

ChecklistFor New Housing Developments

This **Checklist** sets out the things that make new housing areas good to live in without dependence on cars. It has been compiled in the context of the need for radical change in the way new homes are provided. The Transport for New Homes aim is to promote new housing that is well located, well designed, and with good sustainable transport links, as set out in the Transport for New Homes Charter (see website). A suggested system for scoring the Checklist is provided at Annex A.

LOCATION and CONTEXT

1. The location	n avoids car dependency	
-	Within or well connected (by walking, cycling, and public transport services) to an existing settlement that has a clear central destination?	
-	Not promoted on the benefits of major road (car) access?	
-	There is no major road building triggered by the scheme, or being justified by the scheme?	
-	Car use to residents' main destinations is discouraged (e.g. by town centre parking charges, bus priority routes)?	
-	Development supported by clear commitments to walking, cycling and public transport in plans and policies, including mode-share targets (e.g. in Travel Plan)?	
2. Walking, cycare well planne	cling and public transport to the wider area and key destinations	
-	Logical, direct walking routes exist or will be provided to connect the development?	
-	Logical, direct cycle routes exist or will be provided to connect to the development?	
-	The development is connected to key destinations by excellent public transport (as set out in item 9) or there are confirmed plans for this?	
-	The development has clear potential to improve public transport, benefiting residents of existing settlements as well as those living in the new homes themselves?	

DESIGN & LAYOUT

3. Attractive and healthy place to be in				
-	A welcoming environment, for example not dominated by parking?			
-	Greenery part of the design, not just leftover spaces?			
-	Space to sit, and for children to play?			
4. Density of h	nomes (i.e. at least 35-50 dwellings per hectare, gross)			
-	Sufficient to support high quality public transport (bus/rapid transit/tram/rail)?			
-	Highest density housing is sited closest to public transport stations/stops?			
-	Density sufficient to support some local facilities?			
5. Mix of uses in adjacent area	(extent to be judged in relation to size of scheme, and what is available as)			
-	A mix of uses adds vitality to streets, spaces and places?			
-	A mix of housing types is provided (to suit different needs)?			
-	Includes affordable housing?			
6. Local faciliti	ies and employment			
-	Facilities available (or committed) within 10 minutes without a car? (including nursery, primary school, convenience store, cafe, small business service hub, community centre, GP practice, sport/leisure facilities, playground)			
-	Major employment reachable within 30 minutes without a car?			
-	All new homes have access to superfast broadband?			

TRANSPORT PROVISION

7. Pavements and paths			
-	Join up with existing streets, paths and adjacent areas with no major barriers?		
-	Attractive and direct routes to local facilities/town centre?		
-	Safe to use (overlooked and/or well used)?		
-	Low traffic speeds / separated from heavy traffic?		
-	Pavements uninterrupted across side streets, driveways?		
-	Layout avoids having to walk in the road?		
-	Layout makes it easy to find your way around?		
8. Cycle routes	s and cycle storage		
-	Safe and attractive cycle paths and/or low traffic streets?		
-	Direct, easy to follow, routes?		
-	Cycle (and pedestrian) routes shorter than routes for cars?		
-	All dwellings have secure cycle parking?		
-	Cycle racks on-street for visitors to the area?		
	sport services at the development (providing credible 'turn up and go' ive to car users, which can be buses, bus rapid transit, tram, or rail)		
-	All services operate 7 days a week and evenings?		
-	At least one frequent public transport service? (12 minute intervals or better)		
-	From Day 1 of occupation?		
[Continues ove	rleaf]		

-	Provision is certain, including in the long term?	
-	All areas of development within easy walking distance of stops/stations? (Maximum 300m for bus; 800m for rail)	
-	Street layout provides unhindered movement of buses?	
-	Stops prominently and conveniently located?	
-	Priority over other traffic provided (including off-site)?	
-	Direct services available to key destinations from the development?	
-	Services well-advertised and/or branded, with easy ticketing?	
-	Services affordable and with discounts? (e.g. for youth, unwaged)	
10. Parking		
-	Ground level parking provision does not dominate the street scene?	
-	Most parking spaces communal (available to all residents and visitors)?	
-	Parking only in defined spaces or purpose-built bays on-street?	
-	Car parking organised to avoid negative impact on walking, cycling and bus operation? (e.g. avoiding frequent driveway crossovers and segregated parking courts with no other uses)	
-	No parking taking place/allowed on pavements?	
-	Provision for shared "Car Club" vehicles?	
-	Electric vehicle charging points provided?	
Total s	core for the 10 headings	
Maximu	um possible score	
The tot	al score as % of maximum possible	

ANNEX A: SUGGESTED SCORING SYSTEM

When reviewing a particular housing site or development, consider its merit in terms of each of the 10 numbered headings. Use ratings for each of the sub-headings to inform the score for each main heading.

Suggested rating system: 0 (Poor), 1 (Mediocre), 2 (Good) (Sub headings are expressed as positive things, so a score of 2 is good, and 0 is poor)

If a sub-category is not applicable (e.g. because the scheme is not fully built, or its rating is unknown), exclude it from the scoring. In this case its potential score (2) must also be excluded from the maximum total Checklist score.

So, rate the relevant ones, and use their combined score to arrive at the overall score for each heading. For example, if there are 6 sub-categories, then the maximum possible score will be $2 \times 6 = 12$. If two of the sub categories are not relevant (or it is too difficult or too early to score them), the maximum will be $2 \times 4 = 8$. In both cases the overall score for the main heading will be the percentage of the maximum possible score.

Worked example for one of the 10 main headings:

Sub categories

1.	1
2.	0
3.	n/a
4.	0
5.	1

Maximum possible score = 8

Overall score = 2

Overall rating = 25% = "Red" or "Poor"

For the development's total Checklist score, add up the scores for each of the 10 main headings and then express this as a percentage of the total possible maximum score, i.e. 102, less 2 for each excluded item.

This total score can then be expressed as

Red	Amber	Green
(Poor)	(Mediocre)	(Good)
0-33%	34-66%	67-100%

Alternatively, the result can be placed into one of 5 categories, such as:

Very poor	Fairly Poor	Mediocre	Fairly Good	Very Good
0-20%	21-40%	41-60%	60-80%	81-100%

ANNEX B - USING THE CHECKLIST

Purpose of the Checklist:

- 1. To check if sites are appropriate for housing development;
- 2. To expose plans for housing that are likely to result in car-dependent lifestyles, and to identify the reasons;
- 3. To help identify ways in which development proposals can be improved;
- 4. To assess the outcomes of developments already built so that lessons can be learnt, or that people responsible can be held to account.

Who is the Checklist for?

- Local authorities, regional government, and any other bodies responsible for, or aspiring to, housing development in their areas;
- Planning and transport authorities responsible for existing urban areas that are impacted by new development;
- Other bodies and consultants concerned with the development process (whose brief includes, for example: health, education, utilities, environment, landscape, heritage, and conservation);
- Private developers and other bodies (landowners, social, charitable bodies etc.) seeking to promote or undertake development;
- Transport authorities responsible for the planning, promotion and/or the delivery of improved transport facilities (public transport, cycling and walking routes and facilities, roads, streets);
- Neighbourhood and other organisations seeking to resist unsustainable development, or to respond to consultations on local and neighbourhood plans etc.

When should the Checklist be used?

- 1. When the location of new housing and other development is being considered (e.g. regional, strategic, local, neighbourhood plans);
- 2. When new transport facilities are being considered/developed;
- 3. When masterplanning is being undertaken;
- 4. When outline planning permission is being sought;
- 5. When detailed planning permission is being sought.
- 6. The Checklist can also be used to assess the quality of schemes with planning permission, or under way, or completed. In this case check:
 - Travel and traffic generated by the development;
 - Benefits generated for existing areas in terms of more sustainable travel, less traffic.

What action is needed from the Checklist?

- The various criteria should be scored (See Annex A)
- Locations for development should be rejected if they offer little prospect of delivering the aims of the Charter or the specific Checklist objectives;
- Alternative locations or forms of development should be considered/put forward/encouraged (including, if appropriate, no development) that offer the prospect of meeting the Charter's aims and objectives;
- Modifications to development plans and proposals should be considered, to improve their correspondence with the Charter's aims;
- Use the Checklist to inform responses to planning applications for development that is unsuitable.

ANNEX C - SOME RELEVANT DOCUMENTS

Other documents with sustainable housing development criteria or Checklist: (These have been taken into account in the preparation of the Transport for New Homes Checklist.)

- Better planning, better transport, better places, CIHT (with TPS and RTPI), July
- Integrating the Planning and Delivery of Sustainable Transport with New Housing Development, KPMG for Transport Knowledge Hub, 2019
- The Place to Be: how transit oriented development can support good growth in the city regions, Urban Transport Group, 2019
- Buses in Urban Developments, CIHT, 2018
- National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), MCHLG, 2018
- Places Where People Want to Live 10 characteristics, RIBA, 2018
- Rising to the Climate Crisis A Guide for Local Authorities on Planning for Climate Change, TCPA and RTPI, 2018
- Bus Services and New Residential Developments, Stagecoach, 2017
- BREEAM-SE New Construction, Technical Manual 1.1, Sweden Green Building Council, 2017
- Guidance for delivering new Garden Cities, Town & Country Planning Association, 2017
- Building for Life 12 The Sign of a Good Place to Live, Birkbeck and Kruczkowski for Design Council, CABE, Design for Homes and Home Builders Federation, Nottingham Trent University, 2015
- Active by Design, Design Council, 2014
- Handbook for cycle-friendly design, Sustrans, 2014
- Making Space for Cycling: A Guide for New Developments and Street Renewals, Cyclenation, 2014
- International Cycling Infrastructure Best Practice Study, Urban Movement and Phil Jones, 2014;
- Lifetime neighbourhoods, DCLG, 2011
- BREEAM Communities, Technical Manual SD202 1.2, 2012
- Manual for Streets 2, CIHT, 2010
- London Housing Design Guide (Interim), Design for London, 2010
- Sustainable Urban Neighbourhood (2nd edition), Falk and Rudlin, URBED, 2010
- Planning For Sustainable Travel: Integrating Spatial Planning and Transport, Hickman, R; Seaborn, C; Headicar, P; Banister, D (2009)
- Masterplanning Checklist for Sustainable Transport in New Developments, Taylor and Sloman, Transport for Quality of Life, 2008
- Cambridge Quality Charter for Growth, Cambridgeshire County Council, Cambridge City Council, and others, 2008
- Manual for Streets, DCLG and DfT, 2007
- Shaping Neighbourhoods a Guide for Health, Sustainability and Vitality, Barton, Grant and Guise, 2003
- Creating Places, Northern Ireland Department of the Environment and Department for Regional Development, May 2000
- Urban Design Compendium, Llewelyn Davies, for English Partnerships and The Housing Corporation, 2000