

Selby District Council LDF

Core Strategy Submission Draft: Examination in Public, Pre-hearing Meeting, Highways Agency and North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) (Local Highways Agency) Position Statement

1 Introduction

- 1.1 The Highways Agency and NYCC have been in consultation with Selby District Council for some three years and as a statutory consultee has commented on the various draft versions of the Council's Core Strategy proposals and their draft proposed development sites allocations.
- 1.2 The Highways Agency and NYCC, as local highways authority, are committed to working in partnership with Selby District Council to ensure that development is implemented in a sustainable and timely manner without an adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of both the strategic road network and the local road network.

2 Strategic Road Network and Local Road Network

Description

- 2.1 Within Selby District there are three sections of the Strategic Road Network (SRN) managed by the Highways Agency on behalf of the Secretary of State for Transport. These are:
 - M62
 - A1(M)
 - A64(T)
- 2.2 The M62 and A1(M) are three lane dual carriageway motorways with grade separated junctions. The A64(T) is an all-purpose two lane dual carriageway with grade separated junctions.
- 2.3 The local road network (LRN) within Selby District is managed by NYCC as the Local Highway Authority.

Operational conditions

- 2.4 At present no sections of the SRN or LRN within Selby district have regular weekday traffic congestion problems. However, the A64(T) acts as a commuter route between York and the towns and villages beyond and the West Yorkshire urban centres, thus there is a predominant traffic flow in the westbound direction in the morning peak and eastbound in the evening peak.
- 2.5 In addition the A64(T) is subjected to a considerable amount of leisure traffic as it is a route from the urban conurbations of south and west Yorkshire to the Yorkshire coastal towns and North York Moors National Park. This can result in a considerable variation in traffic demand levels, particularly at weekends and on bank holidays.
- 2.6 Traffic congestion can occur on the A64 (T) and its junctions within the vicinity of York as a result of the more popular race meetings at York Racecourse.

Proposed Network Enhancements

- 2.7 The Highways Agency has no proposals for capacity enhancements to the M62 or A64(T) within Selby District. The A1 to the north of Bramham Crossroads has recently been upgraded from all-purpose trunk road to motorway. As part of this upgrade a parallel all-purpose service road was constructed between Bramham Crossroads and Wetherby to the north.
- 2.8 The Highways Agency is currently examining ways of improving the safety at the A64(T) junctions with the A1079 at Grimston Bar and the A19 at Fulford, which are within York District. These options, should they be taken forward will address current safety issues only and not necessarily provide additional capacity for development associated growth.

NYCC as the local highway responsible for the LRN has no proposals for capacity enhancements within the Selby District.

3 Commuting

- 3.1 Selby is unique amongst the Yorkshire and Humber authorities in that almost half (49%) of its population work outside the District. Selby's location as a rural authority with a number of larger towns and cities within easy travelling distance around its periphery explain the high out-commuting.
- 3.2 Work undertaken by the York and North Yorkshire Partnership Trust shows that Selby District had the longest average journey to work of any District in the York and North Yorkshire sub-region; and the highest proportion of car based commuters. These movement patterns are considered to be relatively unsustainable and a matter which should be addressed through the Core Strategy in order to try to reduce the phenomenon as much as possible.

4 Local Development Framework proposals

- 4.1 Selby's main aspiration is to transform from a dormitory for Leeds and York to a self sufficient district. The proposed employment and housing policies reflect this:

Employment - Developing and revitalising the economy of the District has emerged as a major priority if a more self-contained, sustainable way of life for District residents is to be created. The Core Strategy will facilitate increased economic development, particularly focussed on Selby. The Highways Agency supports this approach.

Housing – The RSS indicates a requirement of at least 9,480 dwellings in the period up to 2026. The Council has decided to focus new market housing in Selby (and adjoining parishes) and limit development in the remainder of the District.

5 Core Strategy implications for the SRN and LRN

- 5.1 The Highways Agency has specially developed a network assessment tool (NAT) for the impact of LDF proposals on the SRN in the region. This tool can be used to assess development strategies as well as site specific proposals, either at a single district level or with several authorities at a sub-regional level. NAT has been used to determine the impact of Selby's core strategy proposals both in isolation and combined with those of the adjacent authorities.

- 5.2 Although NAT does not consider junction capacities it can be used to provide an indication of where junctions may come under pressure in future years, through an examination of changes in flow between adjacent links.
- 5.3 The Highways Agency's analysis highlights a number of areas where further analysis is required to identify the scale and nature of mitigation which may be required in regards to the Selby Core Strategy.

Modelling Considerations on the LHN

- 5.4 NYCC, as local highway authority, have had a traffic model of local highway network built which has been used to assess the impact of the proposed level of development with the town of Selby and the surrounding area.
- 5.5 Modelling of the proposed level of development has been carried out and it has identified two key junctions within the town of Selby that require improvements in order to facilitate the delivery of the housing and employment requirements identified in the LDF. These are the junctions of Gowthorpe, Brook Street and Scott Road and New Street, Water Hill Lane, Barlby Road and Ousegate. NYCC have already identified a suitable mitigation measure at the Gowthorpe, Brook Street and Scott Road junction which can mitigate the increase in traffic as a result of the proposed level of development over the plan period. The developer of the Olympia Park Site has developed a suitable mitigation measure at the junction of New Street, Water Hill Lane, Barlby Road and Ousegate which is acceptable to NYCC and can also mitigate the increase in traffic as a result of the proposed level of development over the plan period .

Selby

- 5.6 Considering the Selby proposals in isolation, the core strategy proposals are likely to have an impact on the SRN at:
- A64(T) junctions with;
 - A1079 Grimston Bar (within York),
 - A19 Fulford (within York),
 - A162 and A659 Tadcaster.
 - M62 Junction 34, Eggborough.

The impact on the LRN is at two key junctions within the town of Selby and, as identified above, can be mitigated.

Impact of Selby with neighbouring authorities

- 5.7 It is acknowledged that due to the nature of the SRN, some links will also be impacted by neighbouring authorities and visa versa due to the high degree of out-commuting. For these reasons it is important that the existing partnership working adopted with all parties continues in an effort to manage down traffic generated by new developments and identify the scale and nature of improvements and demand management measures that will be considered to facilitate development.

5.8 The locations upon which development is likely to have a degree of adverse impact on the safe and efficient operation of the SRN are:

- A64
 - A1237 – A1036 (Askham) Approaching capacity in the peak periods in both directions.
 - A1036 – A19 (Bishophthorpe) Approaching capacity in westbound direction in AM peak. Over capacity in westbound direction in PM peak. Over capacity in both peak periods in eastbound.
 - A19 – A1079 (Heslington) Approaching capacity in the Am peak in the Eastbound direction.
 - A659 – A1237 (Tadcaster) Approaching capacity in the PM peak in eastbound direction.
 - A659 – A1 J45 Speed stressed in the AM peak in westbound direction.

5.9 It is not possible at this stage to identify scale of possible physical or management measures which might provide possible mitigation for adverse traffic impact on the SRN and its junctions with the local highway network. Therefore it is incumbent on developers promoting individual sites to demonstrate the likely level of traffic impact and to indicate what, if any, mitigation will be required over and above Travel Plan initiatives. The scale and nature of development will be the overriding factor as to the appropriate mitigation required, this is not however a barrier to development and does not necessarily preclude a development from gaining planning consent. The HA are content that the Core Strategy is not affected by virtue of the fact that certain sites will cause measurable capacity issues, the effects of which will need to be addressed and mitigated against at Developer's expense.

5.10 Through the Infrastructure Delivery Plan (IDP) the LDF must be clear what infrastructure is critical to the ensuring the Plan is sound. The Highways Agency will only consider improving the SRN to meet traffic generated by new development as a last resort.

5.11 Instead the Highways Agency would encourage developers to provide a range of sustainable travel options for people using their development through the use and implementation of Travel Plans.

5.12 Selby has accepted a number of the Highways Agency's earlier concerns with regard to transport proposals required to support the development proposals within the Core Strategy.

5.13 These are identified in the May 2011 Proposed Editorial Changes and Minor Amendments to the Publication Version of the Core Strategy, namely the following insertions:

CP2A, inclusion of Travel Plans and modal split targets, and

CP8, inclusion of a new indicator and target based on Travel Plans.

Anticipated Impact on the SRN

- **Selby** - developments in Selby may have a material impact on the M62 in the vicinity of Junction 34, and on the A64(T) / A19 junction in York.
- **Tadcaster** - development in Tadcaster has the potential for a material impact on the A64(T) and its junctions with the A162 and A659.
- **Sherburn-in-Elmet** - development in Sherburn has the potential for a material impact on the A1(M) / A63 junction and the A64(T) / A162 junction.

- **Brayton, Eggborough and Whitley** - the Highways Agency may have concerns over the type and scale of development that could be allocated in settlements to the south of Selby, particularly Brayton, Eggborough and Whitley. As these settlements are adjacent to the A19 development here has the potential to impact on the M62 junction 34.
 - **Monk Fryston** - if a substantial number of dwellings were to be provided at Monk Fryston there would be the potential for a material impact on the A1(M) / A63 Junction.
- 5.14 Whilst the Highways Agency would not necessarily object in principle to any allocation of employment or housing land adjacent to the SRN, the acceptance of a particular site would depend on the current capacity and use ratio of the SRN and its junctions, and establishing the level and scope for mitigating the impact of development traffic if the.
- 5.15 The Highways Agency cannot provide for enhanced capacity on the SRN to facilitate development under current adopted DfT policy. Therefore where a development has an impact on the SRN that cannot be mitigated solely by the introduction of sustainable transport measures (Travel Planning), the Highways Agency expects that either the developer will have to fund any necessary physical mitigation or the development will have to be modified or scaled down to avoid any adverse impact.

6 Transport Proposals

- 6.1 Policies in the Regional Spatial Strategy (RSS) specifically related to Selby District include:
- The recognition of Selby as a public transport interchange location of sub-regional importance.
 - Strengthen key public transport corridors which include Hull–Selby-Leeds and York-Selby Doncaster.
 - Support for strategies to improve the quality and availability of public transport ticketing.
- 6.2 Additionally, the Highways Agency recognises the importance of Selby Bypass and the benefits created as a result of removal of through traffic from Selby town centre, which mainly comprised of Heavy Goods Vehicles.
- 6.3 The Core Strategy does not have any specific transport proposals or issues. It mainly refers to the contextual regional/sub regional policies. The strategy mentions a number of generic transport issues such as location of development, parking control and transport infrastructure provision – these elements are strengthened by policies CP12, and amendments made to Policy CP2a (May revision).

North Yorkshire LTP3

- 6.4 The County Council's LTP3 (2011 to 2016) published in April 2011 acknowledges that it is likely that for the early years of LTP3 there would be very little funding available for integrated transport schemes and initiatives (improvements) and that funding will be concentrated on fulfilling statutory duties with regards to road safety and managing congestion. If and when sufficient capital funding is made available by the Government the County Council will reassess the situation and where appropriate increase the provision of 'improvement' schemes.

- 6.5 The LTP highlights that it is important that appropriate measures are identified and developed in order to accommodate the impact on transport of future development through the LDF. The County Council will work with the planning authorities (and where appropriate the Highways Agency) to use available traffic models and other transport planning software to assist in assessing the impact of new housing on the transport network and identify necessary new transport infrastructure and services.
- 6.6 The LTP is clear that in many cases the cost of the necessary local highway infrastructure to allow the proposed level of new housing is substantial (in some towns over £10m). With the significant constraints on public funding for transport it is neither possible nor appropriate for the County Council to provide the funding for this level of infrastructure.
- 6.7 The County Council are therefore currently working with the ten planning local authorities and the Highways Agency to seek a countywide agreement on preparing Strategic Transport Improvement Master Plans (STIMPs) which will identify all necessary infrastructure that will be required in each town or district to allow delivery of the LDF. As part of this they are also aiming to agree mechanisms for public / private sector funding packages which will provide the funding to deliver the necessary transport infrastructure identified in the STIMPs and to allow transport improvements for existing users.
- 6.8 The LTP highlights the importance of Travel Planning and as part of standard planning requirements the County Council now requires new developments (above pre-determined sizes dependent upon the type of development) to provide a travel plan. These will need to demonstrate how travel demand can be minimised and how sustainable travel to and from the site can be encouraged. It is anticipated by the County Council that schemes and initiatives identified through this process will normally be funded by developers, although there may be occasions where the County Council will contribute to an initiative.

Infrastructure Delivery Plan

- 6.9 The LDF draft Infrastructure Plan has been prepared in consultation with the County Council. The Plan outlines that the development within Selby over the plan period will impact on sections of the SRN and outlines that further work needs to be carried out and joint working arranged with adjacent LPAs. The plan also highlights the junctions which NAT has suggested require further investigation, the infrastructure plan suggests that the Allocations DPD and future CIL will investigate these issues further.
- 6.10 The HA would agree that such works should continue to be undertaken which will enable a prioritisation exercise to be undertaken to enable the delivery of various infrastructure improvements as a result of development growth within Selby.
- 6.11 The current Infrastructure Delivery Plan outlines planned and proposed Infrastructure improvements, including potential funding sources. It should be noted that any Transport Infrastructure required on the SRN/TRN as a result of future development within Selby District, must be funded in its entirety through Developer led contributions.

7 Summary

The Highways Agency and NYCC, as local highway authority, support Selby's overall approach and are in agreement that the Core Strategy addresses how the Authority will actively manage down the predicted traffic generated by the future development proposals, and does not consider that sites which have an impact on the operation of the SRN or LRN are precluded from gaining planning consent.

- 7.1 If any infrastructure is identified as being critical to the delivery of the Plan, but does not have an identified funding source, this would be identified within the STIMP. By working in partnership the findings of the STIMP can be used to build on and enhance the Infrastructure Delivery Plan to ensure that transport services and both Strategic Highway and Local Highway improvements that are necessary to deliver the LDF proposals, are deliverable.
- 7.2 In terms of improvements to the SRN, the Highways Agency will only consider improvements to meet traffic generated by new development as a last resort. Instead the Highways Agency will encourage developers to provide a range of sustainable travel options for people using their development through the use of secured Travel Plans. This approach would also be adopted by NYCC, as local highway authority.
- 7.3 Notwithstanding these issues, the Highways Agency and NYCC, as local highway authority, seeks to continue working with Selby and North Yorkshire County Council to identify ways of delivering the LDF proposals in a sustainable way.

END