

North Yorkshire Council's Response to Inspector's Matters, Issues and Questions

Matter 8 – Access, Travel and Transport

Issue 1 – Connectivity, Walking and Cycling – Policies NS30, NS31 and NS32

Q1. What is the justification for the suggested changes to paragraph 10.4, Policies NS30 and NS31 and their respective supporting text? Why are they necessary for soundness?

The modifications recommended to both the wording of paragraph 10.4 and policies NS30, NS31 and their respective supporting text respond to comments made by statutory consultees and others during the Regulation 19 consultation. The modifications are recommended to provide clarification. There is also a small formatting correction including in the policy wording of NS31.

Issue 2 – Public Transport – Policies NS33 and NS34

Q1. How will policy NS34 ensure that the new settlement is adequately served by bus routes particularly given the funding issues highlighted by the Access and Movement Background Paper (Supporting Document SDNS07)?

The funding issues in the Access and Movement Background Paper ([SDNS07](#)) relate to the delivery of the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and are not specific to this development. The BSIP does identify several key corridors which would be prioritised for investment, however the A59, in the vicinity of the proposed site does not feature as a key corridor.

Policy NS34 notes that bus provision will be provided early in the development, with bus provision provided from the first occupation. The bus provision for the site will be expanded as each phase of the development comes forward. Funding for the bus services will be provided by the developer. Work is ongoing to agree the more specific details of the bus routes, more details on this issue are expected to come forward in the Transport Assessment.

Q2. What is the justification for the suggested changes to Policy NS33 and the supporting text of Policy NS34? Why are they necessary for soundness?

The modifications recommended to policies NS33, NS34 and their respective supporting text respond to comments made by statutory consultees and others during the Regulation 19 consultation. The modifications are recommended to provide clarification. There is also a small formatting correction including in Policy wording NS33.

Issue 3 – Street Hierarchy, Mitigation and Car Usage – Policies NS35, NS36 and NS37

Q1. How have the effects of development on the non-strategic (local) highway network been assessed as part of the plan-making process? Where highway mitigation is required, where is this set out and how will it be achieved?

The transport impact on the non-strategic highway network have been modelled through the Harrogate District Transport VISUM model. This formed part of the evidence base of the Harrogate District Local Plan and was scrutinised at examination in public in January 2019. There was no specific mitigation for local highway network associated with the new settlement identified in the Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

As indicated in the justification to Policy NS36 (para 10.40) a Transport Assessment has been carried out and submitted to support the planning application. This carried out more localised modelling for junctions and links affected by the new settlement. The outputs from this, together with transport workshops with the site promoter, resulted in a number of highway mitigation measures identified in policy NS36. In addition, a Transport Assessment will be required for each phase of development and this may highlight additional mitigation measures not already set out in policy NS36. The Developer will be responsible for delivering any required mitigation.

Q2. Does the DPD make adequate provision for overnight lorry parking facilities in accordance with paragraph 113 of the Framework?

Whilst there will be provision made for employment uses, alongside a local centre providing small scale employment opportunities, this will not include large scale industrial / distribution units therefore the provision of lorry parking facilities is not considered necessary for the development.

Q3. How have the effects of measures to mitigate and improve the highway network, such as the junction improvement at Whixley crossroads, on heritage assets been considered?

The Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) SDNS09 considered the potential for impacts resulting from highway improvement schemes, whereby increased highways interventions and traffic may further impact on setting. At the time of assessment, the details of the highways interventions

were not known and therefore it outlines recommended mitigation / enhancement measures on a general basis.

This includes recommendations for the designated heritage assets of Kirk Hammerton Conservation Area and Providence House, which have resulted in the inclusion of the requirement, in policy NS16, for development proposals and the supporting documents to take into account the following:

- 'The way in which the conservation area is experienced on entrance and exit along Gilthwaite Lane.' (Kirk Hammerton Conservation Area).
- 'Impact of potential highway improvement schemes.' (Providence House).

In addition, the HIA raised the potential for direct impact on the grade II listed milestone located by the A59, near Providence House due to the potential for it to be stored off-site whilst improvement works are carried out. As a result, policy NS19 is included in the DPD.

Whilst falling outside the new settlement boundary, Cattal Bridge, a scheduled monument, was identified as being sensitive to the potential increase in traffic. As a result, policy NS17 is included in the DPD.

With regards to non-designated heritage assets, policy NS21 requires detailed master planning to take into account the impact of development upon significance and therefore this allows for proposals relating to highways improvements to be assessed accordingly.

Q4. Is the requirement set out in Policy NS37 for development proposals to be delivered within a vehicle trip budget reasonable and justified?

The requirement set out in Policy NS37 is reasonable and justified. Having a trip budget approach in place will help push the sustainable transport options and help to mitigate impacts on the wider highway network

The overall trip budget and trigger points are yet to be agreed with the Local Highways Authority, this will be done through working with the developer and be set out in the Transport Assessment. The monitoring of trips will be essential as will be a strategy to ensuring we know when the developer is approaching the identified budget in advance so any necessary works can be designed and approved.

Q5. What is the justification for the suggested changes to Policy NS37 and its supporting text? Why are they necessary for soundness?

The modifications recommended to policies NS37 and its supporting text respond to comments made by statutory consultees and others during the Regulation 19 consultation. The modifications are recommended to provide clarification. There is also a small formatting correction including in Policy wording NS37.