

TRANSPORTATION AND VEHICLE PARKING

INTRODUCTION

- 7.1 Selby District benefits from well-developed transportation links. It is crossed by a number of railway lines and major roads, including the M62, A1, A19, A63 and A64. There are six railway stations which, whilst primarily catering for commuter traffic, also provide access to other main line stations. Port facilities are also available on the river Ouse, at Selby.
- 7.2 The maintenance and enhancement of the transport system is vital to the national and local economy. Recent improvements include the construction of the Riccall and Barlby bypass and the Sherburn in Elmet bypass. Other planned improvements include the Selby bypass and the upgrading of the A1 to motorway standard, which will further enhance the District's accessibility to the national motorway network and other port facilities. Consideration is also being given to a number of other improvements including local highway schemes and the electrification of the Hull-Liverpool railway line.
- 7.3 Whilst the District Council has no direct influence on transport investment, this being the responsibility of the Department for Transport (in relation to trunk roads), the County Council (as Local Highway Authority) and various service operators, it will use its best endeavours to secure appropriate improvements in services. The District Council will, wherever possible, also take the initiative to introduce measures relating to traffic management, the provision of off-street parking, highway layouts in new development, and the improvement of cyclist and pedestrian safety.
- 7.4 Traffic emissions are widely recognised as a major source of environmental pollution and restricting the need to travel, particularly by car, is now central to national transport policy. In July 1998 the Government published its White Paper on the Future of Transport entitled "A New Deal for Transport: Better for Everyone". This document sets out the Government's proposals to create a better, more integrated transport system to tackle the problems of traffic congestion and pollution. The Road Traffic Reduction Act 1997 (RTRA, 1997) is an important aspect of this "New Deal". The County Council's recent Local Transport Plan 2001-2006, published in July 2000, makes specific reference to the RTRA which gives measures to achieve traffic reductions which the County Council consider are mainly relevant to urban areas and tourist 'hotspots'. The Local Plan Strategy seeks to reduce reliance on the private car as much as possible by locating new development in areas which have opportunities to utilise other forms of transport where practicable. Policies and proposals in this Chapter are intended to be complementary to the Strategy.

STRATEGIC FRAMEWORK

- 7.5 National guidance on transport and land-use planning is set out in PPG12 (Development Plans and Regional Planning Guidance, 1992) and PPG13 (Transport, 1994).
- 7.6 PPG12 establishes the requirement to ensure that transport and land-use issues are addressed in a coordinated manner in development plans and that consideration is given to the inclusion of traffic management proposals.

- 7.7 PPG13 elaborates the strong commitment to reducing the environmental impact of transport, particularly vehicle emissions, and provides further advice on how local authorities should integrate transport and land-use planning. Encouragement is given to policies which aim to provide development at locations highly accessible by means other than the private car, and which maintain and improve the choice for people to walk, cycle or use public transport rather than drive between homes and facilities which they need to visit regularly.
- 7.8 The North Yorkshire County Structure Plan provides a framework for the transport strategy for the Local Plan. Policies are intended to facilitate improvements to the primary road network, sustain public transport, and encourage the provision of off-street car parking, and cycle facilities. Within built-up areas, traffic management measures will be preferred to major new road construction.
- 7.9 The County Council aims to strengthen the existing primary road network by undertaking a programme of major improvements which are identified in the Country Structure Plan and which have been updated in the Third Alteration. These, and other more localised highway improvement schemes, are reflected in the Local Transport Plan (LTP) 2001-2006, which is submitted annually as part of the County Council's bid for financial support from Central Government for transport purposes.

OBJECTIVES

- 7.10 The Transportation and Vehicle Parking policies of the Plan have the following main objectives:
- 1) To promote alternative forms of transport to the private motor car and to minimise the need to travel by appropriate location and layout of housing, employment and other uses.
 - 2) To ensure that new development is served or could be served by satisfactory transport networks giving adequate access and taking into account public health, safety and energy/resource efficiency.
 - 3) To maintain and support the improvement of transport links while managing the roads network to provide a safe and efficient system to serve different functions.
 - 4) To promote appropriate traffic management measures to reduce pedestrian and vehicular conflict and enhance the local environment.
 - 5) To support and encourage and, wherever possible, improve public transport services and associated facilities.
 - 6) To provide a better and safer environment for cyclists, pedestrians and those with mobility problems.
 - 7) To encourage movement of freight by rail and water as an alternative to road transport.
 - 8) To ensure that an appropriate level of car parking is available.

POLICIES AND PROPOSALS

Development in Relation to the Highway Network

- 7.11 The classified highways network serving the Plan area comprises trunk roads and motorways, principal (Class A) County roads and numerous Class B and Class C roads.
- 7.12 The County Structure Plan defines the primary roads which have an important strategic role in carrying traffic between major centres, and linking with other parts of the region and the national motorway network. The primary roads within the Plan area are shown below and comprise the following trunk roads and principal County roads.

Trunk Roads

M62 motorway

A1

A63

A64

A19 (north of Selby)

A1041

Principal (Class A) County Roads

A162

A163

(south of Selby)

A19

- 7.13 Many stretches of trunk roads within the Plan area are already experiencing, or will soon have, capacity problems. Development in the vicinity of these roads, or their junctions, could add significant local traffic movements which may prejudice the ability of the primary network in the area to carry long-distance traffic. It is therefore important to reduce the need to use these routes for short, local journeys and to ensure that traffic in general is served by a satisfactory highway system. Problems of congestion and the risk of accidents will otherwise continue to increase.
- 7.14 Where existing roads and their junctions cannot cater for forecast traffic generated by individual proposals, there may be scope for developers to undertake improvements to existing highways, or enhancement of proposed new highways, prior to the development, in order to accommodate envisaged flows. This may be achieved through the imposition of appropriate planning conditions or by entering into a legal obligation. In certain circumstances, there may be scope for developers to provide new road links in order to facilitate major proposals.
- 7.15 In order to ensure that traffic generated by development proposals does not prejudice the maintenance of an efficient and safe road network, the following policy will apply.

T1 Development proposals should be well related to the existing highways network and will only be permitted where existing roads have adequate capacity and can safely serve the development, unless appropriate off-site highway improvements are undertaken by the developer.

Access to Roads

- 7.16 Whilst development should be well related to the existing highways network, in accordance with POLICY T1, it is equally important to minimise interference with traffic flows and the risk of accidents.
- 7.17 PPG13 (Transport 2001), Annex B, sets out a graduated approach to new connections with trunk roads or intensified use of existing ones. Access will be most severely restricted in the case of motorways and the highest standard strategic routes. The remainder of the trunk road network will be subject to a less restrictive approach to connections, particularly with a view to assisting development of urban brownfield sites.
- 7.18 PPG13 emphasises that, whatever the type of access, safety considerations will be paramount and that similar principles should be applied by local authorities when formulating policies for local roads. The Government's policy on the control of development adjacent to trunk roads is set down in full in DTLR Circular 04/2001 (Roads).
- 7.19 All proposals for new accesses will be assessed on the basis of potential accident risk, on the advice of the Highways Authority. The type of access provided should reflect the type of road involved and the volume and character of traffic likely to use the access and the road. In all cases, good visibility will be a prerequisite for the formation of a new access.
- 7.20 Wherever possible, the combining of individual access points along a road will be encouraged.

T2 Development proposals which would result in the creation of a new access or the intensification of the use of an existing access will be permitted provided:

- 1) There would be no detriment to highway safety; and**
- 2) The access can be created in a location and to a standard acceptable to the highway authority.**

Proposals which would result in the creation of a new access onto a primary road or district distributor road will not be permitted unless there is no feasible access onto a secondary road and the highway authority is satisfied that the proposal would not create conditions prejudicial to highway safety.

Programmed Road Schemes

- 7.21 Continuing growth in road transport and consequent environmental impacts present a major challenge to the objective of sustainable development. It is increasingly recognised that forecast levels of traffic growth cannot be met in full and that new road building, or the upgrading of existing highways, will in some cases be environmentally unacceptable. Following a review of the national trunk road building programme, many schemes have recently been taken out of the programme or postponed. It is also established national policy not to build new trunk or local roads simply to facilitate commuting by car into congested urban areas.
- 7.22 At the same time, some improvements to the road network will continue to be necessary and desirable, where this enables demand to be more effectively managed, and significant environmental or road safety improvements to be secured. Added weight is placed on these improvements where they are needed to support economic growth.
- 7.23 The national road building programme currently includes three Department for Transport trunk road schemes within the Plan area, namely the proposed upgrading of the A1 to motorway standard, the A63 Selby bypass, and the A63 Osgodby bypass. Provision has also been made for a safeguarded route to bypass Hambleton and Monk Fryston.
- 7.24 There are no current County Council road schemes within the Plan area. Restrictions in public expenditure have severely affected the County Council road programme and the County Council has announced its intention to concentrate on traffic management measures within urban areas in preference to road construction.

A1 Motorway

- 7.25 The A1 in North Yorkshire forms part of the principal route from London to Edinburgh, east of the Pennines. The road has considerable strategic importance and a number of sections presently carry traffic far in excess of capacity. It is proposed to upgrade certain sections of the A1 through North Yorkshire to three-lane motorway standard, including realigning parts of the route.
- 7.26 Preferred routes have been published for all sections of the scheme which pass through the Plan area. The District Council supports the scheme in principle which will bypass Brotherton, Byram and Fairburn and will provide safer and more efficient access with consequent economic benefits to the District. The preferred alignment of the road will be safeguarded by refusing planning consent for development proposals which would compromise implementation of the scheme.
- T3 The District Council will safeguard the preferred alignment of the A1 motorway, as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development which would compromise implementation of the scheme.**

A63 Selby Bypass

- 7.27 The detailed alignment of the A63 Selby bypass was approved following a public inquiry in 1991. The route, which is defined on the Proposals Map, will also provide traffic relief to the villages of Brayton and Thorpe Willoughby, and residential development at Barlby Bridge.
- 7.28 The District Council strongly supports the scheme, which will significantly reduce traffic congestion in Selby town centre and facilitate the implementation of environmental improvements and traffic management measures within the town. The bypass also represents the key component in the implementation of a coordinated land-use/transportation strategy for the town, and will help to unlock development sites and stimulate further economic development.
- 7.29 Highway Orders for the compulsory purchase of land were the subject of a public inquiry in May/June 1995, which, following the Secretary of State's decision to confirm the Orders with amendments removed the last remaining obstacle to the bypass. The intention to commit further funding to enable construction to start by the year 2000 was announced in early 1997. The scheme will take two to three years to complete and will involve the construction of a new swing bridge spanning the Ouse. The implementation of a number of development proposals in Selby, Barlby and Brayton are dependent on the construction of the road.

T4 The District Council will safeguard the detailed alignment of the A63 Selby bypass, as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development which would compromise implementation of the scheme.

A63 Hambleton and Monk Fryston Bypasses

- 7.30 The A63 forms part of the old main route from Leeds to Hull which was heavily trafficked until the M62 motorway was built. It is still an important regional route linking the A1 to Selby. Following the public inquiry to consider objections to the proposed A63 Selby bypass the Secretaries of State for the Environment and Transport at that time accepted the case for a future review of the traffic situation in Hambleton and Monk Fryston on completion of the Selby bypass. It is therefore necessary to continue to safeguard the route corridor in the event that the need for a bypass is justified.

T5 The District Council will safeguard the route corridors for the A63 Hambleton and Monk Fryston bypasses, as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development which would compromise implementation of the scheme.

A63 Osgodby Bypass

- 7.31 Following detailed investigation and a public consultation exercise in January 2002, the Highways Agency has published, in September 2002, a preferred route for the Osgodby bypass, linking the northern end of the Selby bypass to the A63 east of Osgodby village. The bypass will remove through-traffic from the village and from the current A19/A63 junction, between Osgodby and Barlby, which has a poor safety record.

T5A The District Council will safeguard the preferred route corridor for the Osgodby bypass as defined on the proposals map, by refusing proposals for development which would compromise the scheme.

Local Highway Improvements

- 7.32 A number of smaller highway improvement schemes have been programmed or are under consideration within the Plan area. These are considered necessary to improve traffic flows and reduce accidents.

Department for Transport Schemes

- 7.33 The A63 east of Selby and the A19 north of Selby form part of an increasingly busy designated route between York and the M62 motorway junctions near Goole. Recent improvements have been carried out at the A19/A63 junction at Barlby.
- 7.34 The A64 forms an important route between Leeds, York and Scarborough. The Highways Agency is implementing measures published in its A64 Management Strategy to improve the level of service the road provides to all users and to improve safety along the route.
- 7.35 Recent improvements have included the closure of central reservation gaps and the banning of U-turns. Work on a major junction upgrading scheme at Colton Lane, Bilbrough began in early 2004; and a preferred scheme for an upgrading of the Tadcaster Bar junction is likely to be announced in 2004.

County Council Schemes

- 7.36 The County Council is responsible for identifying and implementing a programme of capital works for the non-trunk road network. Priority is given to schemes which reduce accidents, relieve congestion, provide a net environmental benefit and represent good value for money. The District Council will continue to encourage improvements to the road network within the Plan area including smaller schemes such as the provision of footways and footway improvements, traffic calming schemes and other traffic management measures. Potential schemes identified as a result of consultation with the public and relevant organisations as part of the Local Plan preparation process will be drawn to the attention of the County Council.

Traffic Management

- 7.37 Within residential areas and town centres, unmanaged traffic flows can degrade the environment and the quality of life, through air and noise pollution and risk of accidents. There is considerable scope for introducing traffic management measures, and traffic calming, within many settlements, particularly in Selby (both before and after the completion of the planned bypass). Traffic management can also be a useful tool in encouraging use of public transport, walking and cycling, improving the quality of neighbourhoods and making the streets safe for children.
- 7.38 The District Council will investigate schemes to enhance the street environment and improve road safety in sensitive locations in conjunction with the County Council. Measures to be considered will include the introduction of pedestrian priority areas, one way traffic systems, pedestrian crossings, traffic signals and

sensitive landscaping and other environmental enhancements combined with the managements of on-street parking. Physical features such as road humps, chicanes and narrowing may also help to reduce vehicle speeds and improve driver behaviour.

Public Transport

- 7.39 Many residents, particularly those in rural areas, rely on public transport to travel to work, school, shops and other facilities. The 1991 Census indicates that approximately 22% of the District's households do not own cars. It is important therefore to maintain and improve existing services for those without access to private transport.
- 7.40 Following bus deregulation in 1986, a variety of bus companies now operate within the Plan area providing access to market towns and also larger settlements beyond the Plan area. The level of service available varies considerably and many rural settlements have no connections to sources of employment or to market towns for evening entertainment or social visits.
- 7.41 There are six railway stations within the Plan area which provide only limited opportunities for local journeys. Selby is on the Liverpool to Hull trans-Pennine route and enjoys frequent services to Leeds, Hull, York, Bradford and Manchester. South Milford is on the same route with a basic hourly service to Selby, Leeds, Bradford and Manchester. Church Fenton and Ulleskelf stations have a limited service to York, Leeds and Sheffield. Sherburn in Elmet has a limited service to York, Selby and Sheffield and Whitely Bridge is served by occasional Leeds to Goole Trains. There is also an infrequent service between Selby and Doncaster.
- 7.42 The provision of public transport is primarily the responsibility of private operators in conjunction with the County Council which provides subsidies for certain services. Whilst the District Council has no direct influence over public transport investment, it will continue to support services by using its influence and by promoting measures designed to improve the efficiency and attractiveness of the public transport system. For example, discussions have taken place with Passenger Transport Executives from neighbouring Metropolitan Authorities with a view to extending cross-county subsidised rail and bus services into the District. The District Council will also promote the electrification of the Leeds-Hull railway via Selby, in view of the improved regional and inter-regional communications and other benefits which would be secured from the scheme.
- 7.43 PPG13 (Transport) emphasises that planning decisions have an important role to play in influencing the need to travel and in determining what level of provision is made for alternative methods of transport to the motor car. The locational policies in the Plan which have been designed to reduce the need for travel by car will also help to sustain public transport services, and may encourage the provision of additional services. Additional measures, such as the provision of facilities for bus users, and ensuring that buses are catered for in the design of the new housing estates, will also be investigated.

T6 The District Council will encourage the provision of effective bus and rail services by:

- 1) **Continuing to liaise with the county council, bus and train operators, and the Rail Users' Committee and other groups in order to promote satisfactory and coordinated services to market towns and all rural villages;**
- 2) **Ensuring that development proposals for housing, employment, retail, leisure and other generators of travel demand are located where they would be capable of being well served by public transport;**
- 3) **Taking full account of the needs of public transport when considering development and highway proposals, and traffic management schemes, including bus priority and integrating transport modes;**
- 4) **requiring developers to provide road layouts and roads that are suitable for buses, where appropriate; and**
- 5) **Investigating the scope for establishing additional railway stations with secure parking and attractive facilities for passenger comfort as well as the improvement of existing stations to encourage rail travel.**

Provision for Cyclists

- 7.44 Cycling is a convenient form of transport within the Plan area owing to the generally flat topography. It is also a particularly popular form of leisure activity for both road racers, tourists and casual riders owing to the availability of a number of cycleways, such as the Selby-York Spur of the Trans-Pennine Trail, and the cycleway alongside the Drax/Airmyn Link Road. A number of other initiatives are currently under investigation, or in the course of implementation, including a combined footpath-cycleway alongside Selby Canal and between Selby and Howden.
- 7.45 The District Council recognises the environmental, recreational, health and economic benefits of cycling. By encouraging people to cycle it is possible to reduce traffic congestion, pollution and conflict between pedestrians and motor vehicles.
- 7.46 The National Cycling Strategy (NCS) was published by Central Government in 1996 as an acknowledgement of the key role that cycling has to play in promoting a sustainable transport strategy. Specifically, the NCS is designed to promote cycling priority on the highway, in the centre of towns, at the workplace and in new developments.
- 7.47 The central target of the National Strategy is to double cycle trips by 2000 with a further doubling by 2012. As a complement to the National Cycling Strategy, North Yorkshire County Council adopted a North Yorkshire Cycling Strategy in June 1999. The objective, particularly in urban areas and where a proven need exists, is to promote a primary network of cycle routes to improve safety for cyclists. This process will involve the identification of appropriate locations and involve the construction of dedicated cycleways, the use of shared footpath facilities, advanced stop lines at traffic signals, traffic calming of existing roads and other facilities. The District Council will seek to ensure that new cycle

routes and facilities will be provided to the standards set out in INT/DoT/CTC/BA Design Standards (1996).

- 7.48 The District Council supports proposals to improve and create new cycling facilities and in this regard is keen to ensure that major development proposals contained in this Plan incorporate proper cycling routes and facilities. The Council will encourage the use of cycle audits for new schemes, the adaptation of more road space for cycle facilities and the taking account of cycling provision in the application of speed restraint measures. Furthermore, the District Council is assisting and encouraging the County Council in the identification of new cycling routes and facilities, primarily in the larger centres of the District such as Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet.
- 7.49 The District Council is also keen to implement measures in conjunction with the planned construction of the Selby by-pass, including the provision of advance cycle stop lines at traffic signal-controlled road junctions within the town. Consideration will also be given to the provision of 'safe school routes' and links between residential areas, employment areas and town centres.

T7 The District Council will seek to promote the objectives of the national cycling strategy by:

- 1) Encouraging the development of a quality cycle route network primarily in the main larger centres of Selby, Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet as well as having regard to the appropriateness of promoting safe routes to outlying villages and smaller hamlets.**
- 2) Having particular regard to the creation/improvement of safe cycle routes to schools.**
- 3) Ensuring that developers make fair and reasonable contributions towards the cost of providing cycle parking facilities and cycle routes on new developments which link to nearby existing or proposed routes or facilities.**
- 4) Ensuring that new development proposals do not sever points used by cyclists/pedestrians unless satisfactory alternative routes are made available.**
- 5) In assessing all development proposals, special regard will be given to the opportunity of improving/creating cycle routes and providing cycle parking.**

Public Rights of Way

- 7.50 North Yorkshire County Council, as the Local Highway Authority, is responsible for maintaining public rights of way, although the District Council has certain powers to create public rights of way and to close or divert rights of way. In assessing new development proposals, the District Council will require new rights of way to be created when existing rights of way are extinguished by new development.

7.51 The District Council will, according to the availability of resources, work with the Highway Authority and other bodies in protecting, promoting and improving public rights of way in the District.

T8 Development which would have a significant adverse effect on any route in the district's public rights of way network will not be permitted unless the following can be achieved:

- 1) Satisfactory and attractive alternative routes are provided; and**
- 2) Adequate sign posting is provided; and**
- 3) As far as is reasonable, the new route can make provision for walkers, horse riders, cyclists and people with sight or mobility problems; and**
- 4) In the case of new reasonable development, such development must replace extinguished rights of way with attractive highway infrastructure which is equally capable of accommodating appropriate users of the original right of way.**

The District Council will work with the highway authority and other interested parties to extend and improve the public rights of way network for amenity as well as highway reasons.

Roadside Facilities for the Travelling Public

7.52 There is likely to be an increasing demand for service facilities for the travelling public along the primary and secondary road network within the Plan area. Typical facilities include petrol filling stations, motorists' restaurants, car and lorry parking, overnight accommodation, toilets and telephones on principal routes. The Department for Transport is keen to encourage development of individual key sites to become the focus for the range of facilities for all motorists, including lorry drivers.

7.53 Roadside facilities are essential to ensure the safety and convenience of travellers, but their number, location and design need careful control to protect the environment. The District Council acknowledges that suitable sites will often only be available outside built-up areas. In considering proposals, care will be taken to ensure that development only takes place where there is a demonstrable need for additional facilities and that the degree of visual intrusion is minimised.

7.54 Developer assessments of the distribution of existing facilities and deficiencies in provision, including taking into account provision within adjoining settlements, will be helpful in justifying proposals. The overriding considerations in determining applications, however, will be the degree of environmental impact and highway safety. Proposals will generally not be acceptable within areas of Green Belt because of the potential conflict with the objectives of Green Belt designation.

7.55 Other, more low key facilities such as lay-bys, picnic sites, public toilets and information boards, may also be required in connection with increased tourism in more remote areas. These will also be considered within the context of POLICY RT5.

T9 Proposals for roadside facilities for the travelling public will only be permitted provided:

- 1) There is a demonstrable need for the facilities and the proposal would not result in a proliferation of facilities in the locality;**
- 2) The proposal would not create conditions prejudicial to highway safety or which would have a significant effect on local amenity;**
- 3) The nature and scale of the proposal would be appropriate to the locality and would not have a significant adverse effect on the character of the area; and**
- 4) The proposal would achieve a high standard of design, materials and landscaping.**

Motorway Service Areas

A) Local Situation

- 7.56 The motorway network affecting Selby District is currently being improved. The opening of the M1-A1 Link Road in early 1999 extends the M1 northwards to Bramham and provides a motorway standard route from the M62 (west) to the north-east. In addition work started in Spring of 2003 to up-grade, to motorway standard, the Ferrybridge to Hook Moor section of the A1 through the District, largely on a new alignment. This section of new motorway is entirely within the Green Belt within Selby District. Outside the District, to the north, the upgrading to motorway standard of the Wetherby to Walshford section of the A1 also started in Spring 2003. Following the completion of the South and West Yorkshire Multi-Modal Study, further work is being commissioned on the Redhouse (Doncaster) to Ferrybridge section of the A1 to determine viable proposals for making the best use of, or improving, this section.
- 7.57 The M1 extension has created new long-distance motorway routes from the south and west which may well require further service provision. The existing service provision is located at Woolley near Wakefield on the M1 and Hartshead Moor near Cleckheaton on the M62. Northward from these, extensive consideration has been given, within the planning and legal processes, to motorway service area proposals on the A1 within Harrogate District. A permission granted by the Secretary of State at Kirkby Hill, Harrogate was the subject of a successful legal challenge in November 2000. There has also been a successful legal challenge to the identification within the Leeds Unitary Development Plan of a motorway service area location at Skelton on the M1 extension. Consequently there are currently (June 2002) no motorway service locations definitively accepted within the planning process on either the M1 extension or the A1 north of the existing services at Ferrybridge, which are to be signed from the realigned A1 via a short length of the M62.
- 7.58 In response to the above events, the Secretary of State has convened a further public inquiry, starting in October 2002, which will reconsider the Harrogate District applications together with applications for services at Bramham, within Selby District, and Skelton, within Leeds District. This inquiry will give the

opportunity for a comprehensive appraisal of service facilities in the vicinity of Selby District.

- 7.59 The A1 corridor within Selby District has Green Belt status and, therefore, as motorway service areas constitute 'inappropriate' development, they should not normally be permitted under national Green Belt policy except in very special circumstances. The considerations the Council will take into account when assessing such circumstances are set out in POLICY T10 below.

B) National Policy

- 7.60 The basis of the Government's policy with regard to motorway service areas (MSAs) is set out in Roads Circular 1/94 as supplemented by Lord Whitty's July 1998 statement.

- 7.61 Under national Green Belt policy, MSAs are not appropriate development within Green Belt. The Council will therefore expect to see evidence, in support of a case that very special circumstances apply, that other non-Green Belt sites have been investigated and found to be unsuitable or unavailable.

- 7.62 Government policy on the spacing of MSAs, as set out in Lord Whitty's 1998 statement, is currently to establish a 'thirty mile' network although this does not amount to a presumption in favour of MSA proposals which would contribute to that network; they will continue to be subject to the normal operation of the land-use planning system. Spacing is not in itself sufficient to outweigh objections based upon a national restraint policy such as Green Belt unless reinforced by other factors. 'Infill' services in between the 'thirty miles' sites will be granted only in exceptional circumstances, even outside the Green Belt, and where a clear and compelling need and safety case has been established

- 7.63 Motorists' needs will vary depending on the type of traffic using the road as well as the characteristics of existing services. Evidence of the capacity of existing MSAs not being able to cope with the demand from motorists may include queuing on MSA approach roads or lack of car parking spaces at peak times.

- 7.64 Road safety is of paramount importance; the basis of the 'thirty mile' network is to provide drivers with adequate opportunities to stop and rest. There must be evidence of a genuine need for the proposed services rather than simply demand: it will not be sufficient to show merely that drivers would use the facility. There should be evidence of a genuine safety-related need such as a higher than normal incidence of accidents attributable to driver fatigue.

C) Local Plan Policy

- 7.65 As the entire section of proposed motorway through Selby District lies within the Green Belt, it is necessary to establish, in the first instance, whether or not very special circumstances apply. Part A of POLICY T10 sets out the considerations the Council would take into account in this respect. If the Council is of the view that such circumstances do exist, then any proposals will be judged against the criteria, as set out in Part B of the Policy. Should the Council consider that any proposal is acceptable under this policy, it would be treated as a departure from the Development Plan and would be referred to the Secretary of State.

- T10 The Council will consider proposals for the establishment of facilities to meet the needs of motorway travellers on their merits and subject to other provisions of the plan. A motorway service area is inappropriate development in the green belt and would not be permitted under Policy GB2. Such a facility would only be considered in very special circumstances.**
- A. In assessing whether such circumstances apply at the time a proposal is made, the Council would take into account the following considerations:**
- a. Whether there is a compelling need for such a facility in terms of:**
 - i. The distance between the proposal and existing and planned MSAs on the A1(M) and related motorway routes, bearing in mind government policy with regard to the spacing of services;**
 - ii. Road safety;**
 - iii. The capacity of existing MSAs to cope with the needs of motorists.**
 - b. Whether there are non-green belt sites on the A1(M) and related motorway routes which are suitable and available for an MSA and would avoid the use of a green belt site.**
- B. If it was decided that very special circumstances did apply, the council would expect the proposal to satisfy the following specific criteria:**
- 1) The proposal would minimise the impact on the openness of the green belt and the character and appearance of the countryside;**
 - 2) The proposal would safeguard and enhance the existing landscape character through new landscape massing and tree planting;**
 - 3) The development would achieve a high standard of design and materials appropriate to the surroundings;**
 - 4) The site is not within an historic park or garden, or in an area of archaeological importance, and the proposal would not harm a site of nature conservation importance;**
 - 5) The proposal would avoid the loss of best and most versatile agricultural land or comply with Policy EMP12;**
 - 6) The development would not create conditions prejudicial to highway safety or affect the free flow of traffic on the motorway; and**

- 7) The proposal meets the minimum standards for car parking and other basic services necessary to meet the needs of motorway users, including the disabled, but it is not a destination in its own right and does not provide anything beyond facilities laid down in government policy.**

Freight Traffic

- 7.66 PPG13 (Transport, 1994) indicates that, wherever possible, encouragement should be given to the carriage of freight by rail or water rather than by road, wherever it can provide a viable alternative. The Plan area is well served by excellent rail and road links and is also crossed by a number of navigable waterways, namely the river Ouse, the Selby canal and the Aire and Calder Navigation. Considerable freight movement by rail and water already takes place in connection with Selby Coalfield, the two power stations in the Plan area and the inland port facilities in Selby. There is also potential for a direct rail link into Sherburn Enterprise Park.
- 7.67 A recent study has identified considerable opportunities for expanding the port and rail facilities in Selby. The District Council is committed to the regeneration of the Selby waterfront and has secured Single Regeneration Budget funding for this purpose. Specific proposals are incorporated in Part Two of the Local Plan.

Vehicle Parking

- 7.68 A certain level of off-street parking provision is necessary to avoid causing traffic problems and to maintain a reasonable level of accessibility, particularly in town centres. At the same time, the availability of car parking has a major influence on the choice of means of transport. PPG13 (Transport, 1994) suggests that car parking policies should support the overall locational policies in development plans, and that local authorities should adopt reduced requirements for parking at locations which have good access to means of travel other than the private car.

Vehicle Parking Standards

- 7.69 Proposals for development are normally required to provide car parking in accordance with the most recent North Yorkshire County Council Parking Design Guide, which sets out maximum car parking standards for residential, commercial, employment and other types of development. The standards have been adopted by the District Council for development control purposes and are included in POLICY VP1 as Appendix 4 to this Plan.
- 7.70 Whilst it is important that adequate parking is provided to serve new development, recent national planning advice on sustainability issues, particularly PPG13, suggests that in the future there may be less justification in fully catering for the needs of motorists in order to encourage other modes of transport. This must be balanced, however, with the needs of rural communities where there are generally higher levels of car ownership and poorer public transport facilities than in urban areas, and with the need to maintain the vitality and viability of market towns by encouraging visitors and shoppers.
- 7.71 In certain circumstances, e.g. within town centres, it may not be feasible or desirable to provide full on-site parking in connection with a proposed development scheme. In certain circumstances, however, a financial contribution may be sought from developers to enable the District Council to make additional provision which is considered to be an essential consequence of the scheme, at an appropriate alternative location.

VP1 The District Council will support the provision of parking spaces/facilities in new developments up to the maximum car parking standards as set out in Appendix 4.

Existing Off-street Car Parking

- 7.72 The District Council maintains a number of 'pay and display' car parks within Selby, and free car parks in Tadcaster and Sherburn in Elmet. These are defined on the Proposals Map and identified in Part Two of the Local Plan. Public car parking provision in Selby is supplemented by a number of private car parks, operated by retailers in the town.
- 7.73 Existing car parks are generally well-used, particularly at weekends and market days, when spaces may occasionally be fully taken. The loss of existing off-street spaces would clearly have a detrimental effect on the capacity and safety of roads and, since demand is unlikely to reduce, the District Council will resist the loss of existing public or private parking spaces unless replaced by suitable

additional car parks. The following policy will apply equally to off-street car parking and domestic parking outside town centres.

VP2 Proposals which would result in the loss of off-street car parking spaces as defined on the proposals map will not be permitted unless alternative provision, for at least the same number of spaces, can be made at an appropriate location, or it can be demonstrated that there is no longer a requirement for the existing level of car parking.

Future Car Parking Requirements

- 7.74 It is anticipated that the demand for off-street and on-street car parking spaces will increase as a result of further population growth and increasing car ownership. Adequate car parking is clearly important to ensure the continued vitality and viability of market towns.
- 7.75 Car parking requirements are not necessarily restricted to the market towns, and a number of Parish Councils have expressed concerns regarding the unavailability of car parking or problems associated with on-street parking in villages.
- 7.76 It is therefore proposed to review the need for additional off-street car parking provision throughout the Plan area. Where appropriate, opportunities for securing additional provision will be incorporated in development proposals and/or brought forward as specific proposals following public consultation on the Plan. Notwithstanding recent PPG advice, it is likely that there will continue to be heavy dependence on the motor car owing to the rural nature of the Plan area.
- 7.77 One of the ways in which car parking can be regulated is through effective price controls. The District Council will ensure positive management of its car parks in order to maintain an adequate balance between short and long-term spaces to meet the needs of shoppers, workers, residents and visitors. At the same time, considerable weight will be given to the desirability of safeguarding and enhancing the vitality and viability of town centres.
- 7.78 It is also proposed to keep the demand for on-street provision under continuous review, to ensure that a level of provision is achieved which balances the needs of the motorist with conservation and environmental objectives and policies. Opportunities for a significant review of on-street provision may arise in connection with traffic management measures undertaken during the Plan period.

POLICY VP3 is deleted.

Parking for People with Disabilities

- 7.79 Motorists with disabilities have an essential need for convenient car parking. It is desirable to provide dedicated parking bays in public car parks and to reserve on-street parking spaces near shops and other key facilities, where these can be accommodated without undue traffic disruption. Parking bays of increased width are required for ease of movement and to enable convenient transfer from car to wheelchair where necessary.

7.80 In order to provide adequate access for motorists with disabilities to places of employment and shopping, recreational, health and other facilities, the District Council will require an appropriate number of car parking spaces to be reserved for disabled people, where car parking is provided in conjunction with new development. The proposed standards are based on those suggested by the Institution of Highways and Transportation.

VP4 Proposals for development that necessitate the provision of on-site car parking will be required to provide car parking spaces for motorists with disabilities on the following basis:

- 1) For shopping, recreational, health and educational development and places open to the general public, where up to 200 car parking spaces are required, 6% capacity with a minimum of 3 spaces, should be set aside.**
- 2) For employment development, where up to 200 combined car parking spaces are required for employees and visitors, 5% of capacity with a minimum of 2 spaces, should be set aside.**

For schemes requiring 200 or more car parking spaces, 4% of capacity, plus 4 spaces, should be set aside.