment of citywide targets in terms of car use as a basis for developing action.

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Bristol City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Proactive, positive “partnership” approach which balances travel plan objectives with wider regeneration objectives ● Working to educate developers and “get them on board” ● Pre-application discussions and Information Pack for Developers ● Draft Supplementary Planning guidance that acts as a practice note ● Standard clauses for section 106 ● Mechanism for speculative developments, with clear framework document and interim targets in some cases ● Promotion of travel forums for businesses to pool information and resources, with section 106 contributions where possible ● Awards/grants schemes and officer support 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Section 106 clauses still being perfected in relation to situation where travel plan measures have failed to achieve modal split targets; ● Vagueness may be of concern to applicants ● Uncertainty over what is reasonable to expect of developers/occupiers in terms of aspects of travel plan implementation eg any requirement for travel plan co-ordinators, and explicit financial sanctions for failure to meet targets ● Some development control officers consider travel plans “marginal” 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● City-wide local travel forums, with funding from section 106 where possible (e.g. Canons Marsh) ● Pro-active and partnership approach, including grant schemes for voluntary travel plans and award schemes for progress ● Information pack for developers ● Framework approach re speculative applications, with detailed requirements including travel plan co-ordinator ● Standard clauses for section 106 ● Interim or preliminary modal split targets referenced in section 106 for some speculative developments

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Camden London Borough	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The need for travel plans delivered through the planning system is integrated with the wider transport and environmental agenda, the council's own travel plan, the promotion of school travel plans, car free housing and the development of a support network for businesses in promoting their own staff travel plans ● The publication of supplementary planning guidance on all aspects of planning obligations including the securing of travel plans with a description of the key elements of the travel plan, measures to consider, a step-by-step guide to including one in the planning process, useful other sources of information and a specimen section 106 agreement for any planning obligations ● A standard format for section 106 agreements for travel plans ● The requirement for payment for the monitoring of any section 106 agreement from the applicant ● The comprehensiveness of the approach in terms of range of applications considered ● The availability of advice from the council's specialists ● Existence of support network through the Camden Green Travel Network. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The content of the actual travel plan does not necessarily directly relate to the transport needs as identified through the policy documents or transport assessment ● There is no monitoring taking place as yet on travel plans required through the section 106 process or their effectiveness and this problem is growing as the number of travel plans increases, although the monitoring requirements are set out in the section 106 agreement; there is concern about the resource implications of the process ● There is no default measure in place in the event of the travel plan not delivering changes in the way people access the site or travel; the scheme is based on "using best endeavours" and good will. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The integration of travel plans very visibly into the wider transport agenda through publications and policy ● The publication of a SPG explicitly setting out travel requirements and a draft section 106 agreement to aid staff and applicants and speed up the process ● The focus on seeking a positive and negotiated agreement ● The travel plan for the Triton Square site in respect of overall site management and the range and quality of information available in published and internet form ● The explicit targets and monitoring arrangements included in The Royal School travel plan

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Eastleigh Borough Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Very effective partnership working with the County council resulting in cooperative working but no overlap of work in order to deliver common objective of road traffic reduction ● Jointly owned policies between the district council and county council on parking, transport assessments and travel plans which are wholly integrated and publicly available ● A clear legal mechanism for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default ● Clear monitoring requirements ● Clear and explicit policies in statutory documents that set out the situations when travel plans will be required ● A clear link between travel plans and transport assessments together with transport infrastructure improvements sought ● Ownership by members, senior officers and development control case officers of the policy and process to be followed ● A working relationship with some transport operators ● A standard format for section 106 agreements including travel plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● No cross local authority working other than a recent initiative ● Lack of linkage to Hampshire County Council Headstart scheme ● No publicly available information on the requirements in the travel plan or other advisory material for the private sector ● The standard format for section 106 agreements is not publicly available ● The potential problem of resourcing the enforcement of compliance with section 106 agreements given the scale and length of time they are to be operative and subsequently the effectiveness of the travel plans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The section 106 agreement setting out explicitly: ● The requirement for a bond to cover default costs ● The monitoring arrangements and requiring the financing of the to ensure independence of the information ● The specific elements of the travel plan ● The requirement for subsequent owners and lessees/occupiers to be tied into the requirements for a period of 15 years ● The production of complementary and integrated policies across the district council and county council ● The partnership approach to discussions and negotiations on travel plans between the district council and the county council with applicants ● The integration in public documents of the transport assessment requirements, parking standards, accessibility levels and request for travel plans as related to all developments

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Lancashire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff induction to travel plans for the district council & county council ● Close working relations between the county council and most district councils ● Substantial support & advice given – a consultancy role, support for organisations inexperienced in travel plans and facilitation in relation to key meetings ● Awards system recognises organisations activities on delivering “intelligent transport” ● Working relationship of county council with the bus company good and used to facilitate dialogue in respect of travel plans and improvements to public transport ● Councils still promoting travel plans not withstanding economic pressures 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Not all the district councils have adopted the same approach to seeking travel plans ● Information is not public on requirements for travel plans ● Some district councils not “on-board” ● Although there is no explicit published policy on when to seek travel plans, national guidance and impact on highways makes the need clear ● Travel plans and any targets will be difficult to enforce ● Outside TravelWise team no county support network for organisations ● No model section 106 agreement available ● Potential time delay in determining planning applications when travel plans involved, although they are requested where there is any doubt. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Staff induction and training both within the county council and district councils ● Substantial support given to organisations developing travel plans ● Standardised survey questionnaires, analysis and mapping service provided by the county ● Good relationship with some districts and the bus operator

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Oxfordshire County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear legal mechanisms for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default (robust legal advice) ● Strong policy and officer-level commitment to improvement of public transport, in conjunction with travel plans ● Mechanism for seeking contributions to public transport improvements from all developments within a defined area ● Sophisticated system of financial sanctions related to targets ● A clear link between travel plans and integrated transport strategies, particularly in terms of setting car parking targets/management and identifying public transport improvements ● Guidance Note on planning obligations includes reference to travel plans ● TravelWise documents and resources which contribute to the planning process by supporting both applicants and planning officers ● Use of automatic and manual traffic counts to cross check monitoring information 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● County/district co-ordination good and improving but not yet formalised ● Absence of public and published information on what will be required regarding travel plans through the planning system – but these are being addressed ● Highly resource-intensive as each negotiation entails varied or new principles to address circumstances of planning application ● Internal procedures and integration of TravelWise and planning still evolving ● Inconsistent definition of travel plan 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Clear legal mechanisms for ensuring the implementation of the travel plan and testing its effectiveness which is enforceable in the case of default (robust legal advice) ● The section 106 agreement setting out explicitly: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The requirement for subsequent owners and lessees/occupiers to be tied into the requirements – Stepped and sophisticated “failsafe” payments related to clear modal split targets to cover further measures to achieve targets – Monitoring arrangements and responsibilities – The specific elements of the travel plan ● Mechanism for seeking contributions to public transport improvements from all developments within a defined area ● A clear link between travel plans and integrated transport strategies, particularly in terms of setting car parking targets/management and identifying public transport improvements ● TravelWise documents and resources which contribute to the planning process by supporting both applicants and planning officers ● Use of automatic and manual traffic counts to cross check monitoring information

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Sheffield City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The inter-relationship of the transport policies at county and city level with the planning process, travel plans and the transport assessment ● The close working relationship with the PTE and the support given to applicants through TOPS, including joint working protocol in relation to travel plans ● The setting up of a baseline survey to establish existing travel patterns and modal share as a basis for future assessments of travel plans and evaluation ● The adoption and publication of supplementary planning guidance on transport assessments and travel plan requirements clearly stating when and what is required ● The integration of the travel plan process into the development team approach involving all key parties ● The promotion of pre-application discussions to scope the transport assessment and travel plan requirements ● The simplicity of the use of planning conditions to minimise the time taken and cost of obtaining planning permission ● The development of specific planning conditions for different types of applications e.g. speculative ● The establishment of a travel plan database to assist monitoring of compliance with the planning condition ● The promotion of travel plans in an area of economic problems as a component aiding regeneration 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The use of a planning condition which limits the scope for ensuring an effective travel plan once it has been approved at the outset ● The draft planning condition for speculative developments is likely to prove too cumbersome in practice to operate and given its contents might be more appropriately covered in a section 106 agreement ● Officers and developers are reluctant to use section 106 agreements ● The lack of methodology for calculating modal split ● No monitoring has yet been done ● No common ownership of the policy or practice across members and officers 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The production and publication of supplementary planning guidance on travel plans ● The integrated working with the PTE and TOPS, and the agreed protocol ● The close relationship between transport policy targets and travel plan requirements ● The establishment of baseline information on travel patterns and modal share ● The setting up of a monitoring database for checking compliance with conditions

Local authorities	Strengths	Weaknesses	Best Practice
Stoke-on-Trent City Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Pursuing travel plans even though regeneration issues are important ● Travel plan promotion is complemented by strong public transport initiatives ● Use of conditions may be a reasonable mechanism in light of the economic climate and role of targets ● Use of data to help calculate modal split targets ● Proactive travel plan co-ordinator involved at Doulton site ● Council has encouraged integration of commercial public transport operators into planning system to facilitate identification of opportunities (Employment Monitoring Task Group) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Procedures and travel plan “framework” not documented ● Lack of standard conditions ● Only use S106 agreements if travel plan includes financial provisions or if a phased development ● Absence of any private-sector travel plan support organisation e.g. TravelWise ● Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Travel plan promotion is complemented by strong public transport initiatives e.g. council subsidies ● Proactive travel plan co-ordinator involved at Doulton site ● Council has encouraged integration of commercial public transport operators into planning system to facilitate identification of opportunities (Employment Monitoring Task Group)
Surrey County Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Closely integrated with transport assessment process ● Well developed and widely used Supplementary Planning Guidance Note ● Partnership (with developer) approach to achieving effective implementation of agreed travel plans ● Evaluation tool for assessing submitted travel plans (and to guide applicants) ● Standard conditions and section 106 clauses requirement for implementation of a travel plan ● Model skeletal section 106 agreement for travel plans ● Incorporate modal split and car parking targets ● Clear responsibilities for stages of travel plan negotiation, including monitoring ● TravelWise information package 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Narrowly defined travel plan – separate from public transport as have accepted that in areas where high car use its unrealistic to expect much improvement in public transport and concentrate on car sharing and staff moving closer to workplace ● Uneven commitment across whole of the authority – have not seen any real impact on car usage yet ● Lack of mechanisms for redressing or enforcing against ineffective travel plans produced through the process ● Effectiveness depends on staff resources to support and encourage implementation of planning agreement ● Flexibility on modal split and other targets weakens incentive and may discourage some occupiers who see neighbours with different targets 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Supplementary Planning Guidance and clear procedures and responsibilities, along with model skeletal section 106 agreement for travel plans ● Partnership (with developer) approach to achieving effective implementation of agreed travel plans ● Evaluation tool for assessing submitted travel plans ● Pro-active approach to encouraging voluntary travel plans not linked to planning applications

APPENDIX 16

Notes of the brainstorming meeting

1. Background

The approach set out to this stage of the study included a “brainstorming meeting” with invitees to debate conclusions and implications of the research conducted in Stages 1 & 2 on travel plans and the planning system. This meeting took place on 30th November 2001. The timing was chosen to ensure the outcomes of case study research could be reported in broad terms to participants, and allow the draft best practice guidance to take account of feedback.

2. Objectives of the meeting

Four key objectives were identified:

- To inform participants of the outcomes from both the initial survey and case study work;
- To identify the key conclusions from the study so far, particularly what elements seem to be effective;
- To highlight any major concerns in respect of the use of the planning system; and
- To debate and agree the implications of the conclusions for the best practice guidance covering aspects such as policy framework, the use of planning conditions or planning obligations etc.

3. Organisation of the meeting

Invitations were extended to over 38 individuals, with the objective of attracting representation from the following sectors outside the project team:

- Local authorities
- Central government
- Professional bodies, including the RTPI and Planning Law Forum
- Associations and other agencies (e.g. Association for Commuter Transport)
- The development industry
- Consultants in this field.

Actual attendance numbered 26, and those who attended are listed in Appendix 6. The number and range of interests represented were impressive and attendees have expressed appreciation for the opportunity to be involved and have requested further involvement.

After a presentation outlining the key outcomes of the study to date and associated questions and issues, discussion focused on five central questions that were discussed both in small groups and in a plenary session. Participants were directed to draw out areas of conflict and consensus in relation to these questions, although inevitably the level of detailed discussion varied from question to question and group to group. The five questions and the associated feedback is summarised below, with a separate section on the final plenary session that concentrated on key messages for best practice. The feedback will be a valuable contribution to the draft best practice guidance.

4. Feedback on Question 1:

WHAT ARE THE 5 KEY ISSUES THAT SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN THE BEST PRACTICE GUIDANCE ON USING THE PLANNING SYSTEM TO SECURE TRAVEL PLANS?

The discussion reflected concerns by local authorities as to what was reasonable to require in terms of measures with financial implications, and the desire by the development industry to have clarity and certainty. Particular issues included:

- Need for clarity over thresholds/scale of development requiring a travel plan
- Need for clarity regarding penalties and enforcement
- Need for clarity over what should be monitored and who should pay
- Need for clarity as to how travel plans link with transport assessments.

Another theme concerned the need for the guidance to address the current lack of consistency of local planning authority policy and protocols for determining applications involving travel plans. Clear consistent advice within a local authority and across local authorities was identified as a need, covering what should be included in a travel plan and how it will be assessed, when conditions/section 106 agreements will be used, targets and links to the wider infrastructure requirements. Suggestions for inclusion in the guidance included staff training and adding a box to application forms to highlight the issue.

Lastly, the question of securing travel plans where occupiers are unknown or changing was highlighted – i.e. what approach is most effective to:

- Secure travel plans in speculative applications
- Secure travel plans in the case of an extension to an existing development which does not have a travel plan
- Secure the obligations/commitment of future occupiers
- Link “tiered” travel plans i.e. where they are required for an area/management estate/occupier.

5. Feedback on Question 2:

WHAT SHOULD BE INCLUDED IN A TRAVEL PLAN AND HOW PRESCRIPTIVE SHOULD AUTHORITIES BE?

Participants agreed on a core list of what should be included, and it was suggested that aspirational targets should be avoided. There was greater conflict over elements with financial implications. The core list included:

- Simple, enforceable targets
- Some form of monitoring (specifying how, costs and frequency)
- Clear penalties linked to monitoring
- Identified lead contacts from both local authority and applicant
- Prescribed identification of a travel plan co-ordinator
- Clear responsibilities as to who “delivers”
- Clear link between the development and the desired outcomes
- Clear and specified inputs/outputs, including what surveys required
- Measures addressing all travel and movements to/from the site, including business, staff, customers and suppliers
- Some form of review process.

Monitoring generated the most debate, with conflicting views emerging over whether it should be continuous or time-limited, and if the latter, how many years? What form of monitoring, who should carry it out and who should pay were also contentious. Further detail on monitoring is covered under Question 4.

6. Feedback on Question 3:

SHOULD TRAVEL PLANS INCLUDE OR EXCLUDE PAYMENTS FOR INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS EGG PUBLIC TRANSPORT?

Views varied on this point and a distinction was drawn between the way the payments were determined and the way they were secured. It was suggested that payment amounts should be determined through:

- The transport assessment of travel modes, including public transport
- Assessment of the impact of the particular development (including what benefits accrue to other users)

- Ensuring that proposed infrastructure is viable
- Monitoring.

Payments could be secured by:

- Section 106 agreement to include one-off payments for basic improvements, but separate from travel plan though linked to it (though question of whether the basis for separation is by onsite/offsite or by capital/revenue); and
- Identification of financial penalties (fail-safe contributions) related to modal split targets in the travel plan, with the penalty payments utilised in a flexible way to further upgrade infrastructure.

7. Feedback on Questions 4:

WHO SHOULD MONITOR TRAVEL PLANS AND HOW SHOULD THIS BE DONE?

There seemed to be a consensus that the developer/occupier should be responsible for monitoring and associated costs, but that the local authority should ensure monitoring is taking place and verify. It should be noted that the recent Transport 2000 research indicated that monitoring is in fact being carried out erratically and without a common basis for comparison and suggested an independent party might undertake this role to improve the effectiveness of travel plans. Both local authority representatives and developers pointed out that the monitoring costs can be substantial (say, over a five year period) and these costs reduce finance available for actual travel plan measures.

Issues raised in relation to the monitoring process included:

- Monitoring needs to be undertaken to measure progress towards targets, so need to be clear about targets and what is being measured;
- Monitoring activities would be different depending on the size and scale of the travel plan and organisation and should relate to objectives;
- Should there be annual monitoring?
- Verification can be undertaken by using open book approach, annual reviews, automatic and manual counters to cross-check figures.

8. Feedback on Question 5:

WHAT IS THE BEST WAY OF ENSURING EFFECTIVE TRAVEL PLANS DELIVERED THROUGH PLANNING, EG. PLANNING CONDITION AND/OR SECTION 106 AGREEMENT; BONDS OR LONGSTOP PAYMENTS IF DEFAULT; THE SETTING OF TARGETS?

As between **planning conditions and section 106 agreements** there was general agreement that conditions may be appropriate for smaller and less complex applications, but that section 106 agreements were usually better in that they offered greater potential to ensure the effectiveness of the travel plan (though accepting that these were not ideal).

The use of **bonds or long-stop payments** (or fail-safe payments) was more controversial, partly due to the question of how calculated, and also as both local authorities and developers felt that these might discourage development if developers could (or perceived they could) avoid/minimise these in another local authority area. Bonds present more complications (e.g. some types can they be argued, who keeps interest) but may be preferable to developers as they offer certainty regarding the limit to financial liability.

In areas where regeneration was an objective these are viewed as creating a barrier to a more “partnership” approach to the achievement of travel plan objectives. Some considered these may not be effective as may be seen by the developer as a “cost of development” to be paid to avoid pursuing the travel plan. There was some difference of view as to when financial sanctions should be used, with options including:

- In relation to implementation of agreed measures
- In relation to payment of agreed contributions
- In relation to achievement of modal shift targets.

Targets were also seen as problematic as mechanisms to achieve an effective travel plan, with the following concerns most often mentioned:

- Need to be simple, time and site-specific, and enforceable, based on verifiable measures;
- Need to take account of economic and transport circumstances of the corridor or area within which the development is located;
- Need to be reasonable- how is this determined?
- Issue of time-scales and monitoring (as above) (need for interim targets?);
- Need to offer an incentive to achieve them; and
- Need to link to phasing and degree of speculative occupation.

9. Feedback on Question 6:

WHAT PROCESS SHOULD BE ESTABLISHED IN RELATION TO SMALLER DEVELOPMENTS?

Smaller developments are often ignored as they may fall below PPG13 thresholds, but the case study research has identified a concern about the cumulative impact of smaller developments and the importance of travel plans for a group of developments. Two key suggestions emerged: to get a “sustainable travel statement”; and to get contributions to/involvement in a wider development corridor/cluster travel plan initiative which can pool best practice, costs etc. Some participants were looking for guidance on complementary thresholds (to those in PPG13) related to circumstances.

10. Final plenary session – key messages for best practice

Two broad issues have emerged which link many of the points made during the other sessions. The first is that at present local authorities are taking three general approaches to the securing of travel plans:

- A partnership approach wherein local authorities work alongside applicants to agree travel plan objectives, including some measures. Effectiveness relies on the applicants’ “best endeavours”, with local authorities shying away from any substantial financial “burden” related to travel plan requirements. The main point is to achieve commitment to the travel plan process/aims, and to ensure this is passed on to future occupiers.
- A more “conventional” planning approach wherein specific measures are agreed, with the underlying assumption that these measures will achieve some improvement in modal split. This approach depends on having a common understanding of the cost-effectiveness and likely impact of particular measures in particular circumstances, and may not be helpful in cases where the end-user is not known.
- The most robust approach utilises section 106 mechanisms to secure agreement to specific targets, payments if default or non-achievement of targets, and monitoring-over and above travel plan measures and financial contributions. This approach provides greater legal and financial support for achieving travel plan objectives.

The second point arising during the final session relates to increasing tensions concerning the need for consistency and certainty in the way travel plans are sought and secured. The developers viewpoint is that they need greater consistency and certainty (a “common” travel plan was mentioned as desirable) – in relation to what is likely to be required, time-scale for negotiations, financial obligations that will need to be passed on to future occupiers as well as the development costs etc. Representatives from local authorities explained what they see as the need for travel plans to vary, within “Framework Headings”, to take account of a wide range of site-specific circumstances, and that issues will vary egg between extensions to an existing use as opposed to new developments.

APPENDIX 17

Glossary

CP	Car park/parking
CPZ	Car Parking Zone
DC	Development Control
DETR	Department of Environment, Transport and the Regions (until June 2001)
DfT	Department for Transport (from June 2002)
DTLR	Department for Transport, Local Government and the Regions (June 2001-June 2002)
IHT	Institute of Highways & Transportation (report <i>Guidelines for Planning for Public Transport in Developments</i>)
ITS	Integrated Transport Strategies
LTP	Local Transport Plan
M/U	Mixed Use
MOSAIC	“Mobility Strategy Applications In the Community” (EU funded project)
OS	Open space
PPG 13	DETR Planning Policy Guidance Note 13, Transport, March 2000
PT	Public Transport
S106	Section 106, Town and Country Planning Act, 1990
SDG	Steer Davies Gleave
SOV	Single Occupancy Vehicle
SPG	Supplementary Planning Guidance
T2000	Transport 2000
TA	Transport Assessment
TC	Town Centre
TP	Travel Plan
UCO	Uses Classes Order
UDP	Unitary Development Plan