Transport Policies

TR/1	Road Improvement Lines
TR/2	Traffic Impact Assessments (*now deleted)
TR/3	Development impacts on the existing road network
TR/4	Traffic management measures (*now deleted)
TR/5	Highway standards and new development (*now deleted)
TR/6	Pedestrians and cyclists (*now deleted)
TR/7	Public Rights of Way (*now deleted)
TR/8	Access to public buildings for people with disabilities
TR/9	Motorway and roadside service provision (*now deleted)
TR/10	Parking
TR/11	Contributions in lieu of on-site parking provision
TR/12	Park and Ride (*now deleted)
TR/13	Goods vehicle operating centres (*now deleted)

* Further information on deleted policies can be found within the chapter.

CHAPTER 6

TRANSPORTATION

Objectives

- **1.** To promote transport choice by encouraging the provision of improved public transport services.
- 2. To recognise and provide for the needs of pedestrians and cyclists.
- **3.** To support improvements to the transport network that will improve accessibility and safety, whilst ensuring that full account is taken of the need to safeguard and enhance the local environment.
- 4. To ensure that adequate parking is provided to serve new development.

Introduction

- **6.1** The District is located at the heart of England and served by the national road and rail and canal network. The M1 and M6 pass through the western part of the District and the A14 (M1-A1 link road) provides good access to the east coast ports. Only 1 km of the A14 east of its junction with the M1 runs through the District, but the A14 could increase the pressure for development in the south of the District. This has been allowed for in the allocation of both housing and employment land on the edge of Market Harborough. The junction of the A14/M1-M6 is remote from any major settlement and is not being promoted as an area for growth by either Harborough District or the adjoining planning authorities.
- **6.2** Rail services are provided on the Midland Main Line (Sheffield London: St Pancras) with a station at Market Harborough. Efforts to improve public transport services are likely to be given greater priority, by both the County and District Councils, during the plan period. The District Council will encourage the development of both rail and bus services to serve the community.
- **6.3** In most cases, new road building is not the direct responsibility of the District Council. The Highways Agency is the executive agency responsible for the construction and maintenance of trunk roads (including most motorways) on behalf of the Government. The Government is currently reviewing its responsibilities in relation to trunk roads following the publication of its White Paper A New Deal for Transport : Better for Everyone (July 1998). The District Council, in partnership with Leicestershire County Council, is responsible for other major and minor roads within the District. In considering transportation issues the District Council will seek to encourage the continued prosperity of the area, subject to the need to safeguard and enhance the local environment and to promote sustainability.

<u>Structure Plan Considerations</u>

- **6.4** The Structure Plan strategy is founded on the concept of transport choice. In land use terms the strategy encourages the location of new development in transport choice corridors, where there is likely to be a realistic choice of alternative, high quality public transport to serve the development; thereby reducing the dependence on the private car (see **paras 4.12-4.14**).
- **6.5** Investment in the improvement and building of roads is guided by the definition of a specified road network. These are the roads which provide links with and within the main centres of population and employment. The Structure Plan defines the specified road network as comprising all motorways, trunk roads and existing A class roads, except where superseded by bypass or relief road proposals.

The National Roads Programme

- **6.6** The Government's White Paper (July 1998) outlines its intention to provide a more integrated transport system to tackle congestion and pollution by improving public transport as a long term sustainable alternative to the private car. The Government has moved away from the 'predict and provide' method of building new roads to accommodate more traffic. There is a place for new road building, but it will no longer be the first option. The maintenance and management of existing roads is to be afforded greater priority.
- **6.7** The New Deal for Trunk Roads in England (July 1998) provides a strategic review of the roads programme and incorporates a new targeted programme of road improvements.

Motorway Schemes

6.8 A study is proposed to consider solutions to congestion and safety problems at Junction 19 of the M1.

A6 Great Glen Bypass

6.9 A public inquiry was held into the preferred route for this scheme in May 1992. The route was subsequently confirmed by the Secretary of State for Transport in 1993. The Bypass is proposed to run to the south of Great Glen. The reservation for the Bypass is shown on the **Proposals Map**. A policy to safeguard the alignment is included in the chapter on Great Glen under **Policy GG/3**. The scheme is retained in the targeted programme of road improvements, with the next stage indicated as the start of works.

Withdrawn Schemes

6.10 The following road improvement schemes previously proposed within this District were withdrawn from the roads programme in July 1998;

M1	Junctions 15-19	proposed widening
M1	Junctions 19-21	proposed widening
M1-M6	Junction 2	proposed widening

A6 Kibworth Bypass

Proposals for Detrunking

6.11 The Government has identified a core network of nationally important routes, which the Highways Agency will continue to manage. For those trunk roads not identified as part of the core network, the Government intend to enter into negotiations to transfer the management of the roads to the local highway authority. Routes within this District that are proposed for detrunking are the A6 (Bedford – Manchester) and the A47 (Leicester – A1).

County Road Schemes

6.12 The following two bypass proposals are included in the Structure Plan and programmed to be undertaken in the plan period:

A4303 Lutterworth Southern Bypass

6.13 The bypass is now complete and provides a dual carriageway route from Magna Park to Junction 20 of the M1, to the south of Lutterworth.

A427 (A4304) Theddingworth Bypass

- 6.14 Although the completion of the A14 has attracted traffic from the A4304, the substandard nature of the existing road creates a need for a bypass for Theddingworth. The scheme is not included in the current (1999/2000) 5 year capital programme in the Leicestershire County Council Transport Policies and Programme.
- **6.15** The proposal for an A4304 Theddingworth Bypass is included in the Leicestershire Structure Plan. A reservation was drawn up some years ago, but it affected the area of the Theddingworth Shrunken Medieval Village, a Scheduled Ancient Monument, designated after the approval of the bypass reservation. In recognition of this conflict, Leicestershire County Council resolved to abandon its reservation for the Bypass in February 1996. The scheme itself is not abandoned and is still retained in the Leicestershire Structure Plan.

6.16	The District Council will press Leicestershire County Council							
	to	define	a	satisfactory	reservation	for	the	A4304
	Theddingworth Bypass, and to include the scheme within its							
	ca	pital prog	gran	nme for compl	etion at the ea	rliest	oppo	<u>rtunity.</u>

6.17 The County Council has lines for additional bypasses and associated improvements along the A4304 at Walcote, North Kilworth, Husbands Bosworth and Lubenham/Market Harborough. These were approved some years ago although none of these schemes are included in the Structure Plan nor in the 5-year capital programme in the current Leicestershire County Council Transport Policies and Programme. Funding for these schemes is extremely unlikely during the plan period. The schemes are not included as proposals in this Local Plan.

Other Road Proposals

6.18 The allocation of land for new development may also require improvements to the local road network, that would benefit both the proposed and existing development.

Lutterworth – Western Relief Road

6.19 In its previous consideration of development at Lutterworth the District Council identified the potential to obtain a Western Relief Road at Lutterworth in conjunction with new housing development. Details of this road are included in the chapter on Lutterworth under **Policy LW/2**.

Lutterworth – Town Centre Highway Improvements

6.20 The adopted Lutterworth and Bitteswell Local Plan includes a policy urging Leicestershire County Council to undertake an improvement scheme to George Street, to enable pedestrian priority measures to be implemented in Church Street. The County Council has prepared a diagrammatic scheme for improvements to George Street. Details are included in the chapter on Lutterworth at **paras 11.51** – **11.55**.

Road Improvement Lines

6.21 Throughout the District, in addition to proposals contained in the Structure Plan and the Leicestershire Transport Policies and Programme, a number of road improvement schemes have been drawn up. These schemes were generally approved some years ago with the intention of either safeguarding them from development or implementing them in the event of redevelopment taking place, by setting new buildings back behind the improvement line. Plans of the improvement lines that will be safeguarded in the plan period are included in **Appendix G**.

6.22 POLICY TR/1 NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL BE REQUIRED TO MAKE ALLOWANCE FOR THE SAFEGUARDING OF THE ROAD IMPROVEMENT LINES LISTED BELOW:-

LITTLE STRETTON	C3404 GARTREE ROAD
LUBENHAM	A4304 MAIN STREET/ WESTGATE LANE
SHEARSBY	A5199 WELFORD ROAD CROSSROADS
TILTON ON THE HILL	B6047 LEICESTER ROAD

6.23 Following the publication of the Draft Harborough District Local Plan, Leicestershire County Council undertook a review of its long-term improvement lines. In order to minimise uncertainty and the potential blight associated with the schemes it resolved to retain those schemes listed in **Policy TR/1** and abandon the following schemes:-

CHAPTER 6

Ashby Magna – Peveril Road Billesdon – Coplow Lane Gaulby – C3403 (east of village) Hungarton – Main Street/Barley Leas Junction Lubenham – A4304 Main Street Lubenham – A4304 Main Street/School Lane Mowsley – Saddington Road Peatling Magna – School Lane Swinford – C7687 High Street/Rugby Road Peatling Magna – School Lane/Arnesby Lane Peatling Magna – School Lane Saddington – Main Street/Weir Road

Traffic Impact Assessments

- **6.24** The traffic impacts of development often cause considerable concern. In order to assess the traffic generation potential of a development and its impact on the highway network, a traffic impact assessment will be required for new developments in the following categories:
 - i) a major development (100 dwellings or 5 ha of employment land), or a development expected to generate over 250 vehicle movements per day or 50 vehicle movements in the peak hour; if the generated traffic exceeds 10% of the traffic flows on the adjoining highway, or 5% where traffic congestion exists or will exist or
 - ii) a large proportion of the additional vehicles are heavy goods vehicles.

Potential developers are advised to liaise with the Highway Authority regarding the scope and content of an assessment. It will sometimes be necessary to give detailed consideration to modal choice.

6.25 *POLICY TR/2 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to PPG13 para.23 regarding Traffic Impact Assessments.

6.26 The environmental impacts of traffic from a development are an increasingly important consideration. In assessing new development proposals, whether or not they are of sufficient scale to warrant a traffic impact assessment, the District Council will have regard to factors such as air and noise pollution, congestion, the location of the development and the environmental capacity of the roads serving the site and intrusion or severance impacts upon the amenities of residents or users of existing facilities.

Development Impacts on the Existing Road Network

6.27 Where new development would have a substantial adverse effect on the existing road network, planning permission will be refused unless off-site highway improvements can be implemented to alleviate the effect of the development. The developer will be expected to fund the improvements. Where development would aggravate existing traffic problems in the area,

contributions will be sought from developers towards the funding of works to upgrade the highway network, or implement traffic management measures to alleviate the impacts of the additional traffic generated by the development. In all cases the District Council will expect the environmental impacts of the proposed works to be addressed.

6.28 **POLICY TR/3**

THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL REFUSE PLANNING PERMISSION FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT WHERE THE TRAFFIC FLOW GENERATED BY THE DEVELOPMENT WOULD CREATE A SUBSTANTIAL ADVERSE EFFECT ON THE EXISTING ROAD NETWORK UNLESS SATISFACTORY AND ENVIRONMENTALLY ACCEPTABLE IMPROVEMENTS CAN BE IMPLEMENTED TO ALLEVIATE THE IMPACTS OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

Traffic Management

- **6.29** The construction of new road schemes and the promotion of public transport usage may ease some of the pressure on the existing road network. But many traffic related issues such as on-street parking, through traffic in residential areas and pedestrian/vehicular conflict may only be alleviated by traffic management measures that constrain the speed or flow of vehicular traffic. Areas where it would be appropriate to introduce traffic management measures are those where there is a high concentration of pedestrians and cyclists. Such areas would include the main shopping areas in the District, schools and residential areas subject to high levels of through traffic. Traffic management schemes and traffic calming schemes involving a Traffic Regulation Order require public consultation. Any objections to a scheme or an Order would be considered by the Highway Authority.
- 6.30 *POLICY TR/4 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to PPG 13 para.67-69 regarding Traffic Management Measures.

Highway Standards and New Development

6.31 The design of roads to serve areas of new development provides an opportunity to incorporate measures to improve access for pedestrians, cyclists and bus passengers. In the development of larger housing areas there may be an opportunity to design cycleways and footpaths to connect residential areas to local facilities such as schools and recreation grounds. Leicestershire County Council's Highway Requirements for Development (1991) recommends that provision should be made for public transport services to pass through larger developments. New developments should be laid out to achieve the minimum practical walking distance to existing or potential bus routes. New housing estates should be designed so that each house is preferably within 200 metres of a potential bus route. The maximum distance should ideally be no more than 400 metres.

6.32 *POLICY TR/5 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to PPG13 paras.6, 29, 76, 77, 79 and 80 regarding Highway Standards and New Development.

Pedestrians and Cyclists

6.33 The District Council recognises the special requirements of pedestrians and cyclists within the transport system and will seek to ensure the provision of safe, pleasant and convenient footpaths and cycleways throughout the District. It will promote new route networks to enhance the current footpath and cycle network including the use of disused railway lies and canal towpaths where appropriate. Provision of a cycle network through Market Harborough is an important feature of the enhancement works undertaken in 1994/95 as part of the Bypass Demonstration Project (see **para. 10.5**).

6.34 *POLICY TR/6 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to PPG13 paras.75-80 regarding Pedestrians and Cyclist Networks.

National Cycle Network

6.35 A national cycle network, originally known as the Inverness–Dover cycle route is being promoted by Sustrans. The aim is to create a national cycle network, suitable for use by cyclists of all ages, that is distinct as far as possible from motor traffic. Three routes that will form part of the network are proposed to traverse this District. Route 6 the Guthlaxton Trail, will enter the District from Northamptonshire along Brampton Valley Way, pass through Market Harborough and it is hoped will utilise the canal towpath from Market Harborough to Debdale Wharf. Thereafter it would follow minor roads before entering Blaby District on the road connecting Willoughby Waterleys and Countesthorpe. Two other routes that will cross the eastern part of the District will run from Leicester to Peterborough and from Market Harborough to Lincoln, primarily utilising minor roads. The District Council supports the principle of the development of the national cycle network. In association with Leicestershire County Council and British Waterways it is contributing to works to upgrade the canal towpath along the proposed route.

Public Rights of Way

6.36 The District Council recognises the importance of local public rights of way networks in affording convenient local links between facilities as well as providing an amenity for residents and visitors to the area. Where new development is proposed on land crossed by a public road or public right of way the route should be safeguarded whenever possible and appropriate. If diversion is unavoidable, the proposals for the diversion of the route should be submitted at the same time as the planning application for development.

6.37 ***POLICY TR/7**

This policy has now been deleted.

For advice on redirecting public footpaths as result of granting permission for development please refer to the Countryside and Rights of Way Act 2000.

Access to Public Buildings for People with Disabilities

- 6.38 Proposals for development that will be accessible or open to the public should make provision for people with disabilities. Greater consideration should be given to the design and use of open space and buildings accessible to the public to avoid restricting access to those with limited mobility. In particular, accesses to buildings should be level or ramped and of sufficient width to accommodate wheelchair access. Adequate provision for disabled parking should also be provided close to the building.
- 6.39 POLICY TR/8 WHEN DETERMINING PLANNING APPLICATIONS FOR BUILDINGS WITH PUBLIC ACCESS, THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL NEGOTIATE WITH THE DEVELOPER TO ENSURE THAT THE NEEDS OF PEOPLE WITH DISABILITIES HAVE BEEN TAKEN INTO ACCOUNT IN THE DESIGN OF THE DEVELOPMENT.

Public Transport

- 6.40 The District Council recognises that the existence of an efficient and effective public transport system is vital to that sector of the population without private means of transport. In particular it is the old, young and those living in the rural areas of the District that have traditionally placed a greater reliance on public transport to provide mobility. An effective public transport system should also reduce the reliance on the private car for transportation. The increasing awareness of environmental issues and heavy peak hour traffic congestion has led to a re-appraisal, by the County Council, of transportation policies and the role that public transport has to play. In major new developments the County Council will seek not only a road layout designed to accommodate bus access, but also the provision by developers of bus stops, shelters and information points. The District Council will support initiatives designed to improve the standard of services and the efficiency of public transport within the District.
- 6.41

The District Council will press for the maintenance and continued improvement of public transport servies to benefit residents in the District.

Rail Services

- 6.42 During the last decade the Midland Main Line has been continually upgraded with the provision of more frequent and faster services. The District Council is keen to see further improvements and the constructive planning of the line's long term future. It has consistently supported the case for the complete electrification of the Midland Main Line between London and Sheffield.
- 6.43 <u>The District Council will continue to press for the complete electrification of the Midland Main Line at the earliest opportunity.</u>

CHAPTER 6

6.44 The Structure Plan includes a policy to promote the development of local passenger services along the Midland Main Line. A site for a new passenger station at Kibworth is allocated in **Policy KB/3** in the chapter on Kibworth. The District Council already liaises with adjoining authorities over the introduction and co-ordination of local passenger services within both Leicestershire and Northamptonshire.

6.45 <u>The District Council will support and encourage the</u> <u>development of local passenger services along the Midland</u> <u>Main Line to serve the needs of residents in the District.</u>

6.46 In 1998 Central Railway plc announced revised proposals to build and run a goods and passenger railway running from the north of England, through the Midlands, passing through the western part of Harborough District, where the intention is to re-utilise the former Great Central Railway Line as far as possible, to France via the Channel Tunnel. To proceed, the scheme would need to be approved by Parliament before going through a public inquiry. Until the feasibility of the scheme and further details of the revised proposals are published, no informed assessment can be made about the implications for this District.

Motorway and Roadside Service Provision

- 6.47 New bypasses and road improvements often result in increased demands for the provision of roadside services, supplying fuel, refreshments and associated facilities for motorists. The location of these facilities will be strictly controlled. A location at a roundabout or suitable junction of a trunk road or principal road with an intersecting road will enable a development to serve traffic on both roads and allow facilities to be concentrated in one site. A distance of between 12-25 miles is a reasonable interval between facilities along a primary route.
- 6.48 In relation to motorway service areas (MSAs) it is equally as important to strike a balance between the needs of motorists and the protection of the countryside from unnecessary development. The provision of MSAs every 30 miles will normally provide drivers with adequate opportunities for rest and refreshments. Proposals for infill MSAs within a 30 mile gap will only be granted planning permission is exceptional circumstances where a clear and compelling need has been established.

6.49 *POLICY TR/9 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to Local Plan Policies IN/1 and EV/20 regarding Motorway and Roadside Service.

6.50 Planning permission has been granted for two service areas on land adjoining the A6/B6047 roundabout, north-west of Market Harborough. The sites are indicated on **Plan B**. **Policy GG/4** allocates a site for a service area adjoining the proposed A6 Great Glen Bypass.

Parking

6.51 All new developments should be provided with adequate off-street parking provision, in order to reduce the need for on-street parking and servicing, which can create road safety and amenity problems. The current parking standards which have been adopted by the District Council are set

out in **Appendix A**. These standards are for guidance and are set out as a range of maximum and operational minimum requirements for different types of development. The operational minimum relates to the absolute minimum level of parking required for service or delivery purposes. The following policy uses the term necessary minimum, which recognises the need to consider the location of the development and the availability of parking within the locality as well as the proposed land use. The policy allows flexibility for the application of the maximum standard if, for example, the minimum provision would otherwise result in highway safety problems.

6.52 **POLICY TR/10**

PARKING PROVISION IN NEW DEVELOPMENT WILL IN GENERAL BE KEPT TO THE NECESSARY MINIMUM AND WILL BE CONSIDERED AGAINST THE FOLLOWING CRITERIA:

- 1. THE SAFETY OF ROAD USERS AND THE FREE FLOW OF TRAFFIC SHOULD NOT BE PREJUDICED;
- 2. THE LEVEL OF PARKING PROVISION SHOULD NOT ADVERSELY AFFECT THE CHARACTER OR APPEARANCE OF THE LOCALITY;
- 3. PARKING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD NOT ENCOURAGE THE UNNECESSARY USE OF THE PRIVATE CAR AND MAY BE REDUCED IN AREAS OF GOOD ACCESS TO OTHER MEANS OF TRAVEL;
- 4. PRINCIPAL SHOPPING AND BUSINESS AREAS SHOULD NOT BE DISADVANTAGED BY UNDULY HIGH PARKING PROVISION AT PERIPHERAL LOCATIONS.
- **6.53** Due to the character of many of the town and village centres, it may not always be environmentally desirable to provide the specified parking for new development on-site. In appropriate instances consideration may be given to the relaxation of parking standards, or the provision of adequate off-site parking, to ensure that the character of such areas is maintained.

Contributions in Lieu of On-Site Parking Provision

6.54 Where the specified number of parking spaces cannot be provided on-site and development would be refused planning permission without adequate car parking, the District Council will consider voluntary financial contributions from developers, towards the cost of providing public off-street parking spaces elsewhere in the vicinity. To avoid increasing congestion and to improve accessibility, such contributions may be more appropriately put towards improving pedestrian, cycling and/or public transport facilities/services.

6.55 POLICY TR/11 THE DISTRICT COUNCIL WILL SEEK TO ENTER INTO A LEGAL AGREEMENT WITH APPLICANTS FOR PLANNING PERMISSION TO COVER A VOLUNTARY FINANCIAL CONTRIBUTION TOWARDS THE COST OF

CHAPTER 6

PROVIDING OFF-STREET PARKING SPACES OR, WHERE APPROPRIATE, PEDESTRIAN, CYCLING AND/OR PUBLIC TRANSPORT FACILITIES SERVICES IN CIRCUMSTANCES WHERE:-

- 1. PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT THAT WOULD IN ALL OTHER RESPECTS BE ACCEPTABLE CANNOT ACCOMMODATE THE REQUISITE NUMBER OF PARKING SPACES ON-SITE ; AND
- 2. THERE ARE PROPOSALS TO PROVIDE OFF-STREET PUBLIC CAR PARKS IN THE AREA.

Use of Private Car Parks

- **6.56** Although provision has been made for public car parking within some of the larger settlements in the District further off-street parking potential exists in the form of private car parks, which may be under-occupied during the day or occupied only in the evenings or weekdays.
- 6.57 <u>The District Council will encourage the public use of private</u> car parks to alleviate parking problems within the District where appropriate.

Localised Parking Provision

- **6.58** The rapid increase in car ownership during recent years had created a number of localised parking difficulties. Narrow roads with on-street parking and insufficient parking spaces within older residential areas are two such problems that occur within the District. The District Council has undertaken the construction of small scale lay-by parking in villages and residential areas throughout the District.
- 6.59

The District Council will, subject to the availability of finance, continue to alleviate localised parking problems within the District through the implementation of small scale parking provision in villages and residential areas.

Park and Ride

6.60 The Government's aim is to promote an effective, integrated public transport system as an alternative to the private car. The concept of park and ride represents an energy-efficient form of transport that can help reduce road congestion and reduce reliance on the private car. Although no site has been identified within the District for a park and ride facility, it is recognised that the siting of such facilities may provide further opportunities for encouraging the use of public transport and improving accessibility to urban centres. To be effective such proposals should form part of a wider planning and transportation strategy that identifies a clear need for the facility.

6.61 *POLICY TR/12 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to PPG 13 para. 61 and Local Plan Policy IN/1 regarding Park and Ride.

Goods Vehicle Operating Centres

6.62 There has been an increase in the number of operating centres for goods vehicles throughout the District. This is partly due to changes in agricultural practice and partly to changes in distribution patterns. Goods vehicles operating centre licences are issued by the Traffic Commissioners. Not all licensed sites require planning permission, because the operating centre may be associated with and subordinate to the existing use of the site. Where the District Council considers that planning permission is required it will be concerned to ensure that the road network is capable of accommodating the development without adverse effects on road safety and other land uses. Where planning permission is granted it may be subject to a limitation on the number of vehicles, in order to regulate the impact of the development.

6.63 *POLICY TR/13 This policy has now been deleted.

Please refer to Local Plan Policy IN/1 regarding Goods Vehicle Operations Centres.