

Scarborough Borough Council
Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004
Town and County Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004
Scarborough Borough Local Development Framework

Statement of Consultation
Transport Assessment Supplementary Planning Guidance

This Supplementary Planning Document has been prepared in compliance with Section 17 (1) of The Town and Country Planning (Local Development) (England) Regulations 2004.

The draft Transport Assessments SPD was advertised within the Local Press, and was published on the Council's Website. Copies of this document were deposited within the Council Offices at Scarborough, Whitby and Filey and in Local Libraries and published on the Council's website. The consultation exercise was carried out 10 November –22 December 2006. The draft Transport Assessments SPD was sent to a wide range of consultees (809 in total), including Councillors, Parish Councils, hard to reach groups, utility providers and surrounding authorities.

16 organisations/individuals responded back to the initial consultation. In general, the response to both documents was positive. Many of the comments made were for clarification of issues, which have been considered and been taken on board and the documents amended accordingly. A second, informal consultation was undertaken with the three transportation authorities, to ensure that they were fully supportive of the document in its revised form. Summaries of the representations received, together with an analysis and recommendation as to whether any changes to the SPDs are listed below.

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
Network Rail	TSPD001	In respect of the TA SPD, paragraph 5.4 should be amended to include specific reference to s.106 contributions towards public transport facilities. This may include passenger and/or railway station facilities. The justification for this is that developments can often lead to considerable increases in passenger numbers; the impact of such an increase often needs to be off-set with the provision of additional waiting facilities, new customer information screens, increased security (CCTV etc), better parking provision and access improvements. This is especially important if the developer is reliant on the proximity to a station in any Travel Plan, or a development has minimum car parking provision to encourage use of public transport.	Agreed. Referenced in paragraph 6.6.
Whitby Hospitality Association	TSPD002 1	Para 3.1 "undertaken by an appropriately qualified" – Specify the qualifications or criteria or trade association, etc. " experienced professional employed	Disagree. It is not for the LPA to impose requirements such as specific qualification requirements. The LPA is not able to have a panel of

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
	2	by the developer" – Not a good idea, as if the consultant wants paying, and another contract, then he is not going to produce an impartial appraisal.	'acceptable' consultants for reasons of impartiality. In any case, developers/applicants come from far and wide and so a comprehensive list cannot be created/maintained without considerable resource input. It is the responsibility of the developer/applicant to provide an Assessment from an appropriately qualified individual/company and then the relevant Highway Authority will assess the Assessment and any measures proposed, to ensure that there is impartiality.
	3	Therefore: 'and experienced professional chosen from a LPA Panel of acceptable consultants' - in this way (similar to Banks), the LPA can pre determine the quality, skill level and desirability of the consultants.	
	4	Para 4.5: Is there a mechanism built in that ensures that developments that fall outside the Scarborough Highways Agency area, have Transport Assessments called for by other appropriate Highways Agency's?	
	5	Apart from those points, the document appears fine to our amateur eyes.	
Home Office	TSPD003	No comments to make.	
Joseph Rowntree Foundation	TSPD004	No comments to make.	Noted.
Julie Asher (RHBay Tourism Association)	TSPD005 1	Great importance was placed on the reliability of the bus service, particularly at the weekends. Inevitably, a number of people cited incidents of late/early buses but the problem also exists of buses too full in the early stages of their journey and refusing to pick up passengers further up the route.	Noted, discussion of the specifics of this issue is not within the remit of this document. Paragraph 5.3 states that an Traffic Assessment should describe the level and frequency of public transport services at different times of the day in terms of access to the development site. Discussions with existing bus operators are encouraged to establish whether a sustainable service can be provided with or without subsidy. Comments referred to North Yorkshire County Council
	2	Conversely, a mini-bus service between Whitby, RHBay and Scarborough was suggested at off-peak times when full-size buses often cross the moors with fewer than 3 people aboard.	
M McGuinn (Clerk to Newby and Scalby Parish Council)	TSPD006	Parish Council content with policies.	Noted.
Yorkshire and Humber Assembly	TSPD007 1	The document is largely based on PPG13 and quotes from draft RSS, which together provides the appropriate guidance. The references made to the RSS throughout the document are welcomed.	Noted.
	2	One of the prime objectives of this Transport Assessments Document is to	Noted.

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
	3	<p>minimise the need to travel and to minimise the negative impact of transport systems on the local and global environment. The Assembly welcomes these objectives as it clearly reflects the overarching spatial vision of the RSS.</p> <p>However, although Policy T1 in draft RSS states the need to have a Transport Assessment, the policy also states that where public transport services to a site are being considered, accessibility should be assessed using the accessibility standards which are included in the draft RSS.</p>	<p>Agreed. This will be inserted as an appendix to the report in tabular form as per the draft RSS p. 277-278.</p>
	4	<p>The Assembly is encouraged by Appendix 1 as this usefully explains the new planning system, however it is suggested that this could be further improved through the inclusion of a reference to the draft RSS which states how it provides the strategic, upper, tier of planning guidance.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to the role of the RSS will be included in Paragraph 2.2.</p>
Highways Agency	TSPD008 1	<p>Section 2.0 <i>General</i>: Specific reference should be made to the Guidance on Transport Assessments (GTA), a draft of which has recently been out for consultation and which is likely to be issued in its final form soon.</p>	<p>Agreed. Referenced as a source of information within the appendix 4.</p>
	2	<p><i>PPG13</i>: The Agency would expect specific consideration to be given to the SHN. Suggested wording: “<i>With respect to any development which could impact upon the A64(T), the Highway Agency (in accordance with the requirements of Circular 04/2001) would require to be consulted upon any application for development that would cause a material increase in trunk road traffic.</i>”</p>	<p>Agreed. Will include in paragraph 5.1.</p>
	3	<p>Section 3.0: the Agency would point the applicant towards the GTA in determining the requirement for a Transport Assessment. If a full Transport Assessment is not required, a “Transport Statement” would provide a more succinct overview of the transport based issues.</p>	<p>Agreed. Refer to in paragraph 4.4 and 6.2</p>
	4	<p>Section 4.0: In determining the need for a Transport Assessment, upon its formal issue, the Agency would refer to the GTA, which provides the following thresholds at which assessment would be required (which generally relate to development</p>	<p>Agreed in part. The figures used within this draft document are taken from the County Council’s document: Transport Issues and Development - a Guide (2003). In response to these comments it has been decided to combine both these</p>

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response																																										
	5	<p>which would generate 30 two-way peak hour vehicle trips). To provide an overview of these thresholds, the Agency provides the following table (see below) to compare with those in the SPD.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of development</th> <th>Transport Statement</th> <th>Transport Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Food retail</td> <td>250sqm</td> <td>800sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-food retail</td> <td>800sqm</td> <td>1500sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Office B1</td> <td>1500sqm</td> <td>2500sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industry B2/B8</td> <td>3000sqm</td> <td>5000sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residential</td> <td>50units</td> <td>80units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td colspan="2">30+ two way movements</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>It can be seen that the thresholds for assessment in the GTA differ from those in the SPD and this disparity could lead to confusion for developers (e.g. a food retail development of 900sqm would require assessment according to the GTA but not according to the SPD). Consideration should therefore be given to the GTA thresholds in order to ensure that a common approach is adopted.</p>	Type of development	Transport Statement	Transport Assessment	Food retail	250sqm	800sqm	Non-food retail	800sqm	1500sqm	Office B1	1500sqm	2500sqm	Industry B2/B8	3000sqm	5000sqm	Residential	50units	80units	Other	30+ two way movements		<p>sources, using the lowest amount to ensure maximum capture. However, in any event the LPA reserves the right to require a traffic statement/assessment in certain circumstances. Below is the revised table:</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Type of development</th> <th>Transport Statement</th> <th>Transport Assessment</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Food retail</td> <td>250sqm</td> <td>800sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Non-food retail</td> <td>500sqm</td> <td>1000sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Office B1</td> <td>1500sqm</td> <td>2500sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Industry B2/B8</td> <td>3000sqm</td> <td>5000sqm</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Residential</td> <td>50units</td> <td>80units</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Other</td> <td colspan="2">60+vehicle movements in any hour</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Type of development	Transport Statement	Transport Assessment	Food retail	250sqm	800sqm	Non-food retail	500sqm	1000sqm	Office B1	1500sqm	2500sqm	Industry B2/B8	3000sqm	5000sqm	Residential	50units	80units	Other	60+vehicle movements in any hour	
Type of development	Transport Statement	Transport Assessment																																											
Food retail	250sqm	800sqm																																											
Non-food retail	800sqm	1500sqm																																											
Office B1	1500sqm	2500sqm																																											
Industry B2/B8	3000sqm	5000sqm																																											
Residential	50units	80units																																											
Other	30+ two way movements																																												
Type of development	Transport Statement	Transport Assessment																																											
Food retail	250sqm	800sqm																																											
Non-food retail	500sqm	1000sqm																																											
Office B1	1500sqm	2500sqm																																											
Industry B2/B8	3000sqm	5000sqm																																											
Residential	50units	80units																																											
Other	60+vehicle movements in any hour																																												
	6	<p>In addition to the local highway authority, the Highways Agency would expect to be consulted upon any transport assessment which is required to consider the A64(T). As such the Agency would request that reference is made to the Highways Agency within this section of the SPD.</p>	<p>Agreed. This is already undertaken as part of the statutory consultation process. Reference will be included in the document in Para. 5.1</p>																																										
	7	<p>Section 5.0 <i>Introduction</i>: The Agency requests that the Strategic Highway Network be mentioned in addition to the local highway network.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference in Para. 3.1.</p>																																										
	8	<p><i>Policy Framework</i>: The Agency considers that Regional Policy Guidelines should also be considered, particularly the Regional Transport Strategy and Regional Spatial Strategy, given the weight they are given in the new planning system.</p>	<p>Agreed. Reference to the role of the RSS will be included in Paragraph 2.2 and Appendix 2.</p>																																										
	9	<p><i>Trip Generation</i>: For any proposal which could impact upon the SHN, the Agency would expect 85th percentile trip rates to be utilised within assessments. In addition to this, the guidance may be best to advise of the specific requirements in relation to trip generation levels to be considered in the local highway network assessments (e.g. average trip rates).</p>	<p>Agreed. Will make reference to this in paragraph 6.3 'Trip Generation'.</p>																																										

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
Further comments made on 06.03.2007	10	<p><i>Future Traffic Conditions:</i> The methodology for calculating traffic growth and the future years to be assessed should be included in this section. For the SHN, consideration should be given to National Road Traffic Forecast (NRFT) Central growth factors and assessment years should be in line with Circular 04/2001 or subsequent guidance.</p>	<p>Agreed. The document guides the developer to seek advice from the Highways Agency should the proposed development potentially affect the site, and then the Highways Agency can specify its requirements.</p>
	11	<p><i>Vehicular Impact:</i> Consideration should be given to the percentage impacts on the SHN and if required the detailed assessment of the SHN using industry standard software. Where required, mitigation measures will need to be designed in accordance with the Agency standards detailed in DMRB.</p> <p>The GTA refers to the need to assess development impacts in accordance with the New Approach to Appraisal (NATA) objectives (environment, safety, economy, accessibility and integration) and this should be specifically reflected in the SPD.</p> <p><i>Section 106 Agreements:</i> In concern of the SHN, the Agency is not in a position to enter S106 Agreements. The mechanism for providing highway improvements on the SHN is via a S278 Agreement, which is detailed in Circular 04/2001. This should be referenced within this section of the SPD.</p> <p>The Agency would consider that within these documents much greater emphasis should be placed on the new Transport Assessment (TA) guidance that was published by the DfT on the 7th March 2007 which moves away from the traditional 'predict and provide' approach to managing travel demand. This guidance is a national document and applies to developments that will affect the transport system, including not only the strategic and local road network but also public transport and footpaths.</p> <p>Transport Assessments produced under this new guidance will need to address travel issues arising from developments in the following order:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduce the need to travel, especially by car • Tackling the environmental impact of travel 	<p>Agreed. Make reference to % impact on SHN In paragraph 6.3 section 'Vehicular Impact'.</p> <p>Acknowledged, make reference to these objectives in paragraph 6.4.</p> <p>Agreed. Make paragraph below the Sect 106 section, paragraph 6.7.</p> <p>The document makes reference to the new Guidance on Transport Assessments (GTA) in various parts of the report. Para. 3.2 is a new paragraph which makes clear that one of the general aims of a Transport Assessments is both to reduce the need for travel by car and therefore minimise further usage of the existing road network. It is considered that the SPD is consistent with advice contained within the GTA. Furthermore it will be the case that for the majority of developments which require a transport assessment, a Travel Plan will also be required, and this is a means show how private car use will be minimised by various measures.</p>

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The accessibility of the location • Influencing Travel Behaviour • Managing the network • Deal with residual trips • Propose mitigation measures <p>As this guidance has now been released reference to this in LDF documents should be included to advise developers of what is now required of them when developing TA's to support development proposals.</p>	
The Theatres Trust	TSPD009	As this SPD is not directly relevant to the Trust's work, we have no comment to make but look forward to being consulted on further LDF documents especially the Core Strategy Submission stage and any associated relevant SPDs, Site Allocations, Development Control policies and Area Action Plans.	Noted.
Dunlop Haywards obo Persimmon Homes (Yorkshire)	TSPD010 1 2 3 4	<p>Generally supportive, however please note the following issues:</p> <p>1 It is not consider appropriate to set a criteria under which a transport assessment would be required [4.4] only to proceed to state that the LPA reserves the right to request a TA in other instances. This paragraph should be deleted from the document and all instances where a TA will be required be clearly set out in the document.</p> <p>2 Following on from the above the reference to 'other reasons' in figure 1 needs amending to clearly set out the circumstances in which a TA will be required.</p> <p>3 Para 5.2 makes reference to 'larger developments'. This statement is considered ambiguous. What constitutes a 'larger development' in this instance should be clearly established in the document.</p> <p>4 The LDS states that a Developer Contributions SPD will be prepared as part</p>	<p>Disagree. This should remain in place, the LPA must be able justify why a Transport Assessment is required when the standard thresholds may not be exceeded. The instances where a TA is automatically required are set out in Section 4.</p> <p>Disagree. The Thresholds give a clear indication as to when such an assessment will automatically be required, but that certain, smaller developments may need a Transport Assessment due to special circumstances. The SPD clearly outlines that pre-application advice should be sought at an early stage from the relevant highway authority for any development, as they would be able to advise on the nature and degree of information required for a transport assessment.</p> <p>Para. 5.2 of the draft document actually made reference to smaller developments at or around the trigger levels in Para. 4.1, and states that a more simplified TA would usually be acceptable or a transport statment. As stated above, para.s 5.1 and 5.2 state that developers should carry out pre-application enquires regarding the need for Transport Assessments.</p> <p>Disagree. Developer Contributions are an</p>

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
		of the LDF. The reference contained in para 5.4 to developer contributions is therefore not appropriate in this document and should be deleted.	important element of the delivery of schemes. The reference is general, and is there to ensure there is cross-cutting of policy.
Cloughton Parish Council	TSPD011	Document well designed and interesting. But: uncertain how balance can be struck between welcoming new local business opportunities and problems of travel planning, and where the Council might stand. It would be easy to discourage new business if another hurdle was introduced at outset.	Development of the Borough's economy is a key issue. However, development must be undertaken in a sustainable manner. The use of transport assessments is there to aid in considering the implications of the proposal. The level of detail and complexity will depend on the scale and nature of the development.
English Heritage	TSPD012	At this stage we have no comments to make on the content of the draft Supplementary Planning Documents, and would generally concur with the conclusions reached in the respective Sustainability Appraisals regarding the likely significant effects, which the SPDs might have upon the historic environment.	Noted.
Nathaniel Lichfield Partners obo Bourne Leisure	TSPD013 1 2 3 4	<p>Bourne Leisure notes that the main aim of the draft SPD for transport assessments, as set out at Para. 1.1, is to provide further guidance as to the nature and content of transport assessments and when a transport assessment will be required with the submission of a planning application.</p> <p>Para. 2.2 of the draft SPD states that the draft RSS (Dec. 2005) emphasises a reduction in travel demand and shift towards modes of transport with lower environmental impacts. However, recognition should be given in draft SPD that in relation to planning applications for tourism-related developments, the fact is that due to the often rural and coastal nature of tourist attractions and facilities there is a reliance on the car for many tourism journeys.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure notes that paragraph 4.1 of the draft SPD incorporates a table setting out when a Transport Assessment is required. For "other uses" (which would include tourism uses), an assessment is required where 60+ vehicle movements are expected within an hour. Clarification should be added as to whether this is a peak flow or averaged over a 24-hour</p>	<p>Noted.</p> <p>Disagree. The document makes reference to the fact that in certain instances the car may be the only form of transport. However, it is not considered appropriate to give allowances to the tourism sector when there will be opportunities for the use of more sustainable forms of travel in certain development situations.</p> <p>Agree. Clarification has been provided on whether 60+ vehicle movements is a peak or an average. The figure refers to <i>any</i> hour, this therefore it is a maximum peak flow. So if at any time in the day or night over 60 vehicle movements recorded in an hour, this would exceed the threshold. This is to ensure that the maximum impact can be assessed. Clarification of this has been provided in paragraph 4.2.</p>

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
	5	<p>period.</p> <p>Moreover, further guidance should be given as to the requirements for a transport Assessment where proposals involve the expansion or extension of an existing use.</p>	<p>Disagree. Paragraph 4.6 advises that if the developers/ agents are uncertain of their requirements, to contact the planning department. Nevertheless, proposals for extension or expansion will have to consider the impacts cumulatively in relation to the existing activities.</p>
	6	<p>In terms of what the transport assessments should include, and to the specific requirements set out at paragraph 5.3, Bourne Leisure considers that further guidance should be given on the likely geographical extent of the data required (for example in terms of the existing highway conditions or existing public transport provision), and that this should be in direct relation to the scale of the proposed development.</p> <p>Bourne Leisure is also concerned that paragraph 5.4 of the draft SPD states that developer contributions will be time-limited to a period of 15 years, as this is considered to be too long a time period, except perhaps only in the case of the most major developments and that each case should be considered on its own merits.</p>	<p>Noted. It is considered that the document provides sufficiently clear advice as to what aspects will be required in a traffic assessment, and that for public transport it will be for services that serve the site, even if they may not physically link to the site, such as rail services and bus services.</p> <p>Noted. Impact of a development on the surrounding infrastructure can have sometimes-long term, unforeseen impacts. Each case will be determined on its own merits, and may well be a shorter term. If the money is not spent it is returned, with interest. In discussion with the Council's Traffic and Transportation Manager it is considered that 10 years is a more appropriate figure.</p>
Seamer Parish Council	TSPD014	<p>...The new 'Caddick' developments proposed for alongside the Seamer Carr Tip access road and to draw your attention in particular to the likely increase in traffic and personnel employed in that area both during construction and when the development is completed. It is felt that a shuttle bus service from the railway station around several business developments at Eastfield/Dunslow Road/Seamer Carr Tip might reduce road traffic and be of benefit to those working in the area.</p>	<p>Specific issues like this are not appropriate to consider within an SPD, which deals with general policy.</p> <p>This comment has been passed to the North Yorkshire County Council and the SBC Head of Traffic and Transportation/engineering.</p>
Les Parker NYCC	TSPD015	<p>From the cursory look through I've been able to give them they appear to give a good basis for Travel Plans and TA's.</p> <p>I presume these are to be applied throughout the SBC Area not just in the Agency area and that this guidance will therefore supersede NYCC guidance. Has this been discussed with Elwyn Williams at County Hall?</p>	<p>The SPDs are to cover the area of the Borough that the SBC Planning Service covers, and once adopted will be a material consideration in the determination of a planning application, just as recommendations from the Highway Authority already are. The document generally runs parallel with NYCC guidance. The document has been produced with a lot of input from the NYCC guide: Transport Issues and Development -a Guide (2003). Also, depending on the location of the scheme, the relevant</p>

Consultee	ID No.	Comments	Councils Response
		of up to 1.5 might be acceptable but larger deviations than this, for example because of excessive fencing, will discourage walking, will not be sustainable and will not normally be acceptable.	
Mr J Hannah Traffic and Transportation Section SBC	TPSD017	<p>I can confirm that both documents are acceptable.</p> <p>They enhance and expand upon the contents of the current NYCC doc. "Transport Issues & Development: A Guide 2003" which we currently use for development control in the Agency area.</p> <p>I note that some of the trigger thresholds for a TA have dropped (in GFA) which is a positive move for our urban area.</p>	Noted.
Mr Bruce Bedford Traffic and Transportation Manager	TSPD 018	I would add that you should require trip generations , that are used in Transport Assessments, to be based on nationally-recognised data (ie TRICS)...	Acknowledged. The SPD refers to trip generation generally, make reference for the need for nationally -recognised data. Trip generation section of para. 6.3.