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Matter 2 Spatial strategy

Main issue - Does the JLP set out the most appropriate strategy to deliver the vision, objectives and outcomes set out in the plan, which is justified, and consistent with national policy?

Evidence Base and Submission documents referenced in this Matter Statement

- JLP Integrated Assessment (Reg 19 stage) - Appendix XII (JLP19L)
- JLP Integrated Assessment - Appendix IX (SUB9I)
- JLP Integrated Assessment - Appendix X (SUB9J)
- Plymouth Retail Study (EC9)
- Plymouth Green Space Strategy (EN4)
- Playing Pitch Strategy Needs Assessment: South Hams and West Devon (EN17)
- Plan for Playing Pitches (Plymouth) (EN20)
- Plan for Playing Pitches (Plymouth) - Appendix 1 (EN20A)
- South Hams and West Devon Playing Pitch Strategy (EN21)
- South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24)
- West Devon Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN25)
- Plymouth Play Assessment (EN26)
- Plymouth Policy Area Open Space Assessment (EN34)
- Baseline Transport Conditions Report (T18)
**Issue 2.1: Spatial strategy (Policies SPT1 and SPT2)**

**Question 2.1(i)**

*Policies SPT1 and SPT2 provide lists of sustainable development principles: are they necessary, justified and consistent with national policy? As the policies in the JLP when considered as a whole should form the framework for delivering sustainable development within the plan area, are the policies effective and is it clear how they will be used by decision-makers when considering development proposals?*

*Policies SPT1 and SPT2 provide lists of sustainable development principles: are they necessary, justified and consistent with national policy?*

2.1 We believe that Policies SPT1 and SPT2 are necessary, justified and consistent with national policy.

2.2 In explaining how we reach this view, it is important to understand how the JLP has been structured in order to present a coherent development plan that promotes sustainable development within the context of the vision and aspirations of local communities (para 150 of the Framework).

2.3 The starting point is the Vision for the Plan Area set out in Chapter 2, which is linked to the plan’s policies through 12 Strategic Objectives (SOs). These SOs progress from the overarching spatial strategy (SO1), to setting out spatial principles and priorities for the two Policy Areas (SO2-10), to setting out key principles around how the plan aims to address development issues (SO11) and be delivered (SO12). This is shown diagrammatically in Appendix 1.

2.4 Policies SPT1 and SPT2 sit under SO1. As the overarching objective for the spatial strategy, SO1 sets the tone for the rest of the plan. The SPT policies are strategic policies (cf para 156 of the Framework) and establish at the outset key spatial principles for sustainable development, the overall needs that the plan is seeking to meet and the sustainable strategy for the distribution of development to meet these needs.
2.5 SPT1 and SPT2 are deliberately placed as the first policies of the plan in order to establish from the outset that the plan is fundamentally about the delivery of sustainable development (see para 3.12 of JLP).

2.6 Policy SPT1 follows the lead given by para 7 of the Framework which identifies three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These three roles are expressed in SPT1 under the categories: a sustainable economy, a sustainable society and a sustainable environment. SPT1 is designed to be a strategic policy that the rest of the plan is built upon.

2.7 Policy SPT2 takes one particular dimension of sustainable development, namely the sustainability of the places where people live in the plan area. It establishes some key principles of about the achievement of sustainable neighbourhoods and communities. As for SPT1 and explained later in answer to this question, the provisions of this strategic policy can be tracked through the plan.

2.8 Were these policies not to be in the plan, its overall ethos and clarity of purpose would be significantly weakened. We believe that it is necessary for the plan to have weighty strategic statements about the delivery of sustainable development, and that an effective way to do this is through strategic policies. This view is supported in the JLP’s Sustainability Appraisal (see SUB9I, page 2), which acknowledges that the Framework provides a certain level of guidance but contends that without these policies the plan ‘would fail to fully convey a locally appropriate policy for sustainable development as the framework for growth and change in the plan area’.

2.9 Overall, the inclusion of these policies is justified because a strategy with sustainable development at its heart is ‘the most appropriate strategy, when considered against the reasonable alternatives, based on proportionate evidence’ (para 182 of the Framework).

2.10 Policies SPT1 and 2 were drafted to reflect well established principles of sustainable development which are given
expression in the Framework and other national documents, and other local documents (see below). Furthermore, the policies have been informed by the Integrated Assessment that was published as part of the JLP’s Regulation 19 consultation. This includes an appraisal of earlier drafts of these policies with recommendations on some amendments, which were subsequently accommodated in the published plan (JLP19L – pages 9 and 10; published again in SUB9J – pages 9 and 10).

2.11 We believe that Policies SPT1 and SPT2 are consistent with national policy.

2.12 The Framework’s opening sentence (in its Foreword) says: ‘The purpose of planning is to help achieve sustainable development.’ Para. 14 then says that ‘a presumption in favour of sustainable development ... should be seen as a golden thread running through both plan-making and decision-taking’. As illustrated below, Policies SPT1 and SPT2 set the plan up to meet this overarching objective of national policy.

2.13 Policy SPT1 interprets and amplifies the provisions of para 7 to a Plymouth and South West Devon context. The identification of the three roles of sustainable development reflects what is already set out in national policy in para 7 of the Framework. Just as para 8 of the Framework recognises that the three roles are mutually dependent, so too do we agree that this is the case in respect of the three roles set out in SPT1. It is the role of the rest of the plan to explain how these principles are applied in the development context in a way that delivers a sustainable economy, a sustainable society and sustainable environment.

2.14 Some of examples of where individual elements of SPT1 are supported through the Framework are given below:

- SPT1.1i (Business growth) – cf Framework para 17, 3rd bullet point, which identifies a core planning principle of proactively drive and support sustainable economic development.
- SPT1.1iv (low carbon economy) - cf Framework para 7, 3rd bullet point, which identifies the objective of moving to a low carbon economy.
- SPT1.2ii (sustainable and health promoting transport) – cf Framework para 29, which identifies the important role of transport in facilitating sustainable development and also contributing to wider sustainability and health objectives.
- SPT1.2iv (resilient communities and climate change) – cf. Framework para 99, which speaks of the need to avoid increased vulnerability to the range of impacts arising from climate change.
- SPT1.3i (effective use of land) – cf. Framework para 111, which says that plans should encourage the effective use of land by re-using land that has been previously developed.
- SPT1.3iii (overall gains in biodiversity) – cf Framework para 109, which highlights the objective of minimising impacts on biodiversity and providing net gains in biodiversity where possible.

2.15 The JLP Councils have aimed to keep the policy at a high level applying generic principles rather than excessive detail and repetition with the Framework. We think this approach is encouraged in the NPPG which says: ‘In drafting policies the local planning authority should avoid undue repetition, for example by using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development. There should be no need to reiterate policies that are already set out in the National Planning Policy Framework.’ (our emphasis).

2.16 Policy SPT2 is a continuation and evolution of previous provisions of the Plymouth Core Strategy (see Appendix 2) and expanding the philosophy to cover the towns and settlements of South Hams and West Devon. The approach set out in the Plymouth Core Strategy was guided by an Urban Task Force report called ‘Towards and Urban Renaissance’. A diagram from this report was included on page 21 of the Plymouth Core Strategy (see Appendix 3). This illustrates some of the key principles that continue to be promoted through the JLP.

2.17 The approach in the JLP is considered to be consistent with the Framework’s objective of promoting healthy communities (section 8), which amongst other things promotes:
• Mixed use centres (para 69 and SPT2.1).
• Safe and accessible environmental (para 69 and SPT2.7).
• Social, recreational and cultural facilities (para 70 and SPT2.9).
• Access to high quality open spaces and sport and recreation (para 73 and SPT2.9).

2.18 Other provisions set out in SPT2 also support different parts of national policy as set out in the Framework. For example:
• Support for expansion of high speed broadband (para 43 and SPT2.3)
• Mixed housing (para 50 and SPT2.4)
• Good design and local distinctiveness (para 57 and 60, and SPT2.10)

2.19 In addition to the Framework, other government departments have published policy and guidance which is relevant to the aims of these policies. For example:
• The Department for Transport – Cycling and Walking Investment Strategy – April 2017. Para. 2.17 says that through their local plans, LPAs should ensure developments are located where the need to travel can be minimised and use of sustainable modes maximised. This includes siting ‘key facilities such as primary schools and local shops within walking distance of most properties …’ (see Appendix 4).

As the policies in the JLP when considered as a whole should form the framework for delivering sustainable development within the plan area, are the policies effective and is it clear how they will be used by decision-makers when considering development proposals?

2.20 Although Policies SPT1 and SPT2 are both designed to set the plan’s foundation as being about sustainable development, it is most certainly not the case that the JLP considers these policies to represent the totality of what the plan says about sustainable development. Again, the plan seeks to take a lead from the Framework which sets its own policy statements about sustainable development at the outset (including particularly paras 6-16) and then proceeds to set out national policy about
how sustainable development will be delivered. It is the same with the JLP, albeit fitted to a development plan and Plymouth and South West Devon context.

2.21 Some examples of the connections between SPT1, SPT2 and the plan as a whole are described below. These demonstrate how the policies work together to provide a clear framework for development decisions, and which will also be amplified by supplementary planning documents where appropriate:

- **SPT1.1i** (opportunities for business growth) is provided for in terms of meeting an Objectively Assessed Need for employment land in SPT4; with DEV14 seeking to maintain a flexible supply of sites to facilitate business growth and DEV15 responding to the particular needs of the rural economy.
- **SPT1.1iv** (low carbon economy) and **1.2v** (sustainable energy) are supported through strategic policies about the sustainability of transport systems including a transport hierarchy (SPT9) and development policies that promote low carbon development (DEV34) and renewable energy (DEV35 and 36).
- **SPT1.2i** (mixed neighbourhoods) is supported by SPT2 (setting out key principles for sustainable communities) and the other policies that support SPT2 (see below).
- **SPT1.3ii** (biodiversity) is supported through strategies policies relating to the natural environment (SPT11 and 13) and a range of development policies (in particularly DEV28).
- **SPT2’s provisions for sustainable communities** are supported and amplified through many policies, including for example neighbourhood access to shops (SPT5 and DEV18), tackling severance and a hierarchy of transport which includes the neighbourhood level) (SPT9), access to sport and recreation (DEV3 and 4), access to allotments (DEV5), a mix of housing (DEV7, 8 and 9), ensuring access to employment (particularly DEV14.1ii), accessible greenspace (DEV29), and community infrastructure (DEV32).
• Additionally, many of the area and site specific policies (PLY and TTV policies) build on the sustainability criteria set out in SPT1 and 2.

2.22 In this respect, in combination as appropriate with other policies of the plan and SPD, SPT1 and SPT2 will be used to help decision-makers consider development proposals. Decisions will need to make reference to whether the proposals meet the plan’s requirements for sustainable development, and this will be determined to a significant extent by the extent to which they satisfy the strategic principles set out in these policies.

**Question 2.1(ii)**
Para 3.17 (p18 of the JLP) states that the measures/standards set out in figure 3.2 will be used in implementing Policy SPT2 when considering development proposals. Does this need to be clearly set out in policy and are the measures/standards justified?

2.23 The measures set out in Figure 3.2 are set out for the purpose of helping the LPAs and applicants interpret some of the sustainable community measures set out in SPT2, rather than being set out in the policy itself. We have taken this approach in recognition that defining sustainable development is not an exact science and there needs to be some recognition of site specific achievability and qualitative as well as quantitative factors in reaching a planning judgment. We think this approach is consistent with NPPG guidance which encourages ‘using generic policies to set out principles that may be common to different types of development.’ However, we have no objection to a modification to the policy which makes clear that Figure 3.2 will be used to help the LPAs reach a judgment in the implementation of SPT2. This could be through a wording change to point 12, as set out below.

‘12. Provide positive outcomes in relation to the characteristics, aspirations and measurable standards set out in figure 3.2 and through any supplementary planning document linked to this plan.’
2.24 We believe that there is sufficient justification for each of the measures, as summarised / signposted below.

2.25 **Walking distance to nearest bus stop:** Para 6.2.9 of Baseline Transport Conditions Report (T18) applies a 400m standard for Plymouth. Appendix 5 highlights extracts from a list of publications where guidance is provided on walking distances (there are many others). 400m walk time is a commonly used standard and has been used in Plymouth as part of its planning process for many years. The Institute of Highways and Transportation (CIHT) referenced in the Appendix sets out in Table 3.2 suggested acceptable walking distances within town centre contexts of 400m. Department for Transport ‘Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan-Technical Guidance for Local Authorities’ in Fig 11 identifies 400m as the minimum distance for core walking zones. 400m represents approximately a 5 minute walk (para 3.30 of CIHT report).

2.26 A different standard of 600m is proposed for the TTV Policy Area. This is justified on the basis of the different nature of rural areas, which don’t have the same concentration of public transport modes as urban areas. Para 3.31 of the CIHT document acknowledges that factors such as the availability, cost and convenience of alternatives transport modes will affect acceptable walking distances. Table 3.2 of the CIHT document identifies 400m as a desirable walking distance standard outside of town centres and 800m as acceptable. A mid-point for TTV is considered to be a reasonable aspiration for rural towns.

2.27 **Walking distance to nearest local convenience store:** An aspiration of a 10 minute walking distance for local convenience stores (800m) is identified and considered reasonable for the plan. 800m has been used in the Plymouth Retail Study EC9 (para 3.16 and Appendix D) to help identify areas which are deficient in food shopping. 800m is identified as an acceptable walking distance in Table 3.2 of the CIHT report.

2.28 **Walking distance to nearest primary school:** An aspiration of a 10 minute walking distance for the nearest primary school (800m) is identified and considered reasonable for the plan.
is a little lower than the 1000m acceptable walking distance in Table 3.2 of the CIHT report but higher than the 500m desirable figure. This is considered appropriate given that the context for this aspiration is primary schools and the CIHT advice relates to schools as a generic category. Plymouth City Council’s Sustainable Mode of Travel to School Strategy (see Appendix 5) recognises that the actual walk to school distances are much shorter than common perceptions with the realistic walk threshold for primary schools being set at 800m.

2.29 **Walking distance to nearest local accessible natural space:** The plan provides for different standards for the two Policy Areas, given that they are informed by different open space studies.

2.30 The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area (400m) is identified in Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, see particularly para 4.6 which explains the rationale for the standard).

2.31 The standard for the TTV Policy Area (300m) is identified in the South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, page 21) and the West Devon equivalent (EN25 page 22). It reflects the Natural England national standards for Accessible Natural Greenspace (‘Nature Nearby’ Accessible Natural Greenspace Guidance, Natural England, March 2010).

2.32 **Walking distance to nearest local playable space / LEAP:** The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area has been aligned with that for the TTV Policy Area (400m), replacing the previous Plymouth standard of 600m as identified in Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, para 4.15), to support a consistent approach across the entire Plan Area. 400m follows Fields in Trust accessibility standards (see Appendix 5). See South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, page 27) and the West Devon equivalent (EN25 page 26).

2.33 **Walking distance to nearest neighbourhood/strategic playable space:** The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area has been aligned with that for the TTV Policy Area (400m), replacing the previous Plymouth standard of 600m as identified in Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, para 4.15), to support a consistent
approach across the entire Plan Area. 1000m follows Fields in Trust accessibility standards (see Appendix 5). See South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, page 27) and the West Devon equivalent (EN25 page 26).

2.34 Allotments / community food growing space: The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area has been aligned with that for the TTV Policy Area to enable a whole plan area approach, replacing its former standard of 0.12 ha per 1000 people as identified in Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, para 3.33). This is explained in para 7.6 of the Plymouth Policy Area Open Space Assessment (EN34). See South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, page 29) and the West Devon equivalent (EN25 page 28).

2.35 Urban local nature reserves: This standard is only applicable to the Plymouth Policy Area. Its inclusion is justified by Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, see paras 3.6-3.7)

2.36 Accessible natural greenspace: The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area (5.09ha per 1,000 people) is justified by Plymouth’s Green Space Strategy (EN4, see paras 3.6-3.7 and 3.16).

2.37 In relation to the standard for the TTV Policy Area the South Hams and West Devon OSSRs have different standards identified. However, these were prepared at a time when it was anticipated that there would be two local plans, one for South Hams and one for West Devon. Given that the context is now of a Joint Local Plan with a TTV Policy Area a pragmatic judgement has been taken to create a single standard for the TTV area.

2.38 The standard of 1.5 ha. per 1,000 people identified in Figure 3.2 is based on adoption of the West Devon standard for the TTV Policy Area (EN25, section 3.3).

2.39 However, on further consideration, it is more robust to take a blended approach between the South Hams and West Devon standards and this will be proposed through a further recommended minor modification. The proposed single standard for the TTV area will be 1.91ha per 1,000 people across
the entire TTV area. This figure takes into account the standard of 1.5ha per 1,000 people within the West Devon Open Space Sport and Recreation Study (EN25, section 3.3.3), and the standard of 2.18ha within the South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, section 3.3.3). The single TTV standard of 1.91ha per 1,000 people is a mid-point between the respective Borough/District figures taking into account their respective total areas of Accessible natural greenspace and population sizes.

2.40 Playing pitch standard: The standard for the Plymouth Policy Area (0.79ha per 1,000 people) is justified by Plymouth’s Plan for Playing Pitches (EN20A, see calculation near bottom of page 7).

2.41 As for Accessible natural greenspace, the South Hams and West Devon OSSRs have different standards. Therefore a further minor modification will be proposed for a single standard of 1.27ha per 1,000 people across the entire TTV area. This figure takes into account the standard of 1.37ha per 1,000 people within the West Devon Open Space Sport and Recreation Study (EN25, section 3.3.3), and the standard of 1.20ha per 1,000 people within the South Hams Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study (EN24, section 3.3.3). The single TTV standard of 1.27ha per 1,000 people is a mid-point between the respective Borough/District figures taking into account their respective Playing Pitches requirements and population sizes.

2.42 Access to broadband: This standard (min 25 Mbps to all premises) is justified on the basis that government policy is to deliver superfast broadband (min 24 Mbps) to 95% of premises by the end of 2017 (see Appendix 6). Plymouth has 99% superfast broadband coverage (for min 24 Mbps and min 30 Mbps definitions) as at November 2017. The figures for South Hams and West Devon are 81%/80% and 76%/74% for 24Mbps and 30Mbps coverage respectively, with a project called ‘Connecting Devon and Somerset’ in place looking to achieve 100% minimum 24 Mbps coverage by 2020 (https://www.connectingdevonandsomerset.co.uk/about-us/). ADSL (copper telephone line based) speeds can theoretically be
up to 24 Mbps. OFCOM and the EU have defined superfast broadband as a minimum of 30 Mbps. 25 Mbps is a superfast benchmark often used elsewhere (e.g. in the US). 25 Mbps has been adopted as a ball park high speed level blending the variety of definitions/benchmarks described above.
APPENDIX 1: PLAN STRUCTURE
APPENDIX 2: PLYMOUTH CORE STRATEGY 2007 - SUSTAINABLE LINKED COMMUNITIES

Strategic Objective 3
Delivering Sustainable Linked Communities
To develop sustainable linked communities throughout the city, by:-
1. Ensuring a sufficient size, scale and density, and the right layout to support basic amenities in the neighbourhood for people’s day to day lives.
2. Ensuring that new development minimises the use of resources (including land).
3. Ensuring that new development takes place where it can promote the effective and sustainable use of resources (including land and infrastructure).
4. Promoting a thriving mixed use centre for each community.
5. Promoting a well integrated mix of housing types and tenures to support a range of household sizes, ages and incomes to meet identified housing needs.
6. Promoting a fully accessible neighbourhood served by good public transport, walking and cycling and other transport infrastructure both within the community, as well as linking it to adjoining communities and the city as a whole.
7. Providing for a safe, accessible and healthy local environment, and for urban cooling with well designed public and green spaces.
8. Supporting and enhancing the quality of public services and amenity provision to meet the needs of all of the community, including provision of education and training opportunities, health care, community facilities, leisure and recreation.
9. Promoting a positive sense of place and identity for each neighbourhood.

Policy CS01
Development of Sustainable Linked Communities
The Council will improve the sustainability of the individual communities and neighbourhoods in the city through allocating sites for development and considering proposals for development in terms of the extent to which they:
1. Contribute to meeting the needs of the neighbourhood, helping to support a sustainable linked community.
2. Deliver development of an appropriate type, form, scale, mix and density in relation to its location relative to the neighbourhood’s centre.
3. Safeguard and capitalise on the local environment, including the need to deliver effective and sustainable use of resources.
4. Contribute to promoting a positive sense of place and identity.
5. Contribute to creating a well connected, accessible, inclusive and safe community.
APPENDIX 3: SUSTAINABLE LINKED COMMUNITIES
PRINCIPLES

2.35 Through their Local Plans and planning decisions, local planning authorities should ensure developments that generate significant movement are located where the need to travel will be minimised and the use of sustainable transport modes can be maximised. Local Plans, prepared in consultation with local communities, should protect and exploit opportunities for the use of sustainable transport modes for the movement of goods or people. Developments should be located and designed where practical to:

- give priority to pedestrian and cycle movements, and have access to high quality public transport facilities
- create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians
- site key facilities such as primary schools and local shops within walking distance of most properties, particularly within large-scale developments
APPENDIX 5: WALKING STANDARDS IN PUBLICATIONS


Identifying Core Walking Zones

6.14 Once the walking trip generators have been identified, Core Walking Zones (CWZs) can be defined. CWZs normally consist of a number of walking trip generators that are located close together - such as a town centre or business parks.

6.15 An approximate five minute walking distance of 400m can be used as a guide to the minimum extents of CWZs (Figure 11). Within CWZs, all of the pedestrian infrastructure should be deemed to be important.

Figure 11: Core Walking Zones and Key Walking Routes
‘Creating Places: Achieving Quality in Residential Development’, Department of the Environment and Department for Regional Development (Northern Ireland), 2000

9.16 Bus stops should be within easy reach of all dwellings. Around 100m should be the maximum walking distance for dwellings designed for the elderly or those whose mobility is impaired. The majority of other dwellings should be within around 200m. The maximum walking distance should be around 400m. Where sites are hilly these distances may need to be reduced.

‘Guidelines for Providing for Journeys on Foot’, The Institute of Highways and Transportation, 2000

Acceptable walking distances

3.30. Approximately 80% of walk journeys and walk stages in urban areas are less than one mile. The average length of a walk journey is one kilometre (0.6 miles). This differs little by age or sex and has remained constant since 1975/76. However, this varies according to location. Average walking distances are longest in Inner London. The main factors that influence both walking distance and walking time in a city or town centre appear to be the size of the city or town itself, the shape and the
quality of the pedestrianised area, the type of shops and number of activities carried out. An average walking speed of approximately 1.4 m/s can be assumed, which equates to approximately 400m in five minutes or three miles per hour. The situation of people with mobility difficulties must be kept in mind in applying any specific figures.

3.31. “Acceptable” walking distances will obviously vary between individuals and circumstances. Acceptable walking distances will depend on various factors including:
- An individual’s fitness and physical ability
- Encumbrances, eg shopping, pushchair
- Availability, cost and convenience of alternatives transport modes
- Time savings
- Journey purpose
- Personal motivation
- General deterrents to walking.

3.32. Table 3.2 contains suggested acceptable walking distances, for pedestrians without a mobility impairment for some common facilities. These may be used for planning and evaluation purposes.

Table 3.2: Suggested Acceptable Walking Distance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Town centres (m)</th>
<th>Commuting/School Sight-seeing (m)</th>
<th>Elsewhere (m)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Desirable</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acceptable</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferred maximum</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘Sustainable Mode of Travel to School Strategy (2007-2011)’, Plymouth City Council
Table 3.1 Practical walk threshold distances in Plymouth compared with statutory distances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of school</th>
<th>Plymouth practical walking distance</th>
<th>Statutory walking threshold</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>800 m (0.5 miles) – approx 15 minute walk</td>
<td>3200 m (2 miles) children under age 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>2000m (1.25 miles) - approx 25 minute walk</td>
<td>4800 m (3 miles) children over age 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Fields in Trust recommended benchmark guidelines – formal outdoor space

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open space type</th>
<th>QUANTITY GUIDELINE</th>
<th>WALKING GUIDELINE</th>
<th>QUALITY GUIDELINE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Playing pitches</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1,200m</td>
<td>Quality appropriate to the intended level of performance, designed to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>appropriate technical standards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Located where they are of most value to the community to be served.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sufficiently diverse recreational use for the whole community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Appropriately landscaped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maintained safety and to the highest possible condition with available finance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Positively managed taking account of the need for repair and replacement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>over time as necessary.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of appropriate ancillary facilities and equipment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Provision of footpaths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Designed so as to be free of the fear of harm or crime.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complied with play</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local authorities can set their own quality benchmark standards for playing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>standards from table 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pitches, taking into account the level of play, topography, necessary safety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>margins and optimal orientation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other outdoor provision</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>700m</td>
<td>Local authorities can set their own quality benchmark standards for play areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(MUGA and skate park)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>using the Children’s Play Council’s Quality Assessment Tool.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Quantity guidelines should not be interpreted as either a maximum or minimum level of provision. Rather they are benchmark standards that can be adjusted to take account of local circumstances.

2 Technical standards produced by Sports England, national governing sporting bodies or professional or trade associations, such as the Institute of Landscape Architects and the Sports and Play Construction Association are proves helpful.
APPENDIX 6: GOVERNMENT BROADBAND TARGET

https://www.gov.uk/guidance/broadband-delivery-uk

Guidance

Broadband Delivery UK

From: Department for Digital, Culture, Media & Sport
Part of: Broadband investment, Communications and telecoms, European Union laws and regulation, and Government funding programmes
Published: 27 February 2013
Last updated: 22 November 2017, see all updates

Details of the plan to achieve a transformation in broadband in the UK
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Overview

Broadband Delivery UK (BDUK), part of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport, is delivering superfast broadband and local full fibre networks to the nation.

The Government is supporting investment to:

- provide superfast broadband coverage to 95% of the UK by December 2017
- provide access to basic broadband (2Mbps) for all
- stimulate private investment in full fibre connections by 2021

Superfast Broadband Programme

The Government’s aim is to provide superfast broadband (speeds of 24Mbps or more) for at least 95% of UK premises and universal access to basic broadband (speeds of at least 2Mbps).

You can check whether superfast broadband is available in your area using the superfast broadband postcode checker and find out more details about what is happening in your local area using our Google Map.

If you have broadband access which is less than 2Mbps you can find out what options are available to you using the Basic Broadband Scheme postcode checker.

More information on the Government’s approach to delivering superfast broadband is available in the UK Next Generation Network Infrastructure Deployment Plan.