

Land West of Kellington Lane, Eggborough: Response to National Highways Comments (29th February 2024)

Application Ref: ZG2023/1037/EIA
Ref: GJ/JW/ITY16146-011 TN
Date: 27 August 2024

SECTION 1 Introduction

- 1.1 This technical note has been produced to provide a response to comments in JSJV's Technical Memorandum dated 29th February 2024, produced on behalf of National Highways (NH). The Technical Memorandum was not received by the Applicant and i-Transport until 24th July 2024. A meeting was held between the Applicant, i-Transport, NH and JSJV on 15th August 2024 to re-establish discussions between the parties in respect of the live planning application.
- 1.2 The technical note provides each summary comment from JSJV (in italics and bold) with our response below.

SECTION 2 Response to Comments

JSJV Comment 1: Clear Local Plan evidence illustrating how the site is or can be made sustainable in transport terms.

- 2.1 The application site benefits from a draft allocation in the Selby Local Plan and is proposed to be retained as an allocation following the incorporation of North Yorkshire Council (NYC) the Council deems the site to be suitably located for the intended uses.
- 2.2 A development vision has been put forward by the Applicant as part of the application (i-Transport document ITY16146-008 TN) and has been welcomed by the Council. A Travel Plan (i-Transport document ITY16146-006D R) has subsequently been approved by NYC, with the email from the Travel Plan Officer included in **Appendix A**. The Public Transport Strategy has also been accepted by NYC, as set out in the email from the Public & Community Transport Officer sent through to NH/JSJV in the email dated 19th August 2024 and included in **Appendix B**.

2.3 As part of the development proposals, Banks Property proposes to support the future enhancement of Whitley Bridge Station through the dedication of land that will enable Network Rail to provide an enhanced 'gateway' to the station, envisaged in the Local Plan site requirements, as note in paragraph 2.9 below.

JSJV Comment 2: It should be clarified whether data contained with the Vision Development Note is from the 2011 Census or the more up-to-date 2021 Census.

2.4 The various data included within the Development Vision is drawn from the 2011 Census, including the journey purpose, modal split and age profile of the existing resident population within the Selby 010 MSOA.

2.5 Regarding the journey purpose and the modal split, this is appropriate as the 2021 Census was carried out during Covid-19 and lockdown enforcement, and therefore trips by residents are likely to have been restricted. This was agreed by NH/JSJV as being the correct approach during the meeting held on 15th August 2024.

2.6 Regarding existing ages the difference between 2011 Census and 2021 Census is summarised below.

Table 1: Selby 010 MSOA - Profile of the Existing Resident Population

Age Group	Existing Population (Selby 010 MSOA) – 2011	% Split (Selby 010 MSOA) - 2011	Existing Population (Selby 010 MSOA) - 2021	% Split (Selby 010 MSOA) – 2021	Difference between 2021 Census and 2011 Census
Infant (0-3 years old)	334	4.1%	355	4.0%	+21 (-0.1%)
Primary school (3-11 years old)	669	8.2%	660	7.5%	-9 (-0.7%)
Secondary School/6th form (11-18 years old)	710	8.7%	669	7.6%	-41 (-1.1%)
Young adult (18-21 years old)	250	3.1%	223	2.5%	-27 (-0.6%)
Young professional (21-40 years old)	1,557	19.1%	1,843	20.9%	+286 (+1.8%)
Older professional (40-65 years old)	3,276	40.2%	3,207	36.3%	-69 (-3.9%)
Early Retirement (65-80 years old)	1,028	12.6%	1,577	17.9%	+549 (+5.3%)
Older Adults (80+ years old)	330	4.0%	291	3.3%	-39 (-0.7%)
Total	8,154	100%	8,825	100%	+671 (0.0%) ¹

¹ Overall increase if 8.2% from 2011 to 2021

2.7 The differences between the 2011 Census and 2021 Census are limited and therefore it is reasonable to assume that there is considerable potential for trips to be retained on the site (i.e. managed down) through, for example, on-site education, home working and on-line education.

2.8 The use of the 2011 Census, in all instances, was agreed by JSJV during the meeting on 15th August 2024.

JSJV Comment 3: Clarity on whether the proposed development is likely to follow the preferred housing mix set out in the SDC Local Plan.

2.9 The current planning application is in Outline. However, the Applicant will provide a policy compliant housing mix. The housing mix need not have any bearing on the process of agreeing vehicular (or person) trip rates.

JSJV Comment 4: No additional Local Plan evidence appears to have been provided illustrating how Whitley Bridge Station can be made more sustainable in transport terms.

2.10 Banks Group remains in close dialogue with the Council's Rail Delivery Team (Graham North) regarding the Council's emerging business case to introduce enhanced passenger transport services at Whitley Bridge Station.

2.11 As part of the development proposals, Banks Property proposes to support the future enhancement of Whitley Bridge Station through the dedication of land that will enable Network Rail to provide an enhanced 'gateway' to the station, envisaged in the Local Plan site requirements.

2.12 Neither the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R) nor the Travel Plan (i-Transport document ITY16146-006D R) are reliant on any enhanced rail services, with no increase in rail modal split assumed.

JSJV Comment 5: DfT document 'Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025' should be referenced.

2.13 DfT document 'Road Investment Strategy 2: 2020-2025' was not referenced as the only part of this relating to the M62 involves a Smart Motorway provision between Junction 20-25, reproduced below:

"M62 Junctions 20–25 – upgrading the M62 to smart motorway between junction 20 (Rochdale) and junction 25 (Brighouse) across the Pennines. Together with other smart motorways in Lancashire and Yorkshire, this will provide continuous extra motorway capacity between Manchester and Leeds, and between the M1 and the M6."

JSJV Comment 6: Other than the provision of footways / cycleways within the site boundaries and proposition to 'in fill' bus timetables, that the measures discussed within the TP do not sufficiently address previous concerns regarding the lack of sustainable access to the Site.

2.14 The Council has signed off the updated Travel Plan and accepted the Public Transport Strategy. The updated Travel Plan and Public Transport Strategy was submitted to NH and JSJV on 19th August 2024.

2.15 As part of the development proposals, Banks Property proposes to support the future enhancement of Whitley Bridge Station through the dedication of land that will enable Network Rail to provide an enhanced 'gateway' to the station, envisaged in the Local Plan site requirements.

2.16 In addition to the above the following off-site active travel improvements are proposed, as set out in Table 7.2 of the Transport Assessment:

- Footway / Cycleway improvements to Whitley Bridge Station.
- Footway / Cycleway improvements along A645 Weeland Road.
- Footway improvements to Kellington Lane / Westfield Avenue bus stops.
- Pedestrian/cycle crossing improvements at Kellington Lane, including zebra crossing south of the Kellington Lane access and a raised table crossing immediately south of A645 Weeland Road.

2.17 Additionally, car club vehicle(s) will be located on the site. If possible, car club vehicle(s) will be ultra-low emission / electric cars. Provision of high-speed electric charging infrastructure for car club vehicle(s) at a central location, if appropriate.

2.18 Furthermore, as part of recent discussions, potential pedestrian improvements at the A645 Weeland Road / Selby Road roundabout are being considered, on the northern arm (Selby Road), with NYC. The potential improvements could include the provision of an uncontrolled crossing, removal of a couple of bollards immediately north of the junction and removal of verge outside of the retail units.

JSJV Comment 7: The Applicant has only presented a target modal shift for private car use. We would suggest that the proposed mode shift targets should be disaggregated so that the targeted shift for all modes is clearly presented.

2.19 The future year disaggregated Travel Plan targets are set out in Section 9.3 of the updated Travel Plan. These targets, which relate to average daily trips for all journey purpose (not peak hours or peak periods), are reproduced below.

Table 2: Travel Plan Targets by Mode

Mode of Travel	% Multi Modal Split		
	Baseline	Target	Difference
Walk	13%	16%	+3%
Cycle	2%	3%	+1%
Car Driver	54%	39%	-15%
Car Passenger	25%	26%	+1%
Bus/Coach	5%	8%	+3%
Rail	1%	1%	0%
Work From Home	-	5%	+5%
Internal to Site	-	2%	+2%

JSJV Comment 8: A revised baseline and subsequent target modal share should be presented, reflective of the proposed measures, and is accompanied by a clear explanation of the methodology used.

- 2.20 As above, the Council has signed off the updated Travel Plan (i-Transport document ITY16146-006D R). The updated Travel Plan was submitted to NH and JSJV on 19th August 2024.
- 2.21 The baseline modal split is set out the updated Travel Plan in Section 9.2 and the future year targets set out in Section 9.3.

JSJV Comment 9: Proposed monitoring strategy should be compliant with PPG (2014).

- 2.22 The monitoring strategy is set out in Section 10.2 of the updated Travel Plan (i-Transport document ITY16146-006D R). A monitoring report will be issued to the Council within three months of initial baseline being undertaken. A follow up travel survey (compliant with a TRICS SAM survey) on the third, fifth and seventh anniversary of the baseline survey.
- 2.23 The agreed monitoring strategy is considered to be compliant with the PPG (Paragraph: 012 Reference ID: 42-012-20140306).

JSJV Comment 10: We would reiterate that the committed development list should be agreed with NYC and Wakefield District Council.

- 2.24 A list of committed developments was submitted to NYC as part of the scoping for the Transport Assessment. To date, that list has not been queried by the Council and hence it is understood to be accepted. Wakefield District Council is a consultee on the planning application which has been registered since December 2023; no further committed developments have been identified by this consultee in the c.9 months the application has been live.
- 2.25 Details of the committed development assessments are included in Section 9.3 of the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R). This sets out where sites do not benefit from an extant planning consent or are not considered reasonably foreseeable development.
- 2.26 The same section of the TA identifies those sites which were completed at the time of the surveys which inform the assessment. The traffic flows associated with those developments are inherent in the baseline.
- 2.27 Finally, TA Section 9.3 sets out those sites which have a no impact or very small impacts on the highway network being assessed, as set out above.
- 2.28 During the meeting with NH and JSJV it was advised that three further sites may merit consideration, these being:

- The former coal yard at Ferrybridge (23/00100/HYB).
- An updated consent at Knottingley Power Station – previous consent (13/03079/DCO) currently included.
- The Axiom development at M62 J32 (22/02485/HYB).

2.29 NH have since supplied information on these planning applications and i-Transport will review these and consider the effects at M62 J34. Where appropriate, these may be considered in the assessment of the motorway junction and the potential mitigation scheme proposed as part of the application.

JSJV Comment 11: JSJV reiterate that this suggestion in relation to 'Business as Usual' residential trip rates be included in any future assessment.

2.30 'This suggestion' relates to the use of person trip rates.

2.31 Details of the development trip rates are included in Section 9.7 of the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R). The approach takes account of the latest 'Decide and Provide' guidance by TRICS. The 'Business as Usual' trip rates are taken directly from TRICS and accepted by NYC. Section 9.7 includes a comparison using vehicle trip rates and person trip rates, with TEMPro modal splits for all journey purposes.

2.32 The 'Projected' trip rates have been calculated based on the approach set out in the TRICS Guidance Note 'On the Practical Implementation of the Decide & Provide Approach' (February 2021), which sets out a methodology for projecting potential future trip rates, based on the historic data available within the TRICS database.

2.33 The 'Vision Based' approach is based on the effectiveness of the interventions and assess what their expected impacts would be on achieving the vision. These scenarios include consideration of:

- What the internalised trip rates could be for a new development – accounting for the provision of any education and retail provision on site.
- The impact of reducing the need to travel – through hybrid working, online shopping, parcel drop-off facilities.
- Modal shift, from the implementation of background interventions and site specific measures that reduce the number and length of residual external trips.

2.34 The 'Vision Based' trip rates therefore take the 'Projected' trip rates and, based on the content of the strategy set out in Section 7.0 of the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R) and cognisant of the now agreed Public Transport Strategy and Travel Plan, it was considered reasonable to assume that it may be possible to achieve further reductions in the number of daily trips generated by the site by c.5%, as well as reducing the modal split by c.5-7% in the peak hours for single occupancy car drivers.

2.35 All three trip rate scenarios were included within the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R), with the results of the junction modelling at the M62 J34 presented in Appendix 10.A – 10.D.

2.36 In this context, it is not considered necessary to amend the assessment parameters nor assess additional scenarios.

JSJV Comment 12: JSJV would again suggest that any vision-based trip rates cannot be agreed until evidence has been provided that the previous deficiencies have been rectified.

2.37 The trip rates included in the Transport Assessment align with current TRICS guidance and uses their available tools. Therefore we do not accept that there are any deficiencies and would ask NH/JSJV to reconsider their position.

JSJV Comment 13: Delivery of the local centre must be considered within the vision for the site and any proposed reductions due to trip 'internalisation' considered.

2.38 The 'Vision of Development Note' (i-Transport document ITY16146-008 TN) sets out in Para 5.4.2 that the development would provide:

"a primary school, local centre and accessible green spaces on the site will allow a significant number of trips to be made locally, with these facilities catering for day-to-day needs, on-foot or by bike and reducing off-site trip making by car."

2.39 In addition, Table 4.6 of the document sets out distances to key facilities, including the local centre, which is expected to include a convenience store and non-food retail units.

2.40 Section 9.7 sets out the reduction in trips due to expected internalisation with 80% of school trips will be internal in the AM Peak, with 20% of the vehicle trips generated by the school external to the site. In the PM Peak, all trips are considered to be external to the site, with no internal linked trips. These internal and external trip proportions were accepted by NYC during the scoping process.

2.41 The local centre will have a high propensity for trip internalisation. It has been assumed that 80% of the generated trips will be internalised, with 20% external to the site. Of these 20% external trips, 50% are considered to be pass-by trips (trips already on the network diverting into the site before continuing their trips) and 50% are assumed to be new trips.

- 2.42 The 'Business as Usual' and 'Projected' trip rates do not consider any reduction in residential trip rates to account for any internalisation, but as set out above there is some element of internalisation included in the 'Vision Based' adjustments to the trip rates.

JSJV Comment 14: A decision concerning the potential for the existing Whitley and Eggborough Community Primary School to be expanded should be confirmed before any trip rates and trip generation for the primary school can be agreed upon.

- 2.43 It was agreed during the meeting with NH and JSJV held on 15th August 2025 that further assessment of alternative (3rd Form) on-site school provision is not warranted at this stage as the scale of the development only requires the development of a 2 form entry. Should the school become a 3 form entry this is a matter for NYC and a separate planning application at some point in the future.

JSJV Comment 15: Given the size of the site, a scenario based approach which considers a 'business as usual' scenario as well as a 'high transfer to sustainable modes' scenario would be welcomed in order for National Highways to understand the range of physical mitigation which may be required on the SRN.

- 2.44 As set out above, three trip rate scenarios ('Business as Usual', 'Projected' and 'Vision Based') are included within the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R), with the results of the junction modelling at the M62 J34 presented in Appendix 10.A – 10.D. This is considered to be consistent with the approach NH is seeking. Please can NH/JSJV review their position?

JSJV Comment 16: JSJV suggest that the applicant confirm which version [of TEMPro] has been used before JSJV can confirm the acceptability of the growth rates. JSJV would also recommend using the latest TEMPro dataset 8.1 to obtain the growth factor for the impact on the SRN.

- 2.45 TEMPro dataset 72 (i.e. 7.2), has been used within the Sensitivity Test scenario assessments within the Transport Assessment (i-Transport document ITY16146-005D R) using version 7.2c of the TEMPro software. The NTM dataset used is RTF 2018 Scenario 1 – Reference 2015-2050. This was the latest version when scoping for the Transport Assessment was carried out.

- 2.46 Applying the same approach, in the Transport Assessment, with no land use growth (no change in households or jobs) and set out in Table 4 below, the growth factors have been obtained using the latest TEMPro dataset 80 and the latest software TEMPro 8.1 and presented in Table 3 below. The latest versions of both the dataset and the software include multiple scenarios and these are included in the table below.

Table 3: Traffic Growth Factors Comparison (Selby Local Authority) – 2022 to 2025

Dataset and Scenario	AM Peak Period	PM Peak Period
Dataset 72 – TEMPro Version 7.2c (Table 9.5 of TA)	1.0096	1.0080
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – Core Scenario	0.9968	0.9956
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – Behavioural Scenario	0.9440	0.9435
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – High Economic Scenario	0.9988	0.9973
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – Low Economic Scenario	0.9973	0.9896
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – Regional Scenario	0.9952	0.9940
Dataset 80 – TEMPro Version 8.1 – Technology Scenario	0.9959	0.9947

2.47 As demonstrated above, using the same approach as set out in the Transport Assessment but using the latest version of TEMPro would result in a reduction in background traffic flows between 2022 and 2025. The assessment of the motorway junction carried out in the Transport Assessment is therefore a robust assessment.

JSJV Comment 17: For the applied assumptions, the applicant needs to state explicitly under Section 9.5 of the TA how many jobs and households were subtracted from the Future Year assumptions.

2.48 The Transport Assessment identifies that all land-use related growth has been excluded to account for the committed developments.

2.49 For the motorway junction (M62 J34), based on Selby Local Authority, this resulted in the subtraction set out below.

Table 4: Land-use Related Growth – Selby Local Authority (2022-2025)

	Base HH ¹	Future HH	HH Subtraction	Base Jobs	Future Jobs	Job Subtraction
2022-2025	38,533	39,482	-949	39,350	39,699	-349

¹ HH = Households

2.50 These subtractions are significantly less than the level of committed development included within the assessments.

JSJV Comment 18: The NTM dataset for the NTM Traffic Growth Calculations needs to be stated by the applicant in the TA.

- 2.51 The NTM dataset used is RTF 2018 Scenario 1 – Reference 2015-2050. This was the latest version when the Transport Assessment was carried out.

APPENDIX A TRAVEL PLAN SIGN OFF

Developer Travel Plan Audit Checklist Form (Residential Developments) - NYC Officers

Development Name:	West of Kellington Lane (Weeland Road), Eggborough
Type of development:	Residential – 1500 dwellings, local centre & primary school
Date submitted to NYC:	04.07.24
Date of review:	09.07.24
Reviewed by:	Clare Greatorex
Planning Reference:	2023/1037/EIA
DM File Reference:	TD-D7-1510
Approved / Rejected	Approved

Checklist

General / Administration	Yes	No	N/A	
Is the TP written in a way that the public can understand the conclusions?	☒	☐	☐	
Has consideration been given to relevant national & local policy?	☒	☐	☐	
Will there be a Travel Plan Co-ordinator (TPC) or a nominated person responsible for the Travel Plan & it's maintenance?	☒	☐	☐	
Is there a timetable for completion of the travel plan?	☒	☐	☐	
Will funding been allocated to the Travel Plan?	☒	☐	☐	
Comments (include section refs if applicable)				

Site Audit – The Travel Plan should provide detailed information regarding the site & surrounding area, however, this can be confirmed by using Google Maps & by looking at the plans.	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Overview of the provision of on and off site infrastructure including speed limits, road widths, footpaths, cycle paths, street light provision etc. NOTE – although full details should be provided in the Transport Assessment (TA), a brief summary needs to be in the Travel Plan as staff/members of the public cannot be expected to read a TA.	☒	☐	☐	
Site plan included which clearly shows all access points, both for vehicles and pedestrians/cyclists.	☒	☐	☐	
Isochrone maps provided showing what can be reached in a suitable walking and cycling distance eg: 2km walking and 5km cycling	☒	☐	☐	
Is the site easily accessible for walkers and cyclists so that all of the desire lines across the site are possible without detour? i.e. are pedestrian and cycle routes shorter than those for vehicles?	☒	☐	☐	
Is the connection to key locations convenient and suitable for walkers? E.g. logical, safe, well lit, even paths etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Is the connection to key locations convenient and suitable for cyclists? E.g. logical, safe, well lit, direct cycle routes or designated cycle paths.	☒	☐	☐	Cycling to amenities in the immediate vicinity of Eggborough would be considered safe but to areas further afield, such as Kellingley, cyclists would need to be experienced and confident.
Are there clear, safe, well-lit connections to the nearest public transport routes?	☒	☐	☐	
Is there any mention of plans to improve walking/cycling routes?	☒	☐	☐	
Does the site join up with existing streets, paths and adjacent areas with no major barriers?	☒	☐	☐	

Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Action Plan – the Travel Plan should include an Action Plan which outlines all the initiatives the developer intends to run that would encourage active and sustainable travel and discourage single occupancy car use. Whilst describing the initiative in the Travel Plan is OK, it also needs to be in a table format and arranged by mode outlining the initiatives, who's responsible, timeframe, monitoring, how it meets objectives and any cost involved. A minimum of 2 initiatives covering all modes should be included.				
Walking Initiatives	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
At least 2 actions to promote walking	☒	☐	☐	
Any proposed footpaths within the development will be designed to encourage walking. e.g. level, safe, well lit etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Will the health benefits of walking be promoted?	☒	☐	☐	
Walking groups or buddy schemes.	☐	☒	☐	
Map highlighting local walking routes provided to residents	☒	☐	☐	
Liaison with local schools to look at the possibility of walking buses	☒	☐	☐	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Cycling Initiatives	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
At least 2 actions to promote cycling.	☒	☐	☐	
Will the health benefits of cycling be promoted?	☒	☐	☐	

Do dwellings have secure parking for cycles, e.g. garages or outbuildings?	☒	☐	☐	
Is there secure, sheltered cycle parking for those residents who do not have the above?	☐	☐	☒	
Map highlighting local cycling routes provided to residents	☒	☐	☐	
Is there financial assistance eg: voucher towards the purchase or loan of a bicycle and/or cycle equipment for residents, discounts at local cycle shops etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Cycle competitions.	☐	☒	☐	
Offer of cycle training provided to residents.	☒	☐	☐	
Provision of a cycle toolbox with pump to assist with on-site repairs while the marketing / sales suite is on-site.	☐	☒	☐	
Bike user group or buddy scheme	☒	☐	☐	
Any other measures such as Dr Bike sessions, cycle marking etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Public Transport Initiatives	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Will timetables and information about services be easily accessible? e.g. included in welcome packs, timetables displayed in a visible location, access to free travel apps promoted.	☒	☐	☐	
Is the development within easy walking distance of stops/stations? (Maximum 400m for bus; 800m for rail)	☒	☐	☐	
Are stops prominently and conveniently located & with shelters to encourage people to wait in bad weather.	☒	☐	☐	

Is the development connected to key destinations by excellent public transport or there are confirmed plans for this?	☐	☒	☐	
Does the development have clear potential to improve public transport, benefiting residents of existing settlements as well as those living in the new homes themselves?	☒	☐	☐	
Taster tickets/provision of incentives to use public transport.	☒	☐	☐	
Is there evidence that public transport operators have been consulted?	☐	☒	☐	
Priority over other traffic provided?	☐	☐	☒	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Car Sharing/EV Initiatives	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Will car sharing be actively promoted?	☒	☐	☐	
Is there a car-share database or other means to encourage car sharing? National databases such as 'Liftshare' are recommended.	☒	☐	☐	
Electric vehicle charge points provided and in a suitable location	☒	☐	☐	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
General Promotions	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Personalised Journey Plans (PJPs) provided to residents	☒	☐	☐	

Welcome Pack issued to all residents which includes: • benefits of active travel • what provision is available • information on discounts, local cycle shops/repairs/clubs • local walking and cycling routes • public transport information including times, bus stop location and ticketing • car share schemes	☒	☐	☐	
Are there positive attempts to promote national travel events & initiatives? E.g. walk/cycle to work week, Lift Share week etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Are there reminders of the need to reduce unnecessary car use? E.g. newsletters etc.	☒	☐	☐	
Encouragement to use internet shopping, home delivery, work from home etc to reduce car travel.	☒	☐	☐	
Face to face engagement with residents eg: door knocking, travel events?	☒	☐	☐	
Space to sit outside, children to play etc. e.g communal areas, play area	☒	☐	☐	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Surveys & Monitoring	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Is there a timescale for Baseline survey & confirmation that results will be shared with NYC? (NYC agree that the baseline survey can be done within 6 months of first occupation or when development reached 50% occupancy, whichever comes soonest.)	☒	☐	☐	Due to the size of the development and the fact it will be built in phases over a long term, the proposed timescales for surveys are acceptable.

Is there mention of communication & submission of interim reports etc to the Highway Authority?	☒	☐	☐	
Example survey questions provided.	☒	☐	☐	
Reference to follow up surveys.	☒	☐	☐	
Reference made to how surveys will be delivered e.g.: paper, online, face to face, combination?	☒	☐	☐	
Confirmation that traffic counts will be done alongside surveys (these provide more accurate results therefore targets need to be set from Trip rates with surveys used to back up the reasons for travel choices)	☒	☐	☐	
SMART Targets set	☒	☐	☐	
Additional Comments (include section refs if applicable)				
Conclusions & Reminders	Yes	No	N/A	Comments
Are there any suggestions for developer-funded improvements or conditions to be applied.	☐	☐	☐	

Additional overall comments (include section references if applicable)

Overall this is a really good Travel Plan and the location of the site should provide many opportunities to encourage residents to use sustainable travel methods.

The improvement to bus services will be key to maximising public transport use so it is essential that funding is secured by way of a Section 106 Agreement to enable this to happen and this should be arranged with our Passenger Transport Department. As per the revised Travel Plan, bus services will need to cover commuting times, not just for 9-5 workers but for those who may have earlier starts and later finishes at the local employment sites.

I am happy to approve this revised Travel Plan.

APPENDIX B PUBLIC & COMMUNITY TRANSPORT OFFICER CORRESPONDANCE

Jon Wilkinson

From: [REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk>
Sent: 08 July 2024 10:16
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hi [REDACTED]

Thank you for taking the time to talk to [REDACTED] and myself about the public transport proposals for the Eggborough development.

I can confirm that the Public Transport Strategy is acceptable subject to the inclusion of the drawings.

Many thanks

Regards

[REDACTED]
Public & Community Transport Officer
Integrated Passenger Transport
North Yorkshire Council

Telephone 01609 [REDACTED]



OFFICIAL

From: [REDACTED]@banksgroup.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, July 5, 2024 11:55 AM
To: [REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk>
Cc: [REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hello [REDACTED] and [REDACTED],

At our meeting you explained that you had two queries on the PTS for our Eggborough site and wanted to:

1. Make sure all residents of the development were within 400m of a bus stop (and)
2. Ensure an additional bus stop was installed to the south off Kellington lane to further support existing residents.

Following our meeting I have had two drawings prepared to address the above points.

- The plan titled *phasing and public transport* overlays the existing/proposed bus stops and phasing to demonstrate that residents within each phase are all within 400m of a stop.

- The plan titled *proposed bus stop improvements on Kellington Lane* shows the proposed new bus stops to the south of Kellington Lane.

Please can you confirm that the Public Transport Strategy is acceptable subject to the attached drawings being formally submitted via the Local Planning Authority as part of our planning application?

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:27 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hello [REDACTED],

I will get the sections organised and over to you.

To give you a chance to read the information lets go for Friday 21st at 11.30. I will drop the meeting in the diary.

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 12:14 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@banksgroup.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@banksgroup.co.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hi [REDACTED]

Sorry for not getting back earlier.

I haven't been able to access the files, is it possible to send extracted versions.

It looks like the only day we are free this week in on Friday 14th June, Thursday 20th June before 10.00, Friday 21 June after 11.00.

Regards

[REDACTED]

Public & Community Transport Officer
Integrated Passenger Transport
North Yorkshire Council

Telephone 01609 [REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@banksgroup.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@banksgroup.co.uk)>
Sent: Monday, June 10, 2024 11:01 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hello [REDACTED]

Did you manage to access the files ok? Also, let me know when suits to meet.

Thanks,

[REDACTED]

OFFICIAL

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Monday, June 3, 2024 5:42 PM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hello [REDACTED],

I have been on leave over half term so apologies for the delay in getting back to you.

I have sent over a one drive link to the TA and appendices. If this causes issues with NYC IT let me know and I will see about extracting the following sections.

Key parts to look at are:

- Appendix 5.A (in part A appendices) sets out our Illustrative Masterplan
- Our Public Transport Strategy is set out in Section 7 of the Transport Assessment
- The plan at Appendix 7.A (in part B appendices) shows the wider residential catchment that would benefit from the proposed service enhancement including dwellings between Wakefield and Eggborough (c.6,900 dwellings) and between Selby and Eggborough (c.9,800 dwellings).
- Letter from Arriva Appendix 7.B (in part B appendices)

In terms of a meeting time/ dates – availability below. Let me know what suits and I will pop a meeting in the diary.

- From 14.00 5th June
- Anytime 6th June (except 10-11am)
- Anytime 10th

- Anytime 11th June
- 9-11am or 14.00-17.00pm 12th June

Kind Regards,

[REDACTED]

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 11:53 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@banksgroup.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@banksgroup.co.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: RE: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hi [REDACTED]

Please could you send me a copy of the TA, or at least the section relating to Public Transport if it isn't too big.

I think a teams meeting early in June would be helpful and I would like to include my team leader [REDACTED].

Let me know what days you are available.

Regards

[REDACTED]
Public & Community Transport Officer
Integrated Passenger Transport
North Yorkshire Council

Telephone 01609 [REDACTED]



OFFICIAL

From: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@banksgroup.co.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@banksgroup.co.uk)>
Sent: Tuesday, May 28, 2024 8:51 AM
To: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Cc: [REDACTED] <[\[REDACTED\]@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:[REDACTED]@northyorks.gov.uk)>
Subject: Eggborough - Public Transport Strategy - Planning Application 2023/1037/EIA

Hello [REDACTED],

I hope this email finds you well?

I am getting in touch regarding Banks proposed development in Eggborough Selby and the Public Transport Strategy we have set out in our application. The site has a draft allocation in the Selby Local Plan and we are looking to bring forward a residential development of 1500 dwellings, a 70-bed extra-care facility, 14 independent living units, a local centre, a two form entry primary school.

Our strategy is to increase the frequency and operating time of the local bus service and we have a letter of support from the Bus Operator Arriva contained within Appendix 7.B of the Transport Assessment. Our intention is to divert the bus service through the site via a loop road so all residents can be within 400m of a stop. The plan at Appendix 7.A shows the wider residential catchment that would benefit from the proposed service enhancement including dwellings between Wakefield and Eggborough (c.6,900 dwellings) and between Selby and Eggborough (c.9,800 dwellings). Our Public Transport Strategy is set out in Section 7 of the TA.

The reason for getting in touch is to see if NYC Public Transport Team are in agreement with the strategy now the application has been submitted?

██████████ is the NYC highway officer looking after application and has sent through initial (without prejudice comments) on the scheme which I am following up. The specific comment in relation to Public Transport is Comment 10 which seeks *A Bus Strategy should be agreed with NYC's Public Transport Team and Operators* [@northyorks.gov.uk](mailto:██████████@northyorks.gov.uk).

The full TA available on Public Access for Planning or I can send you a separate copy if that would be helpful? I am hoping to get NYC sign off on the information we have submitted in the final term before the summer holiday starts.

I am happy to have a team's meeting in June if it would be helpful as I think it was about a year ago when we last met and spoke about the site.

Kind Regards,

██████████

██████████
Strategic Transport Manager

BANKSGroup
development with care

DDI: 0191 ██████████ | M: ██████████ | T: 0191 ██████████ | E: ██████████ [@banksgroup.co.uk](mailto:██████████@banksgroup.co.uk) | W: www.banksgroup.co.uk

Banks Group, Inkerman House, St John's Road, Meadowfield, Durham, DH7 8XL

FACEBOOK: [Like our page](#) X: [@The_Banks_Group](#) LINKEDIN: [Connect with us](#) YOUTUBE: [Click to view our videos](#)

Better Health at Work Award Maintaining Excellence. **Good Health is Good Business**
www.betterhealthatworkaward.org.uk/

Please think before you print – only print the pages you need and help reduce our use of resources.

The Banks Group Limited is a limited liability company registered in England & Wales (registration number 2267400). Our registered office is at Inkerman House, St John's Road, Meadowfield, Durham, DH7 8XL. VAT registration number 569 3236 14.

The information contained in this e-mail (including any attachments) may be confidential. If you are not the intended

recipient (or responsible for delivery of the information to that person) you should not print, copy, disclose or rely on this e-mail. Please notify the sender by reply e-mail and delete the e-mail from your system. Any views expressed in this e-mail that do not relate to the company's official business may not reflect the views of the company. You should note that we cannot guarantee this e-mail to be free from computer viruses and it is your responsibility to scan any attachments before downloading them to your system.

This email has been scanned by the MimeCast Email Security System.



Any opinions or statements expressed in this email are those of the author of the email, and do not necessarily reflect those of North Yorkshire Council.

This email (and any files transmitted with it) is confidential, may contain privileged information and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful – you must not disclose the information to anyone, but must instead notify the sender at the above address and then destroy all copies.

Incoming and outgoing email messages, IT systems and applications are routinely monitored for compliance with the law, relevant policies and to ensure the integrity and effective operation of our ICT network and digital estate. In line with this, the content of this email and any attachments have been checked for the presence of viruses, but we advise that you take your own steps to ensure that they are actually virus-free.

If you receive an automated response stating that the recipient is away from the office and you wish to request information under the Freedom of Information Act, the Data Protection Act or the Environmental Information Regulations, please resend your email to the Council's Information Governance Team(infogov@northyorks.gov.uk) who will process your request.

For information about how we process data, please see our Privacy Notice at www.northyorks.gov.uk/privacynotice.

Any opinions or statements expressed in this email are those of the author of the email, and do not necessarily reflect those of North Yorkshire Council.

This email (and any files transmitted with it) is confidential, may contain privileged information and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful – you must not disclose the information to anyone, but must instead notify the sender at the above address and then destroy all copies.

Incoming and outgoing email messages, IT systems and applications are routinely monitored for compliance with the law, relevant policies and to ensure the integrity and effective operation of our ICT network and digital estate. In line with this, the content of this email and any attachments have been checked for the presence of viruses, but we advise that you take your own steps to ensure that they are actually virus-free.

If you receive an automated response stating that the recipient is away from the office and you wish to request information under the Freedom of Information Act, the Data Protection Act or the Environmental Information Regulations, please resend your email to the Council's Information Governance Team(infogov@northyorks.gov.uk) who will process your request.

For information about how we process data, please see our Privacy Notice at www.northyorks.gov.uk/privacynotice.

Any opinions or statements expressed in this email are those of the author of the email, and do not necessarily reflect those of North Yorkshire Council.

This email (and any files transmitted with it) is confidential, may contain privileged information and is intended for the addressee only. If you are not the intended recipient, please be aware that any disclosure, copying or distribution is prohibited and may be unlawful – you must not disclose the information to anyone, but must instead notify the sender at the above address and then destroy all copies.

Incoming and outgoing email messages, IT systems and applications are routinely monitored for compliance with the law, relevant policies and to ensure the integrity and effective operation of our ICT network and digital estate. In line with this, the content of this email and any attachments have been checked for the presence of viruses, but we advise that you take your own steps to ensure that they are actually virus-free.

If you receive an automated response stating that the recipient is away from the office and you wish to request information under the Freedom of Information Act, the Data Protection Act or the Environmental Information Regulations, please resend your email to the Council's Information Governance Team(infogov@northyorks.gov.uk) who will process your request.

For information about how we process data, please see our Privacy Notice at www.northyorks.gov.uk/privacynotice.

