

**Strategic Planning,
Sustainability & Transportation
Committee**

11 October 2016

Is the final decision on the recommendations in this report to be made at this meeting?

Yes

Consultation – KCC Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016-2031

Final Decision-Maker	Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee
Lead Head of Service	Rob Jarman, Head of Planning & Development
Lead Officer and Report Author	Paul Goodenough, Transport Planner, Spatial Policy
Classification	Public
Wards affected	All Wards

This report makes the following recommendations to this Committee:

1. That Councillors agree the proposed response set out in section 4 of the report and that it is forwarded to Kent County Council as the Council's formal response to the Local Transport Plan 4 consultation by the deadline of 30 October 2016.

This report relates to the following corporate priorities:

- Keeping Maidstone Borough an attractive place for all -
- Securing a successful economy for Maidstone Borough -

The Maidstone Borough Local Plan, and supporting Integrated Transport Strategy and Walking and Cycling Strategy, should have regard for the policies contained within a Local Transport Plan (LTP) in delivering a package of sustainable transport measures in support of the Local Plan allocations and the need to mitigate the transport impact of planned development and deliver modal shift away from reliance on the use of the private car with other potential benefits such as improved public transport networks and improved air quality. However, the consultation draft LTP4 does not pick up comprehensively the Council's early input to the LTP4.

Timetable

Meeting	Date
Strategic Planning, Sustainability and Transportation Committee	11 October 2016

Consultation – KCC Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016-2031

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 On 8 August 2016, Kent County Council (KCC) launched a public consultation on Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016-2031. The consultation closes on 30 October 2016. This report considers the consultation and recommends that the proposed response set out in Section 4 of the report is forwarded to KCC as the Council's formal response.
- 1.2 Under the Local Transport Act 2008 it is a statutory duty for KCC to have a Local Transport Plan (LTP) in place, although the Act allows Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) the freedom to replace LTPs as and when they see fit rather than having a five year planning horizon as previously stipulated. The purpose of an LTP is to set out KCC's plans for local transport investment and is a critical tool to attract Government funding for these schemes.
- 1.3 KCC is in the process of replacing the current LTP3, which covers the period from January 2011 to December 2016. The emerging LTP4 is intended to be adopted in 2017 and replicates the transport schemes identified by the Kent and Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) as being required in the period up to 2031. It thus covers the same 15 year period, also aligning with the timescales for the Maidstone Borough Local Plan. KCC intends LTP4 to form a clear, evidenced basis from which to bid for funding and deliver infrastructure to support housing and economic growth.
- 1.4 Page 36 of the LTP4 consultation draft identifies priority transport schemes for Maidstone Borough. These are split into GIF schemes, schemes from the overarching Strategic Economic Plan (SEP) submitted by SELEP to central Government, and other future schemes. GIF priority schemes are:
 1. SEMSL (referred to as Leeds and Langley Relief Road);
 2. M20 J7 improvements;
 3. Thameslink extension to Maidstone East by 2018; and
 4. M20 Junction 3 to 5 "smart" motorway.
- 1.5 The LTP4 Consultation Draft is attached at Appendix One to this report. Attached at Appendix Two is the questionnaire prepared by KCC for the consultation. The full suite of technical documents is available at <http://consultations.kent.gov.uk/consult.ti/LTP4/consultationHome> .
- 1.6 Members are recommended to agree the proposed response set out in section 4 of the report and that it is forwarded to Kent County Council as the Council's formal response to the Local Transport Plan 4 consultation by the deadline of 30 October 2016.

2. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

- 2.1 Under the Local Transport Act 2008 it is a statutory duty for KCC to have a Local Transport Plan (LTP) in place, although the Act allows Local Transport Authorities (LTAs) the freedom to replace LTPs as and when they see fit rather than having a five year planning horizon as stipulated in the previous legislation (Transport Act 2000). The purpose of an LTP is to set out KCC's plans for local transport investment and is a critical tool by which to attract Government funding for these schemes. Currently, the most significant funding source is from the Local Growth Fund (LGF), awarded competitively via the South East Local Enterprise Partnership (SELEP), with smaller sums available directly from the Department for Transport and from developer contributions (s106/CIL).
- 2.2 KCC is in the process of replacing the current LTP3, which covers the period from January 2011 to December 2016. The emerging LTP4 replicates the transport schemes identified by the Kent and Medway Growth and Infrastructure Framework (GIF) as being required in the period up to 2031. The GIF is considered by KCC to form the evidence base for LTP4 (Appendix One, page 8). LTP4 thus covers the same 15 year period, also aligning with the timescales for the Maidstone Borough Local Plan. KCC intends LTP4 to form a clear, evidenced basis from which to bid for funding and deliver infrastructure to support housing and economic growth, in other words to deliver KCC's transport delivery plan "Growth without Gridlock", which is being refreshed as part of LTP4.
- 2.3 Local Plans and their supporting Transport Strategies should have regard for the policies contained within an LTP. The preparation of the Local Plan and the now adopted Integrated Transport Strategy (ITS) and Walking and Cycling Strategy (WCS) was undertaken with regard to the current LTP3. The support for sustainable transport in Maidstone is clearly set out in paragraph 8.48 on page 91 of that document. Furthermore, paragraph 8.51 (page 92) is of interest in relation to the South East Maidstone Strategic Link (SEMSL), in particular the last sentence "*Maidstone Borough Council has now adopted a more widely distributed development strategy, therefore the SEMSL proposal is unlikely to be pursued further*".
- 2.4 The LTP4 consultation draft sets out the following ambition for Kent (page 10, Appendix One):
- "To deliver safe and effective transport, ensuring that all Kent's communities and businesses benefit, the environment is enhanced and economic growth is supported".*
- 2.5 This ambition is intended to be realised through five overarching policies that are targeted at delivering specific outcomes as shown in the table below.

Draft LTP4 Outcome		Draft LTP4 Policy
1	Economic growth and minimised congestion	Deliver resilient transport infrastructure and schemes that reduce congestion and improve journey time reliability to enable economic growth and appropriate development, meeting demand from a growing population.
2	Affordable and accessible door-to-door journeys	Promote affordable, accessible and connected transport to enable access for all to jobs, education, health and other services.
3	Safer travel	Provide a safer road, footway and cycleway network to reduce the likelihood of casualties, and encourage other transport providers to improve safety on their networks.
4	Enhanced environment	Deliver schemes to reduce the environmental footprint of transport, and enhance the historic and natural environment.
5	Better health and wellbeing	Promote active travel choices for all members of the community to encourage good health and wellbeing, and implement measures to improve local air quality.

2.6 National, countywide and local (i.e. Maidstone Borough) priority schemes to deliver the above outcomes have been identified on page 36 of Appendix One and these are set out in the table below. No commentary is provided in the draft LTP4 as to whether there will be an opportunity to review these priorities during the period to 2031.

National Priorities	Countywide Priorities	Local (i.e. District) Priorities
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Enabling Growth in the Thames Gateway New Lower Thames Crossing Port Expansion (Dover) A Solution to Operation Stack (NB: Highways England's consultation on proposals for a HGV parking area at Stanford West closed on 23 September 2016) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Bifurcation of Port Traffic between M20/A20 and M2/A2 routes Provision for Overnight Lorry Parking Ashford International Station Signalling (Ashford Spurs) Rail Journey Time Improvements and Thanet Parkway Railway Station Rail and Bus Improvements 	<p>GIF Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Leeds and Langley Relief Road M20 J3-5 'smart' motorway Thameslink extension to Maidstone East by 2018 M20 J7 improvements <p>Strategic Economic Plan Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sustainable access to employment areas Integrated Transport Package Bridges improvement scheme <p>Other Future Schemes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Maidstone Bus Station, East Rail Station

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bus infrastructure improvements • Bearsted Road capacity improvements • Rural Service Centre improvements • A229/A274 corridor capacity improvements
--	--	---

- 2.7 Some pre-consultation engagement between Economic Development officers and KCC officers took place during May 2016 to communicate the Council's priorities for LTP4, and suggested amendments to the covering text for page 35 of the consultation draft were sent to KCC on 24 May 2016. However, several of MBC's stated priorities have been referenced in a vague fashion in the consultation draft, for example "improvements to radial (public transport) routes into Maidstone" is instead referenced as "bus infrastructure improvements" and capacity improvements at named junctions in South East Maidstone have been referred to as "corridor capacity improvements". Other stated priorities have been omitted altogether, including "M20 Junction 5 and North West Maidstone improvements" and "walking and cycling infrastructure improvements". None of MBC's suggested amendments to the covering text have been included. The Council should reinforce its view that the measures included in both the Integrated Transport Strategy and the Walking and Cycling Strategy should be supported in the LTP4 as a way to use more efficiently the existing highway infrastructure.
- 2.8 It can be seen from the above table that the draft LTP4 reintroduces SEMSL (referred to as the Leeds and Langley Relief Road) as a priority scheme despite the Council's consultation response to the GIF in July 2015 setting out that SEMSL should not be included in that document, and despite the development strategy set out in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan remaining similar to that referenced in LTP3. SEMSL is nevertheless identified as a future scheme in the ITS for consideration at the first review of the Local Plan in 2022, with construction post 2031 (Local Plan paras. 17.125 and 17.126). KCC are the lead authority which will need to deliver SEMSL, but MBC will work with KCC to develop the detailed case.
- 2.9 None of the stated LTP4 priorities therefore conflict with the Local Plan and supporting ITS and WCS. These documents also align fully with the five LTP4 outcomes and policies. However, the focus of LTP4 is on the achievement of Outcome 1 (economic growth and minimised congestion) through LGF funded schemes. It is not clear how LGF funded schemes will contribute towards achieving the four other LTP4 outcomes (affordable and accessible door-to-door journeys, safer travel, enhanced environment and better health and wellbeing).
- 2.10 The link to the five outcomes is, however, clear for smaller schemes seeking DfT Integrated Transport Block funding. The assessment process is detailed in Annexe 1 of Appendix One. Annexe 2 of Appendix One will list the

schemes to be delivered as part of the Integrated Transport Programme (ITP), and Annexe 3 will list the safety critical schemes (namely those prioritising Outcome 3 (safer travel)) funded using 50% of the ITP budget. These programmes will be updated annually. However, only £6.8m per annum of Integrated Transport Block funding is available until 2017/18 for these schemes, covering the whole of Kent.

- 2.11 £8.9m of LGF funding has already been secured from SELEP for the delivery of the Maidstone Integrated Transport Package (MITP) between 2016/17 and 2019/20, with £1.3m allocated for 2016/17. The priority schemes for delivery in 2016/17 are highway improvement works at the A274/Willington Street/Wallis Avenue junction and, if budget allows, the A20/Willington Street junction. Detailed designs are currently being developed by KCC/Amey. Alongside these schemes, feasibility studies and design work for the A229/A274 Wheatsheaf junction are currently in progress.
- 2.12 A draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) and Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) have been produced for LTP4, but these documents are not referenced in the consultation draft. Section 4.2, page 68 of the draft SEA presents details of the four alternative options for LTP4 which have been assessed against the SEA objectives. Each of the four options affords different weightings (and funding allocations) to each of the five LTP4 outcomes. KCC's preferred Option 3 allocates 40% of funding to Outcome 1 with the remaining 60% split equally between the other four outcomes (page 57, Appendix One). Although not the best performing option environmentally, section 4.4 page 71 of the draft SEA accepts that KCC's preferred Option 3 – which delivers greater funding for Outcome 1 while not causing significant negative impacts on the SEA Objectives – is an appropriate choice for the funding allocation.
- 2.13 It is acknowledged that the private car will continue to be the primary mode of transport within Kent. Nevertheless, developing and promoting sustainable and active travel networks to counteract, to some extent, vehicle traffic growth is an essential element of delivering "Growth without Gridlock" whilst mitigating environmental impacts. This is recognised in the Health Impact Assessment reported on pages 78 and 79 of the draft SEA. Kent's Active Travel Strategy is referenced on page 23 of the draft LTP4.
- 2.14 The findings of the EqIA are summarised in Table 24, page 80 of the SEA. This concludes that LTP4 is not expected to have a significant negative impact on any of the protected characteristics of age, disability, race and gender. Positive LTP4 impacts will depend on the delivery of schemes which improve all types of transport – the EqIA notes that older generations, families with younger children and the disabled will benefit from more affordable and accessible bus and rail services. The EqIA also identifies the promotion of active travel choices for Kent residents as proving beneficial for all, promoting improved health and well-being as well as contributing towards reduced congestion and pollution. Despite this, walking and cycling improvements are not identified in the draft LTP4 as one of Maidstone's transport priorities.
- 2.15 The adopted ITS and WCS seek to take forward a balanced package of transport interventions to support growth but consider the needs of all

users, a strategy which will encourage sustainable travel choices whilst still delivering necessary highway infrastructure improvements. As such both strategies are fully consistent with the findings of the draft SEA and EqIA. However, the content of the draft LTP4 indicates that it may lack symmetry with these strategies.

3. AVAILABLE OPTIONS

- 3.1 There are two options available to Members. Firstly, the Council could send KCC a formal response to the LTP4 consultation. Secondly, Members could choose not to make a formal response to the LTP4 consultation.
 - 3.2 Choosing to make a representation will afford KCC the opportunity to take the Council's views into account in compiling their consultation report and producing the final version of LTP4 for adoption in 2017.
 - 3.3 If no formal representation is made, this would result in a missed opportunity for the Council to set out its position in respect to a document which sets KCC's transport strategy for Maidstone Borough and the wider county for the next 15 years, i.e. the entire duration of the Local Plan.
-

4. PREFERRED OPTION AND REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 4.1 The preferred option is for the Council to submit a formal representation to KCC before the consultation end date of 30 October 2016. This will make the Council's views known prior to the adoption of LTP4 in 2017.
- 4.2 The consultation questionnaire seeks views on the following main questions:
 3. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the overall Ambition set for the Local Transport Plan?
 4. This Ambition will be realised through five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies. To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the Outcomes and Policies?
 5. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Strategic Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
 6. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Kent-Wide Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
 7. To what extent do you agree or disagree with the District Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
 8. Comments on the initial Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)
 9. Comments on the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)
- 4.3 The suggested responses are as follows:
- 4.4 Question 3: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the overall Ambition set for the Local Transport Plan?

- 4.5 A: The Council strongly agrees with the overall Ambition. It is, however, important that the priorities for transport investment set out in the final LTP4 are consistent with this ambition, namely that as well as supporting economic growth they benefit all communities and businesses and contribute towards reducing the environmental footprint of transport.
- 4.6 Question 4: To what extent do you agree or disagree with each of the five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies?
- 4.7 A: The Council strongly agrees with all five overarching Outcomes and Supporting Policies. The adopted Maidstone Integrated Transport Strategy and Walking and Cycling Strategy identify a balanced package of transport interventions that will directly contribute to the realisation of these Outcomes. However, the focus of the draft LTP4 is on the achievement of Outcome 1 (economic growth and minimised congestion). The document would benefit from clarification as to how the four other LTP4 outcomes (affordable and accessible door-to-door journeys, safer travel, enhanced environment and better health and wellbeing) are intended to be achieved by the identified draft LTP4 priorities.
- 4.8 Question 5: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Strategic Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
- 4.9 A: The Council strongly agrees with the nine Strategic Priorities. With respect to the New Lower Thames Crossing, upgrading of the A229 between M2 Junction 3 and M20 Junction 6 is strongly supported, along with improvements to the A249 and M20 Junction 7 improvements as identified to enable the bifurcation of port traffic and release capacity on the M20. The Council welcomes Highways England's proposals for a lorry park at Stanford West to reduce the need to deploy Operation Stack. In our recent response to that consultation we also welcomed the proposals for overnight lorry parking as part of that scheme and cited the need, highlighted in the draft LTP4, to integrate the lorry park with an overall strategy to deliver a network of small lorry parks across Kent and effective enforcement to reduce inappropriate lorry parking.
- 4.10 With respect to rail and bus improvements the document would benefit from clarification as to how KCC will work to influence the new Southeastern franchise from 2018. It is a priority of the Council to lobby for improved rail services to the Maidstone urban area, as set out in Action PT9 of the adopted ITS. KCC's active support for Quality Bus Partnerships and Punctuality Improvement Partnerships is welcomed, as is the citing of Fastrack as an exemplar high quality bus service. The document would benefit from clarification as to how KCC intends to deliver similarly frequent and reliable services elsewhere in the county, encouraging bus use and achieving modal shift from the private car which will contribute towards reducing congestion and benefit motorists and bus users alike.
- 4.11 Question 6: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the Kent-Wide Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
- 4.12 The Council strongly agrees with the five Kent-Wide priorities. A key barrier to the use of active travel modes are concerns about road safety, and

reducing the number of KSI casualties is essential to achieving the objectives set out in our adopted Walking and Cycling Strategy. We welcome the reference to KCC's Active Travel Strategy and the plan to "establish Kent as a pioneering county for active travel". It would be helpful for the final LTP4 to provide a link to this document to enable the reader to gain an understanding of how KCC intend that plan to be achieved.

- 4.13 Question 7: To what extent do you agree or disagree with the District Priorities for the Local Transport Plan?
- 4.14 The Council is concerned that its LTP4 priorities for Maidstone Borough, communicated to KCC in May 2016, have not been comprehensively picked up in the consultation draft. Given KCC's apparent keenness to promote active travel, we are disappointed that the delivery of improved walking and cycling infrastructure has not been identified as a priority in the draft LTP4. Furthermore, no mention is made of M20 Junction 5 and North West Maidstone improvements, nor of public transport improvements on radial routes into the town.
- 4.15 The final LTP4 should align with the Action Plans set out in the Integrated Transport Strategy and Walking and Cycling Strategy, which is adopted Council policy to 2031. The balanced package of transport interventions set out in these strategies is intended to not only address the transport challenges posed by Local Plan growth, but also to remedy existing transport issues. These include congestion on parts of the road network, poor air quality, road safety hotspots, low levels of walking and cycling and a lack of bus priority measures to enable fast and reliable bus journey times. An explanation is required as to why the draft LTP4 lacks a commitment from KCC to the delivery of specified highway improvements, including the A20/Willington Street, A274 Sutton Road/Wallis Avenue/Willington Street, A274/A229 Wheatsheaf, A229/Boughton Lane/Cripple Street and A229/B2163 Linton Crossroads junctions. The draft LTP4 also provides no details of proposed integrated transport/casualty reduction schemes.
- 4.16 In general, the draft LTP4 lacks detail. It is essential that the final LTP4 contains a detailed action plan setting out the specific interventions, timescale for delivery, organisations responsible for delivery and funding sources. Pages 51 and 52 of the document refer to available sources of funding, but do not cite potential DfT funding for sustainable travel. Current/recent examples include the Access Fund, Better Bus Areas and funding for low emission buses. Similar funding opportunities are likely to arise during the lifetime of LTP4 and it is essential that KCC works collaboratively with public and private sector partners to submit competitive applications.
- 4.17 With respect to the Leeds and Langley Relief Road, the Council identifies this in the Integrated Transport Strategy as a future scheme for consideration at the first review of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan in 2022, with construction post 2031 (Local Plan paras. 17.125 and 17.126). KCC are the lead authority which will need to deliver SEMSL, but the Council will work with KCC to develop the detailed case. We do not consider the scheme as a priority for the LTP4 period. The development strategy set out

within the Submission Local Plan remains very similar to that referenced in paragraph 8.51 of the current LTP3, which identified as a result that the Leeds and Langley Relief Road (referred to as SEMSL) was unlikely to be pursued further. The scheme is not required to mitigate the impact of Local Plan growth to the year 2031. The results of strategic and localised transport modelling demonstrate that, with a balanced package of junction capacity improvements, public transport improvements and walking and cycling improvements, the residual transport impacts of Local Plan development to the year 2031 will be less than severe in the context of the National Planning Policy Framework.

4.18 As such the final LTP4 should clearly indicate that the Leeds and Langley Relief Road is not a priority for the LTP4 period, but rather that it is a future scheme for delivery beyond 2031, for which both authorities will work together during the LTP4 period to develop the detailed case. In conclusion, the draft LTP4 is not aligned to either the Local Plan, nor the Integrated Transport Strategy.

4.19 Question 8: Comments on the initial Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA)

4.20 In respect of the transport priorities for Maidstone identified in the draft LTP4, we disagree with the findings of the EqIA as summarised in Table 24 of the SEA, namely that LTP4 is not expected to have a significant negative impact on any of the protected characteristics of age, disability, race and gender. We do, however, strongly agree that positive LTP4 impacts will depend on the delivery of schemes which improve all types of transport.

4.21 As such there needs to be a clear commitment in LTP4 to the delivery of more affordable and accessible bus services, and the improvement and promotion of active travel modes. It is therefore disappointing that public transport improvements on radial corridors and walking and cycling improvements are not identified in the draft LTP4 as priorities in Maidstone despite our previous submission, as these would contribute towards realising these positive equality impacts and achieve full consistency with our adopted ITS and WCS.

4.22 Furthermore, it would be helpful if the final LTP4 directly referenced the EqIA and its conclusions, to demonstrate how equality impact needs have been considered in identifying the transport schemes necessary in the period to 2031.

4.23 Question 9: Comments on the draft Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA)

4.24 It would be helpful for the final LTP4 to briefly summarise the conclusions of the draft SEA, as the draft LTP4 does not make reference to this document. This would help to clarify how all five LTP4 outcomes (not just Outcome 1) have been considered in developing the four LTP4 options; how these options perform against the SEA objectives; how preferred Option 3 was arrived at and how the schemes it includes contributes towards realising the LTP4 outcomes.

5. NEXT STEPS: COMMUNICATION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE DECISION

- 5.2 The consultation closes on 30 October 2016. If agreed, the proposed response set out in this report will be forwarded to KCC to meet that deadline.
- 5.3 KCC will then compile all responses received into a consultation report, which will help produce the final LTP4. KCC intends to adopt LTP4 in 2017.

6. CROSS-CUTTING ISSUES AND IMPLICATIONS

Issue	Implications	Sign-off
Impact on Corporate Priorities	The LTP4 will be critical in delivering a package of transport measures which will support growth over the period to 2031, aligning with that of the Maidstone Borough Local Plan. If the Council's priorities are fully reflected in the final adopted document, LTP4 has the potential to deliver the package of sustainable transport measures identified in the adopted ITS and WCS which support the allocations set out in the Maidstone Borough Local Plan, mitigate the transport impact of planned development and deliver modal shift away from reliance on the use of the private car with other potential benefits such as improved public transport networks and improved air quality.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Risk Management	There is a risk that if the Council's priorities are not fully reflected in the final adopted LTP4 document, there will not be an opportunity to incorporate these into KCC's transport delivery programme for another 15 years.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Financial	No specific financial implications arise from the	Head of Finance and

	consideration of this report.	Resources & Finance Team
Staffing	No specific financial implications arise from the consideration of this report.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Legal	No specific implications arise from the consideration of this report.	Kate Jardine Team Leader Planning Mid Kent Legal Services
Equality Impact Needs Assessment	It is important that LTP4 aligns with the adopted ITS and WCS in tackling transport challenges through a combination of modes, to take into account the needs of all groups including those without access to a car. An LTP4 reliant on highway improvements with a lack of commitment to sustainable and active travel will not promote equal access to employment, services and social opportunities and is likely to lead to increased social exclusion amongst lower income groups in particular.	Anna Collier Policy & Information Manager
Environmental/Sustainable Development	An LTP4 reliant on highway interventions with a lack of commitment to sustainable and active travel is likely to generate more traffic than the additional capacity provided increasing carbon and congestion.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Community Safety	No specific implications arise from the consideration of this report.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Human Rights Act	No specific implications arise from the consideration of this report.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development
Procurement	Consultants are used to prepare specialist or technical evidence to support the Local Plan and are appointed in accordance with the Council's procurement procedures.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development & Head of Finance and

		Resources
Asset Management	No specific implications arise from the consideration of this report.	Rob Jarman: Head of Planning & Development

7. REPORT APPENDICES

The following documents are to be published with this report and form part of the report:

- Appendix 1: Local Transport Plan 4: Delivering Growth without Gridlock 2016-2031
- Appendix 2: Local Transport Plan 4 Consultation Questionnaire