



TRAFFORD
COUNCIL

**COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO MAIN
MATTERS, ISSUES AND
QUESTIONS**

MAIN MATTER 8.0

TOPIC PAPER

CONTENTS

MAIN MATTER 8.1	2
MAIN MATTER 8.2	2
MAIN MATTER 8.3	3
MAIN MATTER 8.4	3
MAIN MATTER 8.5	3
MAIN MATTER 8.6	4
MAIN MATTER 8.7	5
MAIN MATTER 8.8	5
MAIN MATTER 8.9	5
MAIN MATTER 8.10	6
MAIN MATTER 8.11	6
MAIN MATTER 8.12	7
MAIN MATTER 8.13	8
MAIN MATTER 8.14	8
MAIN MATTER 8.15	9
MAIN MATTER 8.16	9
MAIN MATTER 8.17	10
MAIN MATTER 8.18	10
MAIN MATTER 8.19	10
MAIN MATTER 8.20	11
MAIN MATTER 8.21	11
MAIN MATTER 8.22	12
MAIN MATTER 8.23	12
MAIN MATTER 8.24	12
MAIN MATTER 8.25	13
MAIN MATTER 8.26	13
MAIN MATTER 8.27	13
MAIN MATTER 8.28	13
MAIN MATTER 8.29	14
MAIN MATTER 8.30	14
MAIN MATTER 8.31	15
 APPENDIX 8.6 - LAP LEAP NEAP REQUIREMENTS EXTRACT FROM NPFA STANDARDS	 16

MAIN MATTER 8.1

What is the evidence to justify all of the place-making requirements of this policy? What certainty is there that they will be delivered?

Council's Response

- 8.1.1 In general, the identification of the Regeneration Areas in Policy L3 is informed by CD8.7.1 to CD8.7.8 inclusive which identify the areas of deprivation within Trafford and CD8.7.10 which highlights Partington, Sale West and Old Trafford as the most deprived parts of the Borough.
- 8.1.2 More specifically, the Old Trafford Masterplan (CD8.2.1) details a strategy for addressing issues of deprivation in the area and shows how improvements can be delivered.
- 8.1.3 CD8.7.9 and CD12.19/20 set out the issues to be addressed in Partington. Key to the delivery of regeneration in Partington is the Partington Canalside scheme. Further details on this scheme are provided in response to MM8.7 below.
- 8.1.4 The modest improvements required in Sale West are justified by the Indices of Multiple Deprivation (CD8.7.1 to CD8.7.8 inclusive) and CD6.3.25 Section 7 Page 15. The Council considers that Irwell Valley Housing Association is committed to the delivery of regeneration in this area. This is evidenced by the recent activity by IVHA in progressing a number of schemes to promote regeneration in Sale West. The detailed site implications will be provided through the Land Allocations DPD.
- 8.1.5 Further details on delivery and development viability in these areas can be found in CD8.8.22 and 8.8.25.

MAIN MATTER 8.2

Should a further bullet point be added to L3.1 which highlights the desirability of improving accessibility by walking and cycling?

Council's Response

- 8.2.1 The first bullet point under L3.1 will be amended. This is detailed in Suggested Change 200.19 of CD12.4.

Suggested Change 200.19

Improvements to accessibility between the Regeneration Areas and employment areas such as Trafford Park, Carrington, the town centres and the Regional Centre by a choice of modes of transport, [including walking and cycling](#);

MAIN MATTER 8.3

What is the justification for reference to provision of 850 new dwellings at Partington? Have higher or lower figures been considered and, if so, why were they rejected?

Council's Response

8.3.1 Partington in RSS terms lies within the southern part of the City Region and as such residential development should meet local needs and support local regeneration strategies.

8.3.2 Partington is in need of investment in its local economy and diversification of housing stock. The figure of 850 units is what the Council has determined to support the regeneration of Partington during the Plan period, by contributing to a more diverse and sustainable community broadening the housing types and tenures and supporting the redevelopment of the local shopping centre.

8.3.3 There is already an outline planning permission for 550 units (H/OUT/68617, granted July 2010). The remaining 300 units will be provided on brownfield land within Partington.

8.3.4 In 2007, work began on a Partington Area Action Plan. Although work on this was halted so that the Core Strategy could advance, and the above planning applications submitted, a range of housing numbers were tested for Partington, and subsequently reproduced in the Core Strategy - Preferred Options stage tested three spatial options for the Borough, with a range of 700 to 1,000 units for Partington. The figure of 850 units is considered deliverable within the Plan period and is supported by the capacity identified in the SHLAA. It is considered that this the appropriate level to even out existing inequalities in the Partington area.

MAIN MATTER 8.4

Has a viability appraisal been undertaken that demonstrates that 850 residential units are sufficient to meet the regeneration needs of Partington?

Council's Response

8.4.1 A number of viability appraisals have been undertaken for Partington, although there is no one appraisal which addresses this specific question. The Council is therefore confident that the level of development proposed is sufficient and capable of meeting the regeneration needs of Partington.

MAIN MATTER 8.5

With specific reference to the 5th and 6th bullet points of L3.4 what is their justification regarding their requirements for open space provision?

Council's Response

- 8.5.1 Both Trafford's Green and Open Spaces – An Assessment of Needs (CD 8.11.4) and the Partington Area Action Plan Baseline Report (CD 8.7.9) show Partington as a place that has ample provision of open space but lacks accessible and quality open space.
- 8.5.2 The 5th bullet point will allow for development and the loss of some amenity land providing that the quality of other open space land within the vicinity is improved to compensate for its loss.
- 8.5.3 The 6th bullet point refers to contributions that are required as a result of the needs of new development. As it is considered that there is sufficient quantity of open space in the area this requirement will be to improve quality in line with standards set out in R5. It is suggested that the 5th and 6th Bullet points are redrafted to make it clear that the 5th bullet point refers to compensation for the loss in quantity of amenity space and the 6th bullet point refers to contributions required by residents of new development in line with R5. Suggested Changes 200.20 and 200.21 of CD12.4 respectively detail these changes.

Suggested Change 200.20

Where development is proposed on amenity open space this will be allowed provided this will not lead to a deficiency in open space in Partington and works/ contributions are is provided will be required to secure improvements to the quality of remaining areas of open space, ~~while ensuring that standards of sufficiency, as set out in Policy R5, are achieved~~

Suggested Change 200.21

In addition to works/improvements made by means of compensation for loss of amenity space contributions will be required to meet the needs of new residents ~~Additional contributions towards the provision/improvement of open space and public realm in and around the township over and above the contributions required in accordance with Policy R5 may be required in order to fund improvements to the quality of open space.~~

MAIN MATTER 8.6

For clarity should the last bullet point of L3.4 be amended to simply refer to the tests of PPS25, rather than paraphrasing them?

Council's Response

- 8.6.1 Agree with amendment suggested in Representation PU-1045-333. Suggested Changes 200.22 details this change.

Suggested Change 200.22

Developers will be required to locate uses classified in PPS25 as being 'more vulnerable' to flooding such as residential, certain leisure uses, healthcare and educational facilities outside Flood Zone 3 unless the relevant policy test set out within PPS25 can be met.

MAIN MATTER 8.7

What is the commitment referred to in the first sentence of L3.5? Is this a planning application? Clarification is required.

Council's Response

8.7.1 The term Partington Canalside refers to an outline planning permission for 550 houses (H/OUT/68617, granted planning permission July 2010). The development of this new housing will support the redevelopment of local shopping centre in Partington.

MAIN MATTER 8.8

As an additional bullet point to L3.5 should the protection and enhancement of the wildlife corridor at Partington canal-side be highlighted?

Council's Response

8.8.1 A green access loop has been incorporated within the canalside housing development which will carry forward the principles of the wildlife corridor - reference is made to this in paragraph 12.17 of the Plan.

8.8.2 Further to this Policy R2 provides guidance on the protection of the natural environment including wildlife corridors.

MAIN MATTER 8.9

What is the justification for the 2nd and 4th bullet points of L3.5, which require developer contributions over and above those required by policy R5 in order to fund improvements to the quality of the open space and the provision of public transport infrastructure?

Council's Response

8.9.1 It is proposed that the 2nd bullet point is redrafted in line with 8.5 above for clarity. This is detailed in Proposed Change 200.23 (CD12.4).

8.9.2 This amendment will make it clear that contributions towards open space are in line with R5 unless development is on amenity land when a contribution may be required to improve the quality of other open space as a means of compensation.

8.9.3 It is proposed the 4th bullet is amended to clarify that contributions should be equivalent to SPD 1 Developer Contributions to Highways and Public Transport Schemes not in addition to it in line with the suggestions made by rep PU1045/334 and Proposed Change 200.25 (CD12.4).

Suggested Change 200.23

Where development results in a loss of amenity space provide ~~additional~~ contributions towards the provision/improvement of open space and public realm in and around the township by means of compensation. Additional contributions may be over and above the contributions sought to meet the needs of new residents ~~required~~ in accordance with Policy R5 ~~may be required in order to fund improvements to the quality of open space~~.

Suggested Change 200.25

Provide public transport contributions equivalent to SPD1 and work with the Council and its Partners to ensure that they are directed towards transport and accessibility projects that will deliver sustainable transport benefits to Partington.

MAIN MATTER 8.10

For clarity should the 3rd bullet point of L3.5 be amended to simply refer to the tests of PPS25, rather than paraphrasing them?

Council's Response

8.10.1 Agree with amendment suggested in Representation PU-1045-334. Suggested Change 200.24 in CD12.4 details this change.

Suggested Change 200.24

Locate vulnerable uses such as those identified in PPS25 outside of the areas identified as Flood Zone 3 unless the relevant policy test set out within PPS25 can be met.

Policy L4 and Appendix 1**MAIN MATTER 8.11**

Should policy L4 be re-ordered to clearly reflect the priority that should be afforded to pedestrians in the movement hierarchy?

Council's Response

8.11.1 Policy L4 will be reordered as follows: Paragraphs L4.2 – L4.4 (The Strategic, Primary and Local Highway Network) will be moved to take the place of paragraphs L4.6 – L4.8, and paragraphs L4.6 – L4.8 (Pedestrian and Cycling Network) will be moved to take the place of paragraphs L4.2 – L4.4. Proposed Change 200.26 (CD12.4) details this change.

Suggested Change 200.26

[Reordering of text to read [together with subsequent amendment to paragraph numbers]]:

Pedestrian and Cycling Network

L4.6 The Council will work with partners and developers to promote active travel through walking and cycling.

L4.7 In particular, the Council will seek to develop a network of pedestrian and cycle routes and associated facilities to provide safe, secure, convenient and attractive cycling and footpath access linking residential areas to schools, workplaces, tourist and leisure facilities, including promoting the integration of cycling and walking at public transport interchanges, as part of longer journeys.

L4.8 Developers should demonstrate, through the planning application process how their development will contribute towards these connections and deliver quality cycle and walking infrastructure where appropriate.

The Strategic, Primary and Local Highway Network

L4.2 The Council will protect and support the maintenance and Improvement of the Strategic Road Network and the Primary and Local Highway Authority Network, to ensure that they operate in a safe, efficient, and environmentally sustainable manner.

L4.3 The Council will not grant planning permission for new development that is likely to have a significant adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the Strategic Road Network and the Primary and Local Highway Authority Network unless and until appropriate transport infrastructure improvements and/or traffic mitigation measures and the programme for the implementation are secured.

L4.4 When considering proposals for new development that individually or cumulatively will have a material impact on the functioning of the Strategic Road Network and the Primary and Local Highway Authority Network the Council will seek to ensure that the safety and free flow of traffic is not prejudiced or compromised by that development in a significant adverse way either by ensuring that appropriate transport infrastructure improvements and/or traffic mitigation measures and the programme for their implementation is secured, or by securing contributions in accordance with SPD1: Developer Contributions to Highway and Public Transport Schemes, or by a combination of these means.

MAIN MATTER 8.12

What is the evidence to demonstrate that policy L4 is justified, realistic and will be effective in delivering a sustainable, integrated transport network, to ensure that development will be located in sustainable locations?

Council's Response

8.12.1 The following evidence base has informed the development of policy L4: PPG13: Transport (CD 2.1.16), Greater Manchester LTP2 (CD 4.3.1) and draft LTP3, Salford Quays and Trafford Park Accessibility Study (CD 8.6.1), the Trafford LIP (CD 6.2.15), Trafford Phase 1 LDF Transport Modelling work (CD 8.6.3) and the Accessibility Plan in Appendix 4 of SPD1 (CD 7.2.30).

8.12.2 The Council is working with the Highways Agency and GMPTE to undertake further LDF Transport Modelling work – Phase 2a (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b, to identify detailed highway and public transport network requirements that will inform the preparation of the Land Allocations DPD, and ensure that development comes forward in a sustainable manner and in accessible locations. The commitment to this work is set out in the Agreed Statement(s) with the Highways Agency (Appendix 3.8a) and GMPTE (Appendix 3.8b).

MAIN MATTER 8.13

Is it a reasonable requirement of the last sentence of L4.1 (e) that necessary transportation infrastructure is put in place before first occupation of developments? Or would it be more appropriate for such infrastructure requirements to be phased with development?

Council's Response

8.13.1 Further to Suggested Change 27 (SC27) to the Publication Document (CD6.1.2), the last sentence of L4.1 (e) will be amended as follows: "Any necessary public transport, highways or freight schemes required to support each phase of the development should be in place before first occupation of that phase, or a reliable mechanism put in place to ensure that it will be delivered to the required standard and timescale agreed by the Council and its partners." This is detailed in Proposed Change 200.27 of CD 12.4.

Suggested Change 200.27

Any necessary public transport, highways or freight schemes required for each phase of the development should be in place before first occupation of that phase, or a reliable mechanism put in place to ensure that it will be delivered to the required standard and timescale agreed by the Council and its partners; ~~of developments;~~

MAIN MATTER 8.14

Which proposals to the transportation network that are referred to in policy L4 have been costed and have a realistic chance of being funded and delivered during the plan period?

Council's Response

8.14.1 The Local Infrastructure Plan (CD6.2.15) is a 'living' document that contains the most up-to-date information regarding transport proposals. This information was updated in Appendix 5.6 of the Council's response to the Inspectors preliminary questions (CD12.3) to reflect the current status and funding of infrastructure proposals.

8.14.2 The proposals for the transportation network will be updated in the LIP in due course, following the adoption of LTP3 and upon completion of the Phase 2a (CD12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b LDF Transport Modelling work, and will be incorporated into the Land Allocations DPD.

MAIN MATTER 8.15

Should the requirements of L4.5 be more flexible in its aim to improve the frequency and reliability of public transport; funding may not be forthcoming and there may be more appropriate, cheaper alternatives?

Council's Response

8.15.1 L4.5 will be reworded to be more flexible in its approach, but also ensuring that it does not compromise the overall vision and objectives of the plan in terms of future transport needs. This is detailed in Suggested Change 200.28 in CD 12.4.

Suggested Change 200.28

The Council will seek to secure improvements to the frequency and reliability of the public transport network and support further development ~~the development~~ of a high quality integrated public transport network where possible, that will encourage and promote:

MAIN MATTER 8.16

Should L4.5 include an additional point that informs that the route of the Metrolink light rail network will be protected as a designated transport corridor in the Land Allocations DPD?

Council's Response

8.16.1 Paragraph L4.9 already covers matters in regard to safeguarding transport routes, and delegates the identification of such routes to the Land Allocations DPD. The process of identifying public transport corridors/routes (that may include Metrolink) to be safeguarded will be informed by the outcomes of Phase 2a (CD 12.3 – Appendix 5.4) and 2b LDF Transport Modelling work and in consultation with GMPTTE.

MAIN MATTER 8.17

What are the ABC area types referred to in Appendix 1? Clarification is required.

Council's Response

8.17.1 Paragraph 13.22 in the justification text for Policy L4 (*CD 6.2.1*) sets out the definition of the areas covered by these three area types (A, B and C).

MAIN MATTER 8.18

What is the justification for the cycle standards set out in Appendix 1, which appear to differ from those for Greater Manchester?

Council's Response

8.18.1 The standards detailed in the Core Strategy are in line with those set and progressed through the NW Plan Partial Review (*CD3.1.2*). The standards comply with national policy as set out in PPG13: Transport (*CD 2.1.16*). These standards were subject to an 'Examination in Public' and the Panel report (not issued) (*CD 12.21*) was generally supportive of the standards, by implication they are therefore in accordance with PPG13. A few minor additions deal with specific land uses not covered within the RSS partial review.

MAIN MATTER 8.19

From the wording of L4.11 it is not clear if freight traffic will be permitted on the canal. If it will not, the policy and paragraph 13.15 would be inconsistent. Greater clarity is required.

Council's Response

8.19.1 The Bridgewater Canal is an integral part of the Cheshire Cruising Ring one of the original cruising rings of the modern canal era. The Council therefore believes the statement at paragraph L4.11 is appropriate in this recent historic context. Paragraph 4.10 indicates the Council's intention to safeguard and promote the Manchester Ship Canal for the movement of goods. Paragraph 4.11 indicates that the Bridgewater Canal is to be promoted for leisure/educational use only. Paragraph 13.15 refers to the Council's wish that the waterways collectively are maintained for their economic, social and environmental potential. Paragraphs 13.16 and 13.17 indicate that it is the intention of the Council to concentrate on promoting only the Manchester Ship Canal as a sustainable freight transport route servicing the substantial employment areas of the Borough that are closely associated with it.

MAIN MATTER 8.20

Which is the 'associated SPD' that is referred to in the last bullet point of L4.12? When will it be produced/adopted?

Council's Response

8.20.1 The associated SPD referred to in the last bullet point of L4.12 will be a Trafford Travel Plan Guidance SPD. The intention is to produce this SPD following the adoption of LTP3 and the Core Strategy.

Policy L5**MAIN MATTER 8.21**

The form and content of policy L5 has changed significantly since the Preferred Options stage. Is it now too detailed, complicated and onerous, and as a consequence, will it be effective? Does it contain detail that is more appropriately provided in SPD? Should the policy therefore be amended to reflect only the key elements necessary to provide appropriate policy hooks for intended forthcoming SPDs?

Council's Response

8.21.1 The Policy was revised further to provide greater information for its implementation, in line with guidance set within the PPS1 Climate Change Supplement and the additional evidence base becoming available. The PPS1 Supplement requires local evidence base to justify carbon emissions reduction targets, including specific opportunities for use of decentralised and renewable energy. Trafford has used Greater Manchester and Trafford specific evidence base to justify a two tier system for carbon reduction across Trafford. The Trafford specific evidence base justifies Trafford setting its own CO2 emission reduction targets for development growth areas alongside the Greater Manchester targets. Trafford has two evidence base documents to support Policy L5, which include viability testing (AGMA Decentralised Energy Study (CD 4.4.1) and Trafford Low Carbon Study (CD 8.4.9 – Chapter 5)).

8.21.2 The level of detail within Policy L5 has been considered and the minimum guidance necessary for users to understand the requirements of the Policy is included. To help applicants the Council encourages pre-planning application discussions to engage in dialogue regarding carbon emissions reduction opportunities for the development site. This is to ensure the applicant understands the policy and is best placed to apply the policy effectively to their development.

8.21.3 The draft Planning Obligations SPD (CD12.26) and accompanying Technical Note (CD12.30) contains further supporting information to detail the delivery of Policy L5.

MAIN MATTER 8.22

Following recent update of part L of the Building Regulations is the policy necessary at all? Does it duplicate other legislative requirements?

Council's Response

8.22.1 The Policy complements the Part L Building Regulations/Code for Sustainable Homes (CfSH), but does not advance the CfSH levels and timescales except in the case of the Low Carbon Growth Areas (i.e. high development growth areas) where higher CfSH equivalent level is justified and viable as detailed in the evidence base - Trafford Low Carbon Study (CD 8.4.9). The high development growth areas and therefore existing high energy users were tested and identified as having the potential to deliver a minimum carbon emissions reduction target of 40% and create viable low/zero carbon energy networks. Viability testing is to be required as part of the Carbon Budget Statement which will be required to support all planning applications.

8.22.2 This position is further explained in the draft Planning Obligations SPD (CD12.26) and accompanying Technical Note (CD12.30).

MAIN MATTER 8.23

What is the local and specific justification in Trafford to make achievement of targets for the Code for Sustainable Homes mandatory rather than voluntary? Has the potential impact of this requirement on the viability of development delivery been tested?

Council's Response

8.23.1 The targets for the Code for Sustainable Homes are a mandatory standard set by central government.

8.23.2 The carbon emissions reduction targets detailed in Policy L5 have undergone viability testing in the Trafford Low Carbon study (CD 8.4.9 – chapter 5). The Council will expect them to be met unless the developer can demonstrate to the Council's satisfaction that the costs associated with meeting the targets would render the development non-viable.

MAIN MATTER 8.24

Is the policy sufficiently flexible to take account of individual site viability issues?

Council's Response

8.24.1 The Policy takes into account that individual developments may not be able to deliver low carbon infrastructure on-site and makes provision for a "carbon-offset" payment to be made in the form of a developer contribution instead. More detail on viability issues are detailed in the draft Planning Obligations SPD (CD12.26).

Policy L6

MAIN MATTER 8.25

No questions

Council's Response

8.25.1 No response.

Policy L7

MAIN MATTER 8.26

Should policy L7 also include a requirement for development to promote biodiversity and landscape/townscape character?

Council's Response

8.26.1 The Council's approach is to use the policy guidance set within Core Strategy Policy R2, which details that developers need to demonstrate how a proposal will protect and enhance the respective features of the natural environment.

8.26.2 In Policy L7 supporting text on good design seeks to minimise the impact on the natural environment as detailed in PPS1 and ensure that the Borough's character and environment are enhanced.

Policy W3

MAIN MATTER 8.27

No questions

Council's Response

8.27.1 No response.

Policy R5

MAIN MATTER 8.28

Is the Council's approach to the provision of indoor sports and recreation justified and effective?

Council's Response

8.28.1 The Councils approach is in accordance with PPG 17 which places a duty on planning authorities to provide accessible, high quality open space sport and recreation facilities which meet the needs of residents and visitors. Therefore using audit information from the Leisure Management Review (*CD8.11.3 table 2 page 15*) carried out in 2008, deficiencies were identified and the Council has sought in its policy approach to address these deficiencies and provide improved facilities within the Borough. Policy R5 provides the basis for addressing these deficiencies.

MAIN MATTER 8.29

Are the quantity standards and accessibility thresholds supported by robust, up-to-date evidence?

Council's Response

8.29.1 Quantity standards for open space and outdoor sports have been set based on local amounts of provision from 2009 audits (CD 8.11.11 and 8.11.7) respectively and The Greenspace Strategy (CD 8.11.2 page 32). Play space standards and thresholds have been set based on nationally recognised and widely acknowledged and used standards (Fields in Trust Planning and Design for Outdoor Sport and Play 2008 Chapter 4. Available in hard copy only due to copy right. Appendix 8.29 contains an extract of the standards from the pre 2008 documents that were superseded by the former.). Thresholds were also set from analysis of the community consultation section of the Trafford Green and Open Spaces Assessment of Need June 2005 (CD8.11.4, page 25). This consultation found 64% of people travel less than a mile to the Greenspace they use. Swimming Pool and indoor sports standards and thresholds have been set based on supply and demand modelling carried out by consultants Strategic Leisure in the Leisure Management Review Summary of Key Issues Report 2008 (CD: 8.11.3 table 2 page 15). These sources of evidence are considered to be robust and up to date.

MAIN MATTER 8.30

With particular reference to the requirement for development to contribute towards the provision of swimming pools, health and fitness facilities and cemeteries is the method of calculation for these contributions justified and reasonable?

Council's Response

8.30.1 Consultants Strategic Leisure identified using modelling based on Sport England methodology a deficiency in their Key Issues Report 2008 (CD8.11.3 Table 2, page 15) as part of the Councils Strategic Leisure Review a deficiency in swimming pools and health and fitness facilities. In order to address this deficiency Policy R5 sets a standard for this provision. The method for calculating whether new development should contribute to the provision is set out in the draft Planning Obligations SPD (CD12.26) and accompanying Technical Note (CD12.31). In summary this methodology will only require a contribution if there is a deficiency within the accessibility zone of the development and any contribution collected will be spent within this area to improve accessibility of provision. The SPD also sets out that contributions towards cemeteries will be negotiated in line with the needs of the development and available provision at the time of the development as no standard is set in the Policy. It is considered this a justified and reasonable approach.

MAIN MATTER 8.31

Was the qualitative section of the need assessment of Trafford's Green and Open Spaces updated in 2010, as referred to in paragraph 25.3? If so, does the policy reflect its findings?

Council's Response

8.31.1 Quality assessments of many of the open spaces have been carried out using methodology set out in the Greenspace Strategy (*CD: 8.11.2, page 33*) Assessments will be ongoing and information updated as it becomes available. The latest assessments are listed in the accompanying Green Infrastructure Technical Note (CD12.31) linked to the Planning Obligations SPD (CD12.26) and will be used to inform the methodology of calculating contributions to Green Infrastructure.

**APPENDIX 8.6 - LAP LEAP NEAP REQUIREMENTS EXTRACT FROM
NPFA STANDARDS**

**Extract from Appendix D of
The NPFA Six Acre Standard**

**Summary of the
Characteristics of Children's Play Areas**

Facility	Time	Walking Distance	Radial (Straight Line) Distance	Minimum Size Activity Zone	Nearest Dwelling	Characteristics
LAP (Local Area for Play)	1 min	100m	60m	100m ²	5m from Activity Zone ¹	Small, low-key games area (may include "demonstrative" play features)
LEAP (Local Equipped Area for Play)	5 min	400 m	240m	400m ²	10m from Activity Zone ²	5 types of play equipment, small games area
NEAP (Neighbourhood Equipped Area for Play)	15 min	1,000m	600m	1,000m ²	30m from Activity Zone ³	8 types of play equipment, opportunities for ball games or wheeled activities

¹ To forward-most part of dwelling that faces the LAP

² To property boundary

³ To property boundary