



Active
Travel
England

ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit: Checklist User Manual



May 2023



© Crown copyright 2023

This publication is licensed under the terms of the Open Government Licence v3.0 except where otherwise stated. To view this licence, visit <https://www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/doc/open-government-licence/version/3/> or contact, The National Archives at www.nationalarchives.gov.uk/contact-us. Where we have identified any third-party copyright information you will need to obtain permission from the copyright holders concerned. This publication is also available on our website at www.gov.uk/government/organisations/active-travel-england

Cover photo by Jim Stephenson

ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit: Checklist User Manual

Published: May 2023

Next review: September 2023

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This document has been prepared as a desktop guide for users of the Active Travel England (ATE) Planning Application Assessment Toolkit. It includes brief instructions on how to use the toolkit and is supported by examples.
- 1.2 The ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit is not in itself the determinant of a planning application. Its purpose is to allow the user to assemble the evidence and assess the development proposal against current expectations. Users are expected to use their professional judgement in providing an evidence-based recommendation.

Required Knowledge

- 1.3 This guide has been developed to lead the assessor through the process required to assess planning proposals against existing policy requirements and technical guidance.
- 1.4 The ATE Standing Advice Note contains the policies and guidance that should be referred to in assessing the application. Guidance on key technical matters is provided in Manual for Streets (MfS) and the National Model Design Code (NMDC). It is also important that the appraiser refers to Inclusive Mobility and the following sections of Local Transport Note 1/20 – Cycle Infrastructure Design (LTN 1/20):
 - Thresholds that determine whether people cycling should mix with traffic, or where separation is needed (Figure 4.1)
 - Requirement for appropriate crossings (Table 10-2 – Crossing design suitability)
 - Geometrical requirements of infrastructure (Table 5-2 – Cycle lane and track widths and associated tables)
 - Locations where shared use is appropriate (para 6.5.6, section 1.6 (2) and table 6-3 – Recommended minimum widths), and
 - Junction Assessment Tool (Appendix B).

Before you start

- 1.5 Before assessing an application, the assessor should review key documents submitted as part of the planning proposal.
- 1.6 Essential documents include:
- The Planning Statement
 - The Design & Access Statement (DAS) including masterplan
 - Transport Assessment /Statement (including any technical notes and highway drawings)
 - Travel Plan
 - Delivery & Servicing Plans
- 1.7 In order to understand local policy expectations in relation to the proposed development the following documents should also be reviewed:
- The Local Plan and Local Plan Site Allocations document
 - The Local Transport Plan or any other authority-wide Transport Strategy or infrastructure plan
 - Area Action Plans (AAP), Spatial Frameworks or other published Design Briefs, Guides and Codes
 - Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plans (LCWIPs)
 - Any previous planning applications or ATE Appraiser Report
- 1.8 Transport Assessments and Statements are sometimes prepared at different stages of the planning proposal to planning and design documents. Therefore, these documents do not always provide sufficient detail, making it imperative to review the initial sections of the Planning Statement and the 'opportunities' analysis within the DAS to understand the evolution of the development proposals regarding accessibility and connectivity.
- 1.9 The DAS will often reveal the reasons why an applicant has either chosen or declined to pursue certain options. Understanding these issues ensures that assessors are well-informed about site constraints and opportunities.

1.10 Where the Toolkit is used to provide pre-application advice, to help develop a proposal, or assess a potential Local Plan site allocation, not all the above documents may be available. In this case the Toolkit can be used to assess the available information, giving a more strategic overview and informing the user of what additional information is required to develop a comprehensive proposal. The toolkit allows for the user to indicate where certain information is not yet presented or not applicable to the assessment being undertaken.

Other resources

- 1.11 This User Guide should be read alongside the guidance notes provided within the ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit itself. These are located within the Cover & Triage sheet.
- 1.12 Other resources available include the ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit Tutorial Video which will be available online.
- 1.13 ATE has will also publish the following materials that are designed to complement this User Guide and give more context on ATE's approach to development management:
- Development Management Procedural Guidance for Local Planning Authorities
 - ATE Standing Advice Note: Active travel and sustainable development

Using the Toolkit

2. Cover & Triage (Red Tab)

- 2.1 The Cover and Triage sheet provides an overview of the site and its wider planning context. This is largely for internal use by ATE for understanding the local area and existing policy situation. However, this would also be of potential use where there is a need to become familiar with the site, its surroundings, and the local policy situation, for instance where an applicant is preparing a Transport Assessment.
- 2.2 It is important to note that if using the Cover & Triage sheet, you will need to complete this in its entirety before commencing assessment using the Checklist. Due to the background formulae within the toolkit, if you return to the Cover & Triage sheet having carried out the checklist assessment this may cause later inputs to the checklist assessment sheet to lose data.

Location, Reference Number and Status – Blue Section

The cell names and row numbers are shown in bold with corresponding advice.

- **Site Address (C6)** – this should match that on the local authority website.
- **Local authority reference (C7)** – this is the planning application number.
- **Above the ATE Statutory Threshold (C8)** – Above 150 dwellings, 7,500 square metres non-residential floor space,- or over 5 hectares in area.
- **Local Planning Authority/Local Highway Authority (C9 &10)** – select from drop down menu.
- **Completion date (C12)** – the date assessment should be completed in DD/MM/YY format.
- **Application stage (C13)** – select from drop down menu.
- **Application type (C14)** – select from drop down menu. If the application is a 'hybrid' application, select 'Detailed'.

Site Description, Planning Context and Policy Background – Orange Section

- **No. of Residential units/GFA/Area (C16)** – This should include a summary of the development proposals.
- **Planning Context cell (C17)** – This information will form part of the Appraiser Report (see example in **Figure 1** below). This should include whether the site is allocated in the local plan; proximity to existing or planned active travel routes; proximity to other existing or planned developments; local planning history for the site, as well as any other relevant planning applications.

Figure 1 – Planning Context

<p>Is the development allocated or part of an emerging local plan/Has ATE commented on it previously/does it relate to an ATF scheme or other bid for govt funding/does it relate to neighbouring sites</p>	<p>The scheme is not an allocated site in the 2014 Local Plan, but it is considered a suitable site for regeneration in the 2021 Site Allocations and Capacity review.</p> <p>This was part of an ATE Pilot Scheme. There are no ATE schemes/bids nearby.</p> <p>There is a plan for a new cycleway in the LCWIP – Route 12</p> <p>Committed development ABD/18/0567 to the north will impact on the site.</p>
---	--

- Planning Policy Background (C18)** – This should summarise the relevant planning policies, such as: local plan, including any site allocations or development management policy documents; adopted or emerging Local Cycling & Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP); relevant Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs), including Spatial Frameworks; Area Action Plans (AAP); Design Codes; and section 106 charging schedules. For each document, the assessor must state the year of publication, whether it is emerging or adopted and include a URL alongside any relevant information.

Deciding when to use the Checklist or Full Assessment

- 2.3 In most cases the use of the Checklist will be sufficient to determine whether the proposal has provided sufficient active travel opportunities to make a step change in walking, wheeling and cycling, however in some cases a Full Assessment should be carried out. This will also be available online.
- 2.4 The Checklist contains 31 criteria and is recommended as the standard approach for assessing planning applications and pre-application enquiries of varying detail and asks the user to comment and confirm the acceptability or otherwise of the proposal being analysed.
- 2.5 The Checklist is more closely aligned with planning policy and therefore bears more relevance to an assessment made at the Development Management stage.
- 2.6 The Full Assessment contains a considerably higher level of detail and sets out a scoring approach to provide an overall rating for the site. This is relevant to the preparatory stages of an urban extension or where a reserved matters application or submitted Design Code requires a greater level of detailed scrutiny.

3. User Input – Checklist (Orange Tab)

- 3.1 The User Input tab comprises the main body of the assessment and is where the development proposals are assessed and reported against a series of criteria.
- 3.2 In most cases, this information is contained within the planning application, as part of Planning Statements, Transport Assessments/Statements, Travel Plans, Design & Access Statements, Masterplans and other submitted drawings and reports. These are available on the LPA website and need to be considered by the user of the toolkit to complete the assessment.
- 3.3 For each of the criteria, the user must only complete the three unlocked columns as shown below in **Figure 2** – the *Rating*, the *Appraiser Comments* and any *Relevant Local Policy* as appropriate. All other cells are locked.

Figure 2 – User Input

Rating	Appraiser Comments	Relevant local policy
1	<p>The TA includes a multimodal trip generation and distribution. Data is included on existing multimodal trips.</p> <p>The trip rates are based on TRICS with an adjustment for modal shift towards active travel and bus journeys.</p>	Local Plan 2014 – T1 (transport assessments);
0	<p>The TA has a general description of the local highway network but does not have a detailed qualitative analysis such as that included in LTN 1/20 (app A). The surrounding cycle network is not LTN1/20 compliant in a way that will enable the desired level of active travel from the site, and this has not been stated or addressed in the TA.</p> <p>No speed surveys or traffic flows on routes to local amenities have been provided.</p>	Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections);

Rating

- 3.4 The criteria are split into five colour-coded categories, as shown below in **Table 1** and are ordered within the toolkit to provide a logical progression through the proposals as submitted, starting with scrutiny of the wider strategic and off-site situation before continuing to the detailed on-site matters.

Table 1 – Sequencing of Assessment categories

Category	Rows
Transport Assessment	7, 8, 23
Off-site infrastructure/facilities	9 to 17
On-site and Off-site infrastructure/facilities	18 to 22
On-site infrastructure/facilities	24 to 36
Travel Plan	37

Table 1 Colour coding of criteria

- 3.5 The submitted **Transport Assessment** must provide quantitative and qualitative analyses of the active travel environment surrounding the site. An evaluation of the quality of current walking, wheeling and cycling infrastructure should be provided and the future trip generation forecast based on well thought out and realistic yet ambitious assumptions for the take-up of active travel and the future provision of active travel infrastructure, schemes and initiatives.
- 3.6 **Off-site infrastructure/facilities** should conform to the latest available guidance, be of high-quality design and support a significant shift towards active travel. Additionally, it is important that deliverability is demonstrated through detailed plans and safety audits as necessary.
- 3.7 **On-site and Off-site infrastructure/facilities** should follow the principles noted above. These criteria are grouped on the basis that there will be times when they are proposed on-site and occasions where they are located off-site.
- 3.8 **On-site infrastructure/facilities** should follow the principles noted above and should ensure that placemaking and active travel are at the centre of the planning proposal and the permeability of the site is maximised.
- 3.9 The **Travel Plan** should have an ambitious series of targets, monitoring, review and remedial measures/funding to be actioned in the event that the targets are not achieved.
- 3.10 For each criteria the user should read the associated description and scoring guide, noting whether the submission meets the criteria. The assessor can then select the most appropriate rating from the options available in the drop-down, which will feed directly into the Appraiser Report.
- 3.11 The drop down Rating column provides five options:
- **Pass (1)** can be selected if the criteria are met in full.

- **Fail (0)** can be selected if the criteria do not meet the policy/guidance and the user considers there is no clear way to remedy this (i.e. through a request for further information or condition).
- **Further Information Required** – can be requested if not enough detail has been provided.
- **Recommended for condition/contribution** – may be applied to secure specific improvements.
- **N/A** – The criteria can be excluded if it is not required by the application at this stage; for example an outline application may not include a detailed design of internal infrastructure.

3.12 It should be noted that the Checklist Assessment does not include scores of 2 and 3 as the user is being asked to make a more binary judgement on whether the development is acceptable or not in the context of planning policy and design guidance, as opposed to the graded scoring system requested by the Full Assessment.

Appraiser Comments

3.13 The assessor should introduce and provide justification for each rating clearly linked to policy and guidance. These comments will feed directly into the Appraiser Report and should therefore be factual and quantitative and based on the evidence assembled (see Figure 2).

3.14 The level of detail provided will depend on the score, with greater explanation needed where a criterion is scored 0, where a condition/financial contribution is recommended, or where more information is required.

Relevant local policy

3.15 Where there is local policy that overrides national policy (e.g. more onerous cycle parking requirements), these should be specified in this column.

3.16 Where there are multiple policies, these should be separated with semicolons, as they will feed into the Appraiser Report. (see Figure 2).

3.17 National policies will be referred to in the Appraiser Report, so are not required to be entered here.

4. Appraiser Report (Green Tab)

4.1 This section of the toolkit comprises the summary report of the inputs the user has made up until this point. Most cells will be locked and auto-populated with content from the two previous tabs. Please note the user will need to highlight all cells and go to **Format>AutoFit Row Height** to ensure all text is visible. The only unlocked cells which require assessor input are:

- **Decision (checklist only):** This is the assessor's overall recommendation and the most important part of the assessment: Does the application meet policy requirements, enabling and prioritising active travel? Where there are issues, could these be realistically addressed post-consent? Two recommendations on the pull-down menu – 'Do not wish to comment' and 'Refer this application to standing advice' are for the use of ATE.
- **Appraiser – general comments:** This is a summary of the evidence gathered to date to support the recommendation. It should highlight the main points and compliance/non-compliance with policy requirements and draw out the key observations, including the opportunities and strengths of the proposals, alongside the areas of concern and any changes or further information that may be required.
- **Appraiser – next steps (checklist only):** These are the recommended next steps for the LPA. This could include the suggestion of a discussion with the applicant, the requirement for further information or the involvement of relevant third parties, for instance the Local Highway Authority or National Highways.
- **Summary of Detailed Assessment:** The number of occurrences of each deliberation table is auto-populated from the User Input sheet and allows the user to briefly identify what matters have not been considered, what conditions or obligations are necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms and what key concerns remain. The number of excluded criteria, recommended conditions/financial contributions and fail flags are automatically populated here and the evidence should be assembled as shown in **Figure 3** below.
- **Assessment Report:** The criterion and outcome from the User Input sheet is auto-populated here, while the Appraiser Comments column confirms the previous assessment made by the reviewer. The Relevant Policy section provides a summary of local policy from the User Input sheet and automatically generates national policy relevant to each criterion where fail flags are apparent and where there is a recommendation of a condition/obligation. The final column provides a suggested reason for refusal relevant to each criterion where a fail flag has been raised. An example of this is shown in **Figure 4** below.

Figure 3 Summary of Detailed Assessment (example)

	Count	Appraiser Comment
Excluded criteria	3	<p>The route to the closest bus stop has been excluded as although it is acceptable in design no regular, frequent service stops there.</p> <p>Links to adjacent sites have been excluded, as there are no sites immediately adjacent to this application site.</p>
Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	7	<p>At this stage in the process, conditions are required for the lighting on the route between the site, crossings on drawing XXX and XXX, improvement of bus stops, crossing on the proposed spine road, cycle parking and showers and locker. More conditions/obligations may be required if additional information and mitigation are submitted to the planning authority.</p>
Fail flags	6	<p>Five of the six fails refer to external infrastructure, the need to understand the nature and conditions of the current network and, therefore, what needs to be done to make the key walking, wheeling and cycling routes compliant with current standards and, therefore, safe and attractive to potential residents. There is also a need to improve the bus services within 400m of the site and strengthen the travel plan to meet the ambitious modal shift targets in the Travel Plan. If this work is carried out and the package of measures for active travel and bus services is strengthened, the proposal can be made acceptable in terms of active travel.</p>

Excluded criteria: An explanation of why some criteria have been excluded from this assessment. For sites which are at the early planning stages, the assessor could indicate whether they should be considered at the later planning stages.

- **Recommendation for condition/financial contribution:** An explanation of which aspects of the development can be dealt with through condition or financial contribution.
- **Fail flags:** A summary of the main failures, clearly indicating which policy the proposals are not complying with and whether they can be addressed in the future.

Figure 4 Assessment Report (example)

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
TRAVEL PLAN	FAIL	The travel plan contains targets over a 5 year period that show a substantial increase in walking, cycling and bus use. The plan does not contain adequate measures to achieve these targets. The cycle infrastructure is inadequate for the volume of use, there are no incentives to travel on bus services or use bikes (such as cycle training, help to buy, cycle hire scheme). No correlation has been made between the mitigation/schemes and the achievement of targets nor information provided on what interventions would be put in place if the targets were not achieved.	NPPF 113 Planning Policy Guidance: Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements; Local Plan 2014 – T3 (Effective travel plans)	The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the negative impacts of the development can be effectively minimised through a commitment to deliver an effective and targeted Travel Plan with ambitious/ achievable targets that will be regularly reviewed/effectively monitored and robustly actioned if the development fails to meet its ambitions to minimise its impact on the local environment.

5. Troubleshooting

5.1 Throughout the Toolkit there are guidance notes, marked by a small red triangle in the top right corner of the relevant cell. Please refer to these as you progress through the Toolkit for further tips and guidance. ATE will continue to develop the Toolkit to ensure it is user-friendly. **Table 2** below refers to some of the common issues raised during testing. If assessors identify any other issues, please notify ATE at Planning-Advice@ActiveTravelEngland.gov.uk.


Table 2 – Troubleshooting

Issue	Solution
Links and formulas not working	Formulas may have been corrupted or altered. The Toolkit relies on formulas that are generated by hidden/locked worksheets. Please refer to the master copy of Toolkit to resolve issues.
Not possible to complete relevant sections	Toolkit only works if sections/sheets are completed in the order they appear. For example, start at row 4 of the Cover & Triage sheet and proceed to complete each row in order, to unlock the relevant user assessment.
Error with locked cells	Refer back to the master copy or speak to ATE if not possible to resolve.
Unable to adjust row heights	Most row heights auto-adjust, but some require manual adjustment. You will therefore need to adjust this (Format>AutoFit Row Height) before finalising.
Ratings disappear from User Input sheet	This can happen if you go back to change the Cover and Triage Sheet. You will have to reinsert the data. See paragraph 2.2 on order of input.
Formatting/formula failures/ adjustments	The formulas have been set up within the toolkit to work and are linked to numerous hidden worksheets. It is therefore strongly advised that these are not disrupted/ altered and that you download the toolkit from our website. Each sheet is password protected to protect the integrity of the toolkit and prevent accidental edits.

6. Further Information

- 6.1 Please refer to the Sample Checklist User Report which follows for an example of the Cover and Triage, User Input and Appraiser Report sections of the Planning Application Assessment Toolkit.
- 6.2 For any questions and/or support please contact us:
Planning-Advice@ActiveTravelEngland.gov.uk.

Sample Checklist User Report

 Active Travel England	Active Travel England Planning Application Assessment Tool – Appraiser Report
Site address	1 Station Road, Anytown, Anyshire
Local authority reference	ABC/23/1234/FUL
ATE Scheme reference	
Local Planning Authority	North Yorkshire
Local Highway Authority	North Yorkshire Council
Completed by – name	Assessor Name
Completion date	00 January 1900
Application stage	Application
Application type	Detailed
Model version	1.5
Assessment outcome	FAIL
Decision (appraiser)	Recommend the application be refused

Policy Background/Wider Context

The scheme is not an allocated site in the 2014 Local Plan, but it is considered a suitable site for regeneration in the 2021 Site Allocations and Capacity review.

This was part of an ATE Pilot Scheme. There are no ATE schemes/bids nearby.

There is a plan for a new cycleway in the LCWIP – Route 12

Committed development ABD/18/0567 to the north will impact on the site.

Appraiser – General Comments

This application is for 800 dwellings and community buildings. It is a full application, and therefore the Transport Assessment, Travel Plan, Masterplan, Design and Access Statement and Design Code have been assessed as to whether they meet the requirements of national and local policy pertaining to Active Travel and, in particular, to the paragraphs 104, 110 and 111 of NPPF and the transport policies in the Local Plan of Anyshire.

The application was assessed using the ATE Planning Application Assessment Toolkit; the assessment details can be seen below. In summary, the transport assessment needed to fully assess the local highway network to ensure that appropriate active travel links could or have been identified and committed to in the planning application. The local junction does not cater sufficiently for people on bikes, and the proposals do not meet the required standards. The proposed cycle routes do not meet appropriate standards in terms of the type of cycleway and geometry. The level of public transport service is insufficient for residents to rely on, and the opportunities to propose sustainable transport modes have not been taken up regarding diverting or improving local bus services. The rationale for the ambitious targets in the travel plan needs to be clarified, and the schemes and initiatives within it need to be considered robust enough to deliver them.

In addition to the details above, further information is required on several issues outlined below in order to assess whether the scheme is acceptable. Further detail is required on the actual walking distances from the site, the speeds and traffic flow on Speedy Road, the lighting strategy for cycle routes, the walking and cycling network for the site and the traffic calming strategy for the site.

The applicant has yet to demonstrate to the satisfaction of Active Travel England that the development has prioritised pedestrian and cycling movements within the scheme and with neighbouring areas and will, therefore, not provide a genuine choice of transport modes for future residents. Hence the proposal is contrary to national policy and the relevant policies in the Local Plan and unacceptable to Active Travel England.

Appraiser – Next Steps

It is recommended that the Local Planning Authority pass these comments to the developer to be reviewed and responded to. If the developer or the transport consultants wish to discuss any changes to the application, mitigation or further information, ATE would be available to meet with the applicant. It is suggested that this is in the presence of the Local Planning Authority and Highway Authority.

Should the planning authority be minded to approve the application, further consultation concerning conditions and S106 obligations should take place.

	Count	Appraiser Comment
Excluded criteria	2	The route to the closest bus stop has been excluded as although it is acceptable in design no regular, frequent service stops there. Links to adjacent sites have been excluded, as there are no sites immediately adjacent to this application site.
Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	7	At this stage in the process, conditions are required for the lighting on the route between the site, crossings on drawing XXX and XXX, improvement of bus stops, crossing on the proposed spine road, cycle parking and showers and locker. More conditions/obligations may be required if additional information and mitigation are submitted to the planning authority.
Fail flags	6	Five of the six fails refer to external infrastructure, the need to understand the nature and conditions of the current network and, therefore, what needs to be done to make the key walking, wheeling and cycling routes compliant with current standards and, therefore, safe and attractive to potential residents. There is also a need to improve the bus services within 400m of the site and strengthen the travel plan to meet the ambitious modal shift targets in the Travel Plan. If this work is carried out and the package of measures for active travel and bus services is strengthened, the proposal can be made acceptable in terms of active travel.

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Quantitative analysis	PASS	<p>The TA includes a multimodal trip generation and distribution. Data is included on existing multimodal trips.</p> <p>The trip rates are based on TRICS with an adjustment for modal shift towards active travel and bus journeys.</p>		
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Qualitative analysis	FAIL	<p>The TA has a general description of the local highway network but does not have a detailed qualitative analysis such as that included in LTN 1/20 (app A). The surrounding cycle network is not LTN1/20 compliant this has not been stated or addressed in the TA. No speed surveys or traffic flows on routes to local amenities have been provided.</p>	<p>NPPF 113 Planning Policy Guidance: Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)</p>	<p>The applicant has failed to assess the quality and capacity of the surrounding movement network to accommodate the demands that would be placed on it by the proposed development</p>
Local Amenities	More info needed	<p>Some distances of facilities have been provided but they are “as the crow flies” rather than actual distances residents would have to walk, wheel or cycle. They have also been provided from the centre of the site meaning that not all residents are included.</p>		

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Walking routes to a primary school	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	The walking route to school is adequate for most of the route. However, the section from the site to School Road is unlit. Street lighting should be provided to current standards in order provide a safe route.	NPPF 92c, 110a, 112abc; National Model Design Code 64vi/U.3.iii; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections) Local Plan 2014 – T3 (encouraging walking and cycling to school)	
Walking routes to a food shop	PASS	The walking route to local convenience store is adequate. (a crossing is being provided see below)		
Suitability for walking and wheeling (external to the site)	PASS	The widths of the footways are adequate but dropped kerbs are required. See below		

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Safety at junctions (off-site)	FAIL	The signalised junction of Busy Road with Speedy Road has no crossing facilities for people on bikes. The junction does not meet the standards in the LTN1/20 junction assessment tool. The advance stop lines do not have lanes leading to them and no safety audit has been provided.	NPPF: 110c, 112b; National Model Design Guide: 58ii; Inclusive Mobility Guidance (DfT); CIHT designing for walking LTN 1/20; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	The proposed development is unlikely to maximise the number of trips to and from the site by sustainable modes of travel by failing to take into account the accessibility needs of people who are walking, wheeling or cycling and users with specific mobility needs
Cycle routes to key destinations	FAIL	Two of the provided routes have sections that do not conform with LTN1/20. In addition, further information is required to understand if they comply in other areas. Details are outlined in the crossing, safety and shared use sections of this form.	NPPF 92c, 110a, 112abc, 110c National design guide M2 83; National Model Design Code: 64 iv/U.3.i; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	The proposed development does not offer sufficient enhancement to the local cycle network that would enable and encourage access to and from the site by bicycle.

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Cycle Safety on links (off-site)	More info needed	Cycleways are provided on Speedy Road and Narrow Road. Both these roads have speed limits of 30mph however Speedy Road is long and straight and no speed surveys have been provided to show the current 85th percentile of the road or the current flows. This will impact width of the cycleway or the separation of the cycleway from the carriageway. (LTN1/20 tables 5-2 and 6-1).		
Crossings (external to the site)	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	The route to the nearest convenience store includes crossing the B1234. A parallel crossing of the road is suggested and shown on drawing xxx and includes adequate visibility splays and a safety audit. Dropped kerbed crossings at X,Y and Z as shown in drawing xxxx are required.	NPPF 110c, 112a, 112b; National Model Design Guide: 58ii/M.2.ii; LTN 1/20 and other highway guidance; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Shared use routes (external to the site)	FAIL	Busy Road 1. Speed limit 40mph, 2. Increasing ped and cycle movements by 835 all day (365 cycle and 470 walking) and the current data shows over 300 peds an hour use the route in peak times. 3. A shared use footway/cycleway 3.5m wide is proposed. This does not conform to LTN 1/20 – 6.5.6 4. It connects to an existing segregated shared use footway/cycleway. However this is not LTN1/20 compliant, the number of pedestrians make it inappropriate especially outside the school. 5. There is pavement parking managed and unmanaged.	LTN 1/20, NPPF 112abc; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	The proposed development fails to ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists
Physical barriers for cycle users (on and off-site)	PASS	There are no steps or barriers.		
Lighting (on and off site)	More info needed	The design code provides no information on lighting for cycleways. This needs to be addressed.		

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Walking routes to nearest transport nodes	N/A – exclude	The route is acceptable in design terms however the bus service is not adequate and is too far away.		
Access and provision of public transport	FAIL	Not all of the site is within 400m walking distance of regular service, that will meet everyday needs. The only bus stop close to the site has two services a day serving it. The closest regular services are 800m from the site.	NPPF 112a; National Model Design Code: 50, 58i/M.1.ii; CIHT Buses in urban developments A.4.5; Local Plan 2014 – T4 encourage the use of bus services.	The proposed development is located in an area where sustainable travel patterns cannot be achieved as a result of the distance from existing public transport facilities and/or the lack of viability of promotion of new public transport services
Active Travel infrastructure enabling use of public transport	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	The bus stop improvements to the two bus stops south of the access point on Station Road (northbound and southbound) outlined in paragraph 5.2 of the Transport Assessment should be secured by condition.	NPPF 112b CIHT Buses in urban developments B.7.2; Local Plan 2014 – T4 encourage the use of bus services.	

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
TRANSPORT ASSESSMENT: Proposed Infrastructure	FAIL	The transport assessment proposes improvements to infrastructure, however as outlined in other areas of this checklist the infrastructure proposals are not all LTN1/20 compliant and the design is not always supported by the relevant evidence.	NPPF 113 Planning Policy Guidance: Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	The proposed development has not provided/ offered a sufficient level of detail/ funding/ infrastructure necessary to actively enable and encourage trips within and/or to/ from the site by alternative modes to the private car.
Site permeability	More info needed	The walking and cycling network has not clearly been shown on the masterplan. It is not clear if a direct, convenient walking and cycling network is being provided.		
Walking and cycling access	PASS	There are more pedestrian and cycle accesses shown on the masterplan. The accesses are useful and will provide more attractive links to local facilities and neighbouring residential sites.		
Future-proofing and safeguarding	N/A – exclude	There are no adjacent sites proposed in the local plan or in committed developments.		

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Through traffic	PASS	There are no opportunities for the spine road to be used as a shortcut. A bus gate is provided on the spine road allowing only public transport to use both accesses.		
Safety at junctions (internal to the site, including site accesses)	PASS	The internal junctions are shown as having side treatments and have appropriate radii.		
Design speed of new streets	More info needed	Details of the street design including any proposed traffic calming, radii of bends should be provided. They should conform with the current standards for traffic calming for a 20mph road and be included in the design code.		
Crossings (internal to the site)	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	There is no pedestrian/cycle crossing provided to link the community centre to the residential area on other side of the spine road or to link the two bus stops provided in the same area.	NPPF 110c, 112a, 112b; National Model Design Guide: 58ii/M.2.ii; LTN 1/20 and other highway guidance; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Suitability for walking and wheeling (internal to the site)	PASS	The routes are acceptable and the details are included in the design code.		
Cycle safety on links (Internal to the site)	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	The routes are acceptable and the details are included in the design code. Except for lighting see above.	NPPF 112a, 112c National Model Design Code: 58ii/M.2 LTN 1/20; Local Plan 2014 – T5 (High quality streets for people)	
Shared use routes (internal to the site)	PASS	The routes are acceptable and the details are included in the design code.		
Car parking layout	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	An outside and small underground car park would be provided by development. This includes 10% of visitor parking with a minimum of 1 space plus 1 disabled car parking space for each new dwelling designed to be wheelchair accessible. Ensure all of the bays have electric vehicle charging.	NPPF: 104e, 110c; Local Plan T10 – Car parking in new development	

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
Cycle Parking	PASS	No off-street parking is available, but the development provides secure external cycle parking in line with LTN 1/20. All recommended measurements in table 11.2 are exceeded and 10% of spaces available for larger cycles.		
Trip end facilities for cycling (Destinations)	Recommendation for condition/ financial contribution	All necessary facilities are included in the development. Only 1 shower per 15-cycle spaces is provided. It is recommended that this should be 1 shower per 10-cycle parking spaces.	LTN 1/20 11.4.12 BREEAM; Local Plan 2014 – T2 (High quality sustainable transport connections)	

Criterion	Outcome	Appraiser comments	Relevant policy	Reason for potential refusal
TRAVEL PLAN	FAIL	The travel plan contains targets over a 5 year period that show a substantial increase in walking, cycling and bus use. The plan does not contain adequate measures to achieve these targets. The cycle infrastructure is inadequate for the volume of use, there are no incentives to travel on bus services or use bikes (such as cycle training, help to buy, cycle hire scheme). No correlation has been made between the mitigation/schemes and the achievement of targets or information provided on what interventions would be put in place if the targets were not achieved.	NPPF 113 Planning Policy Guidance: Travel Plans, Transport Assessments and Statements; Local Plan 2014 – T3 (Effective travel plans)	The applicant has failed to demonstrate that the negative impacts of the development can be effectively minimised through a commitment to deliver an effective and targeted Travel Plan with ambitious/ achievable targets that will be regularly reviewed/effectively monitored and robustly actioned if the development fails to meet its ambitions to minimise its impact on the local environment.

