

OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION

# OSPD



**Calderdale**  
Council

## Developer Contributions Towards Meeting Open Space, Sport and Recreation Facilities

Regulation 19 Consultation Statement

**APRIL 2008**



<b>1</b>	<b>Regulation 19 Consultation Statement .....</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Regulation 17 Summary of Issues .....</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>SPD Production Arrangements .....</b>	<b>14</b>

## 1 Regulation 19 Consultation Statement

PLANNING AND COMPULSORY PURCHASE ACT 2004

Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England)Regulations 2004

Regulation 19:Consultation Statement

DEVELOPER CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARDS PROVIDING OPEN SPACE, SPORT AND RECREATION FACILITIES

Under the Town and Country Planning (Local Development)(England) Regulations 2004,

Regulation18(4)(b), it is a requirement to prepare and publish a Consultation Statement setting out:

- (i) a summary of the main issues raised at Regulation 17 consultation
- (ii) how those issues have been addressed in the SPD.

Regulation 19 of the Regulations relates to the adoption of Supplementary Planning Documents (SPDs) and requires Local Planning Authorities to prepare a Consultation Statement when adopting an SPD.

---

## 2 Regulation 17 Summary of Issues

**2.1 Regulation 18(4)(b) (i) & (ii):** The Council, following early engagement with stakeholders on 6 July to 17 August 2007, prepared a draft of the document and provided stakeholders with an opportunity to have their say on the way the Council is proposing to ask for contributions from developers towards providing open space, sport and recreation facilities. The six-week period of consultation ran from 30 November 2007 to 11 January 2008. In total, 41 representations were received on the draft SPD. The representations received, and the Council's response to each representation and a recommendation as to what changes were made to the draft SPD are set out below. A summary of this information is provided in the following table.

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
British Waterways	British Waterways seek to encourage the enhancement of recreational opportunities that the waterways offer to a number of different users and activities, including boating, angling, walking and cycling. We would encourage developers to contribute to improving access to the waterway i.e. new developments are orientated to the waterway with good linkages to it, contributing to towpath improvements, including maintenance and the provision of new mooring facilities. Waterways offer great recreational opportunities for the local community and provide sustainable transport routes.	Agreed, inclusion of accesses to waterways will fall within green corridor definition. Amend paragraph 3.1 category 7 to include access to waterways. Amend Table 4.1 to add a new row of Open Space Type under "Natural/Semi-natural" to include green corridors.
Yorkshire & Humber Assembly	Thank you for consulting the Assembly on the document. On this occasion these are not documents the Assembly wishes to comment on.	No further action
Lancashire County Council	Thank you for consulting Lancashire County Council on the SPD. Do not wish to make any observations.	No change to document required
Hebden Royd Town Council	It is the view of Hebden Royd Town Council that Developer Contributions should be phased rather than paid on completion of a project. It is suggested that the contributions be based on a quarterly basis, agreed prior to commencement of work or specified in a condition of the planning consent. In addition, disability access should be considered with all development proposals. The reason for phasing payments is to ensure that contributions are made and that the failure to complete an element could not be taken as reason to withhold payment.	Contributions are normally made at the beginning of the development. However, by arrangement with the Council on larger schemes, as part of the s106 agreement, contributions can be phased (see para 5.5 item 2). New development is subject to the provisions of Part M of the Building Regulations and the Disability Discrimination Act so that new sports and recreation provision must meet the needs of the Disabled. No change required to document.

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Jason Boom	Developments of all sizes have a contribution to make to the amenities of the area. They, if conceived and managed properly, will generate a profit to allow a contribution to their local outdoor space.	Agreed. No further action
Yorkshire Forward	Welcomes the development of the Draft SPD, as the provision of high quality open space and recreational facilities has the potential to make an important contribution towards renaissance projects supported by Yorkshire Forward.	No change to document.
ES Marshall	As a developer in Calderdale we are concerned by the increasing legislative pressure being placed on developers. Building is already very competitive in West Yorkshire and there are many cost pressures on developers both nationally and locally. The increase in another area of contributions will make building even more difficult and may well mean that we are forced to look to other areas in West Yorkshire for our developments.	Contributions to needs generated as part of development are part and parcel of development costs, recognised nationally through Circular 05/2005 and locally through UDP Policies CGCF1 and OS5. This SPD is not introducing new costs but clarifying and refining the procedure for requesting contributions. No change to document.
ES Marshall	As a developer in Calderdale we are concerned by the increasing legislative pressure being placed on developers. Building is already very competitive in West Yorkshire and there are many cost pressures on developers both nationally and locally. The increase in another area of contributions will make building even more difficult and may well mean that we are forced to look to other areas in West Yorkshire for our developments.	Contributions to needs generated as part of development are part and parcel of development costs, recognised nationally through Circular 05/2005 and locally through UDP Policies GCF1 and OS5. This SPD is not introducing new costs but clarifying and refining the procedure for requesting contributions.  No change to document.
Barratt Northern	The document is not fit for purpose and is unsound as it is impossible to calculate for any given development, the amount of open space required, the proportion to be provided on site and thereby any offsite contributions. This SPD says it is linked to policies in the RCUDP and if so the relevant policy appears to be Policy OS5. This policy clearly states that provision should be made "of a scale and kind reasonably related to the development" and "in accordance with standards set by the Council". It is impossible to ascertain from this SPD what these standards are and thereby to judge if any requirements are in scale and kind to the development. The purpose of an SPD as set out in paragraph 2.43 of PPS12 is to "expand policy or provide further detail to policies in a development plan document". This	Disagree. The SPD has been prepared in accordance with the methodology set out in PPG17 Good Practice Companion Guide "Assessing Needs and Opportunities". The Replacement Calderdale Unitary Development Plan indicates that prior to the introduction of locally assessed standards, that NPFA standards shall be used. Once the new standards have been established, they can be used for calculating local needs. These standards were adopted by Calderdale MBC in 2007 and therefore form the basis for this document. For the sake of clarity, a worked example will be included in the appendices to

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
	<p>SPD clearly fails this requirement. Whilst Policy OS5 does allow for the setting of future standards by the Council, this SPD introduces a wholly different concept than the NFPA Standard on which the policy was based and as such amounts to introducing new policy. It appears that this SPD is contrary to paragraph 2.44 of PPS12 and so is challengeable. The proper course of action should be to promote a change to Policy OS5. In the previous response to the initial consultation, we raised fundamental concerns about the form and use of the document that have not been addressed. As such, it is considered that the document now issued for public consultation is so fundamentally flawed that it cannot be used for planning purposes and it should be withdrawn. A new open space policy is required before and SPD can be prepared. Such a policy should be included in the Core Strategy and be subject to independent scrutiny. As stated earlier, it is impossible to calculate the cost and form of open space provision but it may be that for a 50 dwelling development in Todmorden this document would imply an open space cost of £12,500 per dwelling. This is excessive and coupled with other planning gain costs - affordable housing, education, etc. - would result in land not being brought forward. This result would be clearly contrary to the Government's policy on housing delivery. This document should be abandoned.</p>	<p>show how the new standards will be applied. The open space contributions for a new 5-bed dwelling in Todmorden would not come out at £12,500 but more in the region of £9,200 including maintenance costs.</p> <p>However this assumes that all new provision will be required on site and therefore require maintenance. This would not be the case for a development of 50 houses. A more likely outcome would be a requirement for £5,495 per dwelling to enhance existing provision</p> <p>Add a worked example in the appendices to show how the new standards will be applied.</p>
Jon Crowther	<p>I agree with the concept of the Open Spaces SPD and hope it will be a useful tool to help get contributions to improved sport and recreation facilities in Calderdale. However I feel that there is a lack of any reference to the addressing the poor swimming facilities in Calderdale which are quite frankly not adequate for the increasing needs of people trying to have healthier lifestyles and an increasing population. We had 5 swimming pools in Halifax alone only 20 years ago and we now have only 1, Brighouse is out of action and the ones at Elland and Sowerby Bridge are well past their sell by dates. Maybe this is not just a planning issue but this SPD should be about improving facilities surely?</p>	<p>The SPD does make provision for obtaining contributions for indoor sports facilities in Table 4.1 which would include swimming pools. However, given the scale of swimming pool undertakings any new projects would need an accumulation of funding.</p> <p>No amendments required to document but pass comments on the Community Services for response.</p>
North West Regional Assembly	<p>The NWRA welcomes the approach taken by Calderdale in addressing this particular issue, however I have no specific comments to make on the documents.</p>	<p>No change.</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Square Chapel	I was surprised when reading through this document to read Table 4.1, note 1 which suggests that the cost of providing new civic spaces has not been included. Surely the council needs to be able to receive contributions for the possible creation of new spaces as well as existing ones? It is recognised that Halifax has few public spaces which are needed for social interaction and community cohesion and this is central to the UK Government 'Placemaking' agenda which all local authorities are expected to work with. At a time when the centre of Halifax and the Piece Hall area in particular is being reassessed, future plans may well include additional open public spaces and allowance should be made for this.	Agree to include this form of new civic space in the SPD. Amend the wording for Note 1 of Table 4.1 to add "This does not preclude the provision of new civic space as an alternative to other formal open space."
Entec for Sport England	The intention and content of the SPD are welcomed, recognising the importance of providing adequately for sport and recreation opportunities of all kinds through new development.	Noted. No change to SPD.
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- Its foundation on an Open Space, Sport and Recreation Assessment forming a sound basis for improving the overall provision, accessibility and quality of facilities in the Borough	Noted. No change.
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- Reference to Sport England's core guidance document 'Towards a Level Playing Field'	Noted. No change to SPD.
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- The use of a clear, stepped approach to determining and securing contributions	Noted. No change to SPD.
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- Differentiation of contributions by types of provision	Noted. No change to SPD.
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- The adoption of a pragmatic approach to individual circumstances within the overall framework.	Noted. No change to SPD.

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Entec for Sport England	Support the following aspect:- The adoption of a pragmatic approach to individual circumstances within the overall framework.	Noted. No change to SPD.
Entec for Sport England	<p>Sport England would also like the following observations to be considered as part of further revisions of the document: 1. Clearer cross-referencing to the emerging Core Strategy and specific policies therein relating to open space, sport and active recreation.</p> <p>2. There could be merit in setting out in an Appendix the proposed standards and definitions of various kinds of open and recreational space, for example, according to NPFA definitions of: pitches, built sports facilities, equipped children's playspace, informal playspace and other outdoor recreational space.</p> <p>3. Inclusion of (a) worked example(s) of the calculation of a development contribution, based on a typical scenario. 4 For the avoidance of doubt, specification of where development contributions might be spent (on items such as pitches, improvements to facilities, drainage etc) and specific exclusions (such as landscaping for aesthetic purposes or routine maintenance [unless specified in the legal agreement]). 5. Mention of how unspent contributions will be dealt with. 6. Reference should be made to how contributions will be tracked, or monitored, to ensure that the agreements made are in fact met.</p>	<p>1 At present this SPD will apply to UDP related allocations and developments. When the Core Strategy is in place, the SPD will need revising to take account of new allocations and designations.</p> <p>2. Agreed - add appendix containing definitions. 3. Agreed - worked example to add. 4. This detail will form part of the agreements for each individual case. 5. This has been covered in Paragraph 5.5 but details of payback of unspent contributions can be covered in individual legal agreements. 6. Agreed that tracking and monitoring should be referred to as a required process for sound audit reasons.</p> <p>Add appendix with definitions of different types of open space and recreational facilities. Add worked examples to document. Add reference in paragraph 5.5 Item 2 to the need for tracking and monitoring as part of a sound audit trail.</p>
Entec for Sport England	Sport England would also like the following observations to be considered as part of further revisions of the document: - The dates of the Open Space Action Plan are different in paras 1.4 and 1.6.	Agreed. Amend all references to April 2007 of adoption of Open Space Action Plan.
Barratt Northern	Is provision to be that which is generated by the development or to contribute to overcoming deficiencies in the local area? It is unclear from paragraph 2.4 to 2.6 what is intended and Stage 2 at paragraph 3.10 adds confusion. If there is a sufficiency of provision why should there be a need to make an enhancement contribution; this is unreasonable.	PPG17 indicates that quantity, quality and accessibility are factors to be taken into account in assessing open space and recreation provision. Through the Open Space, Sport and Recreation Study carried out by consultants for Calderdale in 2006/7 it has been established that there is no high quality accessible surplus of provision

# Open Space SPD Consultation Statement

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
		<p>in any of the areas in Calderdale. The study is the basis for asking for contributions towards Open Space, Sport and Recreation provision in the SPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD.</p>
Barratt Northern	<p>Table 3.1 is undecipherable and provides no clear guidance. Does it supply the standards to be met or is it a level of provision that exists? If it is the former then it is unreasonable, if it is the latter then what is the standard against which provision is to be measured? The stages at paragraph 3.10 do not provide any clarification of these vital issues.</p>	<p>Agreed. The tables can be simplified to make them more easily understood</p> <p>Simplify table 3.1 to cover just the whole Calderdale Borough to show actual standards and insert the current detailed Table 3.1 into the appendix to serve as detailed information.</p>
Barratt Northern	<p>Table 4.1 is totally confusing as no standard is set for the point at which these contributions would be intended to apply.</p>	<p>This table is guidance and each planning application contribution will be calculated by Community Services using this table and following the methodology set out in paragraph 3.9. The purpose of this document is to explain the methodology.</p> <p>Amend tables to clarify how they apply.</p>
Barratt Northern	<p>The proposed maintenance costs at paragraph 4.4 and 4.5 are excessive to the point of being wholly unreasonable. They are unjustifiably based on a perpetuity period calculated as 41 years. Where open space is provided off site it is clearly intended for wider public use and so in accordance with paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005, the costs should be borne by the Council and if any "pump priming" is required it should not be calculated on an in perpetuity basis. This provision is clearly contrary to 05/2005.</p>	<p>Maintenance for on-site provision on a development e.g. a playspace, is justified and is confirmed by paragraph B18 of Circular 05/2005 and can be required in perpetuity. However it is agreed that, whilst initial establishment of off-site facilities is justified, long term maintenance should be the responsibility of the relevant body to whom the facility is conveyed</p> <p>Amend paragraphs 4.3 - 4.5 to clarify, that where is facility is for wider public use, the responsibility for maintenance will be borne by the body in whom the facility is vested in accordance with paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005.</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Home Builders Federation	When will this SPD be applied? Paragraph 3.8 - Ten years is too long a time period for the returning of contributions in order to reasonably maintain a relationship between the contribution and the benefit to satisfy the tests in Circular 05/2005. The return of contributions should be made if they are not committed by the completion of the development or no more than 5 years in all other cases.	<p>Paragraph 3.3 of the SPD sets out what developments this SPD will apply to. At present, payback provision is not included in S106 agreements, unless the developers' solicitors require it. The details of this can be negotiated on a case by case basis, but 10 years is not considered an unreasonable timescale and even longer may be required for longer term projects where funding needs to be accumulated e.g. for a new sports hall.</p> <p>Delete reference to payback provision from paragraph 3.8 of the SPD.</p>
Home Builders Federation	Maintenance Paragraph 4.3 The HBF objects to the requirement that developers have to maintain on site open space. We consider that these policies go beyond the requirements of Circular 05/2005. Paragraph B19 of Circular 5/05 states that "as a general rule, however, where an asset is intended for wider public use, the costs of subsequent maintenance and other recurrent expenditure associated with the developer's contribution should normally be borne by the body or authority in which the asset is to be vested. Where contributions to the initial support ("pump priming") of new facilities are necessary, these should reflect the time lag between the provision of the new facility and its inclusion in public sector funding streams, or its ability to recover its own costs in the case of privately-run bus services, for example. Pump priming maintenance payments should be time-limited and not be required in perpetuity in planning obligations." Therefore, the HBF believe that this policy should be removed. The plethora of other s106 obligations local authorities load on to new development (some appropriate, many not), not least of which is the obligation to provide high levels of affordable housing, mean that there is a need for flexibility when setting policies on this issue. Overall the Council must be realistic when determining contributions.	<p>Maintenance for on-site provision on a development e.g. a playspace, is justified and is confirmed by paragraph B18 of Circular 05/2005 and can be required in perpetuity. However it is agreed that, whilst initial establishment of off-site facilities is justified, long term maintenance should be the responsibility of the relevant body to whom the facility is conveyed</p> <p>Amend paragraphs 4.3 - 4.5 to clarify, that where is facility is for wider public use, the responsibility for maintenance will be borne by the body in whom the facility is vested in accordance with paragraph B19 of Circular 05/2005.</p>
Home Builders Federation	Planning Obligations Cost Recovery Paragraph 5.5 In terms of the legal costs for preparing Section 106 Agreements, the HBF objects to these recovery costs. The Council charges a planning application fee for the	<p>The planning fee is intended to cover part of the cost of processing the planning application and does not cover additional costs such as the preparation of legal</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
	<p>determination of planning applications which is monitored and managed by Government to ensure the fee accurately reflect the cost incurred by Local Authorities in the determination of planning applications. It is the Council, which is imposing these Section 106 requirements, and it should bear costs of entering into such an agreement.</p>	<p>agreements. It is reasonable for parties to a legal agreement to meet the legal costs of preparing that agreement.</p> <p>Retain paragraph 5.5 but delete word "professional" from Item 1 so that costs relate to legal fees.</p>
Entec for Sport England	<p>Sport England would also like the following observations to be considered as part of further revisions of the document: The sentence at 4.3(1) needs some attention as this is not clear.</p>	<p>Agree , this needs clarifying.</p> <p>mend paragraph 4.3 (1) to clarify meaning.</p>
English Heritage	<p>Our only comments on the content of this Supplementary Planning Document relate to the circumstances under which priority should be given towards securing contributions towards improving the quality of existing facilities rather than seeking the provision of additional open spaces. The definition of open space, in PPG17, includes a number of open areas which, themselves, could be specifically designated as being of historic importance (such as People's Park, Halifax, Shrogg's Park, and Lister Lane Cemetery, Halifax), which might contribute towards the character of the District's Conservation Areas, or (in the case of numerous civic spaces) provide a setting for its Listed Buildings. Where there are such open spaces in the vicinity of development sites, particularly where the park itself or its components have been identified as being "at risk", then instead of automatically requiring the provision of open space on the housing development itself, consideration should be given to the wider public benefit which would result by using commuted sums towards the restoration (and future maintenance) of those spaces of historic importance. This is particularly the case where there is clear evidence that an existing open space is likely to be regularly used by the residents of the new development. Indeed, it would seem a waste of resources to require the provision of on-site open space when it is more probable that the future residents of the new houses will, in all probability, use the existing public parks anyway. Irrespective of whether or not there is sufficient existing open space in the vicinity of a new development, existing space and facilities will be used by</p>	<p>Agree with points made based on sound principles set out in PPG17.</p> <p>Clarify wording of SPD to emphasise points raised.</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Marilyn Hodgkinson	<p>the residents of the new dwellings. Therefore, it would appear only equitable that a contribution should be made from the developers of those dwellings towards the improvement or continued upkeep of open spaces in the area.</p> <p>My only comment is concern that the open space escarpment area between Toothill Bank and Long Ridge, Rastrick, Brighouse remains an Open Space area as already designated and there is no change to that.</p>	<p>This SPD does not deal with allocations and therefore not relevant at this time. The consultee is however on a database of consultees to be consulted at a later date on land allocations and Designations DPD.</p> <p>No change to SPD</p>
Barratt Northern	<p>It is unfair and unreasonable to equate bedroom size to occupancy. This produces an average occupancy 27% greater than the census figure of 2.36 and such an overprovision cannot be justified.</p>	<p>Contribution rates based on bedroom numbers of a dwelling is a reasonable and logical guide to house size, cost and potential occupancy levels and is used by other authorities e.g. Harrogate BC.No change to SPD.</p>
Barratt Northern	<p>There is no provision in Circular 05/2005 for the Council to seek to recover its monitoring and compliance costs and such charges cannot be imposed.</p>	<p>Whilst no mention is made of monitoring and compliance costs in Circular 05/2005 it does not specifically preclude Local Authorities from charging for such costs. Monitoring and compliance are part of a good audit practice. Legal advice is being sought on this matter and will be reported to the Working Party.</p> <p>Await outcome of legal advice before deciding whether on amendments in relation to this issue.</p>
The Theatres Trust	<p>The Theatres Trust is the national advisory public body for theatres and a statutory consultee on planning applications affecting land on which there is a theatre. This applies to all theatre buildings, old and new, in current use, in other uses, or disused. Established by The Theatres Trust Act 1976 'to promote the better protection of theatres', our main objective is to safeguard theatre use, or the potential for such use but we also provide expert advice on design, conservation, property and planning matters to theatre operators, local authorities and official bodies. Due to the specific</p>	<p>Comments noted.</p> <p>No change to SPD.</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
	<p>nature of the Trust's remit we are concerned with the protection and promotion of theatres and as this consultation is not intended to cater for specialist facilities such as theatres we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents especially the Core Strategy stages, Development Control Policies and town centre Area Action Plans.</p>	
<p>Government Office for Yorkshire and the Humber</p>	<p>Thanks for your letters of 28 November inviting us to comment on the above. Please note that we do not wish to comment - copy of letter attached (sent by mail today).</p>	<p>Noted No change to SPD</p>
<p>Natural England</p>	<p>Natural England agrees in principle with the proposal to adopt a Supplementary Planning Document to assist in securing financial contributions from developers towards meeting open space, sport and recreation needs. Such improvements will be beneficial to the long term health and well-being of residents in the area. Natural England has no further specific comments on this document from a natural environment point of view.</p>	<p>Noted No change to SPD</p>
<p>Philip S Ryley &amp; Co</p>	<p>it seems that the first developer to approach an area that is deficient in facilities will have a much higher burden than subsequent developers. Will anyone consider whether the need to make these provisions will be shared amongst sites with development potential?</p>	<p>Agreed. The Council would not expect the first developer in a major development scheme to pick up all the shortfalls in an area. The sharing of responsibility for all infrastructure will be built into any new allocations for major development in the Core Strategy. In any event contributions are made on the basis of the number of houses built and this itself would spread out the responsibility for infrastructure proportionally.  No change at present.</p>
<p>Philip S Ryley &amp; Co</p>	<p>Rates set out as "starting points for negotiations" are in my experience considered to be a minimum provision and there is no scope for discussion.</p>	<p>Agreed - the rates are a starting point and the document indicates at Para 4.1 that these will be revised in line with the inflation index on a yearly basis (Para 3.5).  No change to SPD.</p>

Consultee	Issue	How Issues have been addressed
Philip S Ryley & Co	The Council is imposing these contributions and has the benefit of the resultant provisions - they should at the very least pay their own associated costs.	Await outcome of legal advice before deciding on amendments in relation to this issue.
Philip S Ryley & Co	The residual valuation approach is unwieldy and unworkable as a tool for calculating contributions. A simple fixed cost approach would be altogether more reasonable from all parties' points of view	<p>Whilst no mention is made of monitoring and compliance costs in Circular 05/2005 it does not specifically preclude Local Authorities from charging for such costs. Monitoring and compliance are part of a good audit practice. Legal advice is being sought on this matter and will be reported to the Working Party.</p> <p>No change.</p>
Philip S Ryley & Co	This is a very complex set of criteria and open to far too much debate and discussion. It will require constant updating and monitoring. Could it not be dealt with more simply? Most developers do not object to making a reasonable contribution and this seems to make it all too complex	<p>It is agreed that Table 3.1 is complex and is to be simplified in the main text with a copy of this table added to appendices for detailed consideration.</p> <p>Amend and simplify Table 3.1.</p>
Philip S Ryley & Co	is it not possible to simplify this into a standard reasonable amount per dwelling? What about a situation where provision is to be made for something not on the list i.e. a new footbridge?	<p>The purpose and complexity of this SPD is to identify accurately the specific needs and shortfalls of a community for open space, sport and recreation facilities in line with the methodology set out in PPG17 and it's Companion Guide. The SPD serves to demonstrate in detail what contributions are required and how they will be used, giving the process a more accurate and transparent approach than older "rule-of-thumb" approaches such as the NPFA Six-Acre Standard.</p> <p>A footbridge may form part of a green corridor but would usually be included within the transport infrastructure.</p> <p>No change.</p>

## 3 SPD Production Arrangements

**3.1** Throughout the preparation of the SPD the Council's Community Services Directorate were involved in it's preparation. The Council's Local Development Framework (LDF) Working Party considered the proposed responses to the early community engagement document on 1 November 2007, following which the SPD was revised to go out for Regulation 17 consultation. On 24 January 2008 the Working Party considered the responses and recommended actions to the Regulation 17 consultation document, where it was agreed that the SPD be revised in line with officers recommendations. The final version was considered by LDF Working Party on March 13 2008.

---