

Malton & Norton

Strategic Transport Assessment

Alan Martin I am A Chartered Engineer, being a Member of the Institution of Civil Engineers, a Member of the Chartered Institution of Highways and Transportation and a Member of the Chartered Institute of Management. Although now retired, I was for thirty-one and a half years, the Senior Engineer of the No. 2 Area {Eastern} of North Yorkshire County Council from its inception in April 1974 to October 2005 and had responsibility for the design of highway improvements and the highway aspect of Development Control.

North Yorkshire County Council. Is [*inter alia*] the local highway authority for all except trunk and special roads with responsibilities for the improvement, repair, maintenance and transportation of the roads and streets within the County of North Yorkshire.

I was consulted by Councillor Paul Andrews of Malton Town Council following the publication of the statement made by Messrs. Jacobs to assist with the comprehension of the technicalities contained therein and having seen his report I undertook to assist with its up-dating to take into account the completion of the Brambling Fields interchange, but subject to this the Report seems reasonably correct.

With reference to the Addendum dated October 2010 to the main report Section 1 refers to a partial ban on traffic movement on Norton Road, to permit westbound movement with a (busses excepted) ban on eastbound traffic. Unfortunately the diagram does not make it clear exactly how this will be accommodated. The scheme proposed readily gives the residents of Norton access to the Railway Station, Bus Station, Medical Centre, Government offices shops and car parking on Norton Road and Railway Street but does not indicate any readily available means of access to return. The Bus contra-flow system is likely to be much abused unless reinforced with a solid construction which physically prevents any 'bollard dodging'

Throughout this addendum much reference has been made to the original report. Unfortunately this has never been made available to the public to objectively assess the complete scheme; thus the Scenarios in section 2 – 7 whilst accurately calculated by computer programme based on the data fed in are somewhat inscrutable.

Section 3 of the Final Report whilst factually accurate in its assessment and traffic generation predictions does not appear to include the existing traffic on the nodes in question; and section 3.9 gives the traffic generation assumptions made. Unfortunately this appears to be at variance with other published data such as 'Employment Densities Guide' and the County Council's own publication 'Parking Design Guide.' Whilst some of the tenets in the latter document have been subject to downward revision to concur with Government policy the universal overall standard of private domestic residences generating on average six trips per day still holds good; thus some of the predicted generated traffic figures (without including the existing flows) are considerably low.

Section 13 of the report clearly shows that overloading will occur at the junctions under consideration and Section 14 gives various engineering solutions and costs less any statutory undertakers works which may be considerable.

The construction of a junction with the B 1257 cannot be guaranteed as the Trunk Road A 64 does not fall within the remit of the local highway authority and its construction is contrary to the principle of limited access, high volume unobstructed traffic flow embodied in the principle of Trunk Roads.

Section 7 of Jacobs final report states that Scenario 4 includes all the areas considered in Scenario 1 plus the development sites from Groups 2 & 3; thus giving the totals in Table & 1. From the total figures given it is possible to calculate the traffic generated and trip generation. North Yorkshire County Council's own publication - Parking Design Guide - gives an excellent and comprehensive summation of this in table 4.4. In applying this it must be argued that whilst other systems may give differing answers this has been in use in North Yorkshire for many years as the County standard and like all systems is only a prediction of trip generation. As not all of the developable areas will be constructed at once another factor that cannot be totally disregarded is the annual increase in traffic flow. Whilst this depends on many (economic and population) factors and can vary year to year its effect on existing flows and the gradual increases occasioned by future developments over a period has not been taken into account.

Table 4.4 and section 4.5 {appendices} of the Parking Design Guide gives the following factors:-
Residential 109.1 trips/hectare over a 12 hour period or 637.7 trips/100 households which equates to the universal accepted figure of 6 trips per dwelling per day.

Industrial 343.4 trips per hectare or 10.1 trips per 100 m² Gross Floor Area.

Retail (Non supermarket) 41.1 weekday trips per 100 m² GFA with an 18.1% increase on Saturdays. Supermarkets generate 115.2trips per 100 m² GFA with a 7.2% increase on Saturdays.

Education No information available other than basic parking space requirements. However there is a growth of school- run commuting and parking taking pupils to and from school.

Leisure No information available other than basic parking space requirements

The total trip movement generated by the development listed in table 3.1 (That already approved, under consideration) is:-

$$\text{Retail } 27\text{ha} \times 41.1/100 \times 10000 = 110,970$$

$$\text{Residential } 667. \times 6 + 4.6 \times 109.1 = 4,504$$

$$\text{Employment } 41 \times 343.4 = 14,079$$

$$\text{Education } \text{allow} = 250$$

TOTAL

129,803 trips

For comparison purposes with table 7.1 scenario 4 which includes the whole of Scenario 1 development plus that from Secnarios2 and 3 :-

$$\text{Retail } 27\text{ha} \times 41.1/100 \times 10000 = 110,970$$

$$\text{Residential } 3665 \times 6 + 4.6 \times 109.1 = 22,492$$

$$\text{Employment } 44 \times 343.4 = 15,110$$

$$\text{Education } \text{allow} = 250$$

$$\text{Leisure } \text{allow} = 500$$

TOTAL

149,322

INCREASE

19,519

Whilst it has been shown that key junctions can be ' tweaked' to give some increase traffic flow and capacity, nothing like the increase to be generated by present approval's and considerations can be accommodated by the existing road system without either the complete demolition and rebuilding major parts of the town or the massive development of virtually a new town thus leaving the existing one as an anachronism of the past.

The report wisely does not state or speculate on the practicality of the necessary infra-structure works necessary

There is little with which to find fault with in sections 15 – 20 of the report.