

**THE ECONOMIC REGENERATION AND TRANSPORT SCRUTINY PANEL
THE TRANSPORT ELEMENT OF THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK
– ACTION PLAN**

9 October 2012

SCRUTINY RECOMMENDATION	PROPOSED ACTION	BY WHOM	BUDGET COST	TIMESCALE
1. That all planning applications for large sites should include measures to improve traffic flows and avoid congestion and, where possible, provide funding for public transport subsidies.	All planning applications where appropriate will be accompanied by a transport assessment which will consider the transport impacts of the proposed development. Where required developments will need to provide for mitigation measures to address these impacts, including accessibility via public transport	Derek Gittins / Paul Clarke	Nil	Aug 2012
2. That, where appropriate, the agreed transport infrastructure is put in place prior to the development of a particular site.	The Council will work closely with its development partners on major regeneration schemes to ensure that funding is in place and that the necessary transport infrastructure is provided at appropriate times to facilitate development. For other developments the Council will use the S106 and S278 processes to ensure that the necessary infrastructure is provided either before development commences or at appropriate times during the development period.	Derek Gittins / Paul Clarke	Nil	Aug 2012

<p>3. That efforts should be made to ensure that the Tees Valley Area Action Plan (AAP) and Local Development Framework (LDF) are aligned as closely as possible. Since the AAP covers all developments across the Tees Valley it should be regularly reviewed to ensure any resultant transport infrastructure measures have a positive impact on proposed developments in Middlesbrough.</p>	<p>The development database for the Area Action Plan is derived from the Local Development Framework review process. The AAP is updated to reflect changes in development identified through such reviews. Through involvement with the Tees Valley Transport and Infrastructure Group, Middlesbrough's interests will be given strong representation.</p>	<p>Derek Gittins</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>Aug 2012</p>
<p>4. That the Highways Agency decision on outstanding planning permissions for south Middlesbrough is provided as soon as possible in order to accurately inform the revised AAP.</p>	<p>The Council, the Developers and Highways Agency have now reached a decision to provide mitigation measures as part of the current planning applications within south Middlesbrough. The Highways Agency are full partners in the work on the Area Action Plan.</p>	<p>Derek Gittins</p>	<p>Nil</p>	<p>September 2012</p>
<p>5. That further consideration should be given to the introduction of the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), in consultation with neighbouring Local Authorities, to assess how it could be implemented equitably to improve transport network schemes for the mutual benefit of all Authorities.</p>	<p>The introduction of CIL will require the Council to have in place an up to date strategy and revised evidence base. This cannot be achieved until the LDF review has been completed. The introduction of CIL at this stage will then allow the Council to capture value from appropriate developments as they come forward. CIL will be advanced at this stage in line with the regulations and provisions in place at that time. Consideration will be given to working with other Tees Valley authorities.</p>	<p>Paul Clarke</p>	<p>There will be costs associated with the preparation of the CIL charging scheme and inquiry, but these are unknown at this stage.</p>	<p>April 2014</p>

<p>6. That in respect of the transport infrastructure options for Middlehaven, the scrutiny panel's view is that, finance permitting, Option Three, to include a swing bridge, would be the preferred solution. Although Option Two may be the most deliverable option in the current financial climate, this should not preclude the development of a swing bridge in the future.</p>	<p>The Infrastructure proposals for the revised Middlehaven Masterplan will take on board the Scrutiny Panels recommendations. As part of the Masterplan development an investigation into the viability and affordability of a bridge over the dock will be considered. The options for appraisal will include a swing bridge option. However, this is expected to be more costly to build and maintain on a static bridge.</p>	<p>Derek Gittins</p>	<p>To be assessed as part of the Masterplanning work</p>	<p>September 2012</p>
<p>7. That issues concerning young people's transport access to MyPlace are addressed as a matter of urgency, particularly in the light of the earlier recommendation made by the Children and Learning Scrutiny Panel and approved by The Executive in June 2009.</p>	<p>Interim transport arrangements are in place up until March 2013. These are using mini buses run and paid for by the Youth Community Centres on a cluster basis. However when the centres close it is proposed to transfer the buses to MyPlace who will need to fund their operation. As yet no funding has been identified. The transport officers in Highways and Transportation will work with officers of MyPlace to try to reach a sustainable transport provision going forward.</p>	<p>Derek Gittins</p>	<p>To be ascertained through exploring transport options.</p>	<p>Dec 2013</p>