

## **Agenda**

- Meeting:** Selby and Ainsty Area Planning Committee
- Members:** Councillors John Cattanach (Chair), Bob Packham (Vice-Chair), Karl Arthur, Mike Jordan, Cliff Lunn, Steve Shaw-Wright and Arnold Warneken.
- Date:** Wednesday, 11 December 2024
- Time:** 2.00 pm
- Venue:** Selby Civic Centre

Members of the public are entitled to attend this meeting as observers for all those items taken in open session. Please contact the named democratic services officer supporting this committee, details at the foot of the first page of the Agenda, if you have any queries.

### **Supplementary Agenda**

- 3a. Officer Update Note (Pages 3 - 6)**

Members are reminded that in order to expedite business at the meeting and enable Officers to adapt their presentations to address areas causing difficulty, they are encouraged to contact Officers prior to the meeting with questions on technical issues in reports.

#### **Agenda Contact Officer:**

Dawn Drury, Democratic Services Officer  
Tel: 01757 292065  
Email: dawn.drury@northyorks.gov.uk

Tuesday, 3 December 2024

This page is intentionally left blank

## Officer Update Note

### Selby and Ainsty Area Planning Committee – 11 December 2024

#### Item 3- Application - ZG2024/0159/OUTM

**Outline planning application including access, with all other matters reserved for a storage and distribution use (Class B8) with HGV parking and ancillary uses including vehicle servicing workshop at land adjacent to the A19 roundabout, Selby Bypass, Selby.**

#### Additional objections.

2 additional letters of objection reiterating the issues already raised in the report.

#### Objection from Active Travel England

Active Travel England recommend refusal of the application.

#### Background

New and updated information has been supplied and ATE is also cognisant of the responses from the Local Highway Authority on the file. It is unfortunate that no response has been received to specifically respond to our comments raised in our letter of 3 April 2024.

It is once more noted that this site is not allocated for employment uses and that a previously refused application with an identical description, included a reason for refusal directly related to the highway safety and the sustainability of the site. The original Planning Statement indicates that the Local Highway Authority has requested that consideration is given to accommodating pedestrian/cycle accesses on the A19 Doncaster Road. It is also noted that a large employment allocation is proposed in the emerging Selby Local Plan inside the Selby A63 bypass at Olympia Park, Barlby Road.

Since making our original comments earlier this year we have been able to discuss this application with the Active Travel England Inspectorate division on the design and technical aspects of the proposal. This has highlighted that given the nature of the surrounding road network, the A63 and A19, whilst no longer shown on the 2023 National Highways SRN map, are nevertheless 60mph routes and were only recently detrunked. Given this, it is more appropriate to consider the design for active travel under the Standards for Highways guidance CD 143 - Designing for walking, cycling and horse-riding and CD 195 Designing for Cycle Traffic.

#### Summary –

The revised plans submitted show more details on two active travel access points, a shared cycle and walking route to the west of the site and a second walking only route to connect with a hail a ride stop to the south west on the A19. This is now accompanied by a stage 1 Road Safety Audit and an updated travel plan. It is understood that the internal route for pedestrians and cyclists will be detailed at the time of a reserved matters application. It is noted that the RSA has not considered cycle

movements specifically or any conflicts with the technical design standards we have referred to above.

ATE would advise that the design and layout must comply with table E4.1 within CD 195, which for 60 mph roads must include grade separated crossing with no alternative given. Whilst Google Streetview would indicate that the roundabout and its approach roads would all presently be 60mph, and as the designed crossing proposed cannot comply with this guidance, serious concerns are raised.

Pedestrian access is likely to be towards bus stops rather than direct to settlements given the distances proposed. It is welcome that clarity is provided on a contribution towards improving services, which are at a low level presently, but it is not known realistically what this contribution will achieve. Walking routes to stops require crossing 60mph roads, with the routing identified by the first figure in the TA addendum showing crossing the A64 to the north first to the east of the roundabout that is not present on the proposed site plan or plan ref: 20091/GA/01 the A63 site access plan. Will this route also be created to help facilitate access to the related bus stops?

It is welcome new bus stops would be provided, and analysis is set out to understand the best location for them. New bus stops must have good natural surveillance and provide seating, lighting, shelter, real-time passenger information and raised bus boarders or specialist kerbs. Footpaths/ways to public transport nodes do not conform to the National Design Guide standards of being safe, direct, convenient and accessible for people of all abilities, which includes but is not limited to routes that:

- have a minimum width of 2m, with limited pinch points no less than 1.5m
- are step-free
- have a smooth, even surface
- have seating at regular intervals
- are uncluttered
- have good natural surveillance and clear lines of sight
- have street lighting
- have wayfinding, and
- have crossing points suitable for the speed and traffic flow of the road(s)

Pedestrian access to the south towards the A19 as understood would require construction on a changing topography which is not shown as a detailed design on the site plan, as indeed the shared use cycle and pedestrian route to the north would and again is not shown. This would be likely to require steps or ramps which should be detailed in the submitted plans and must conform to Inclusive Mobility (2022), and in the case of the shared use route LTN 1/20. In addition, onward connections outside the site to the south would be to narrow footways across the bridge with no crossing identified on this 60mph road and no lighting. The footway to the eastern side of the bridge runs

out shortly after the bridge. If this is to be a fully viable option for pedestrian access further significant improvements off site would be required but none are specified.

It is noted that the travel plan has been revised but does not appear to have considered the issues we raised in our first response, which still stand. This is a difficult location to maximise active travel modes and therefore the travel plan needs to work hard to influence mode shares.

The site is unallocated for employment uses and located a significant distance away from settlements and residential areas with major barriers from the A19 and A63 impeding access by active modes. No design solution has been presented to assure Active Travel England that NPPF paragraphs 114 b) and 116 a), b), c) can be met; in that:

*Paragraph 114 b) ...safe and suitable access can be achieved for all users..*

*Paragraph 116 a) give first priority to pedestrian and cycle movements... access to public transport ..and provide facilities that encourage public transport use, b) address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport. c) create spaces that are safe, secure and attractive minimising conflicts between pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles...respond to design standards.*

On this basis Active Travel England must recommend refusal on this application.

#### **Additional Reason for refusal**

*6. The site is located a significant distance away from settlements and residential areas with major barriers from the A19 and A63 impeding access by active modes. The proposal does not contain sufficient information to ensure safe and suitable access to the site can be achieved for all users. The application is therefore contrary to Selby District Local Plan Policies ENV1 and T1 and Core Strategy Policies SP15 and SP 19 section 9 of the NPPF.*

#### **Item 4 - Application – ZG2023/1153/FUL**

##### **Erection Of Three New Detached Dwellings With New Accesses To Garden Lane On Land To The South Of 44 Garden Lane, Sherburn In Elmet**

In terms of the Emerging Local Plan then to clarify, although Paragraph 10.27 states that no weight is being given to this document. The correct position is as stated at Paragraph 6.5. In accordance with paragraph 48 of the NPPF, given the stage of preparation following the consultation process and depending on the extent of unresolved objections to policies and their degree of consistency with the policies in the NPPF, the policies contained within the emerging Local Plan can be given weight as a material consideration in decision making and, if relevant, will be referred to in the body of the report.

Officers consider that the scheme is acceptable in the context of the Emerging Local Plan.

This page is intentionally left blank