Matters 3 Strategic Approach

Q3.2 Is the broad spatial distribution of development in policies 2 & 3 justified in particular aims to accommodate

c) major new employment sites in locations accessible from the main urban areas and main towns to the strategic transport network.

Site 001 Thorne North is not easily accessible from the main urban areas and the main town of Thorne and Moorends, it is located outside the main town away from the main urban area by over a mile, not easily accessible, the landowners' agents admits that “the site is relatively isolated from main residential areas of Thorne and Moorends and the railway line and M18 are barriers”

To access the site from Thorne and Moorends or from Thorne North and Thorne South railway station employees would have to travel on foot / cycle, after five years a safe cycle / pedestrian footpath has not yet been identified, in order to get to Site an employee would have to cross two uncontrolled crossings on the slip roads of the M18 motorway at Junction 6 twice a day, travel along the A614 Selby Road a busy A road, 60mph, high speed users of heavy goods vehicles, partly unlit narrow footpaths (not wide enough to support a cycle path) which then narrows considerable as you nearer the site, they would then cross the A614 at a uncontrolled crossing with limited views
left and right to enter the site. Employees from Moorends travelling by foot / cycle would
by human nature take the shortest / quickest route this would mean additional danger to
their journey by them having to cross one of the unmanned level crossings between
Thorne / Moorends and Site 001, they quote in a consultation reply to planning
application 16/02136/OUTM
“we would appreciate clarity and assurance from the developer that there is no intention
to establish pedestrian links between the site and this area that may lead to an increase in
usage of these crossings.”

We are all encouraged to walk / cycle to places of work more now than ever because of
climate change, Increased footfall of this route from Thorne to Site is likely to increase
high risk situations, danger to the users both Road and pedestrians. Thorne North
proposes 2000 - 3700 jobs the potential for high increase in footfall crossing busy
motorway slip roads put many lives in serious danger.

Because of the proximity of the site and the undesirable dangerous pedestrian / cycle
route proposed by the landowners development on this site would very much be road
dependent because of its detached position situated some distance away from Thorne
and Moorends on the wrong side of the motorway, I understand a small percentage of
jobs will be “offered” to the local community but travelling on foot / cycle would not
make it inviting / desirable for the local community because of the unsafe dangerous
access to it, the jobs it creates will be for whoever can get to work on time irrespective of
where they live, the ongoing regeneration and the economic growth needed in this area still trying to be achieved will once again not be achieved because Site 001 can not be considered sustainable as there is limited opportunity to access it other than by car. Employees will totally bypass the main town of Thorne, employees wages will not be spent in this community, the regeneration and economic growth failed to achieve once again.

The same sub standard unsafe route from Thorne North and Thorne South railway station would also accommodate people with disabilities getting to Site, the Disability Discrimination Act requires that their is fair treatment for those with disabilities, this is most definitely not the case.

No bus service to Site 001 is in place.

The agent states an alternative route which is along the Northern Boundary, along North Common Road, just to clarify there is no pedestrian / cycle path along this route neither is there space either side to construct one, the road is narrow, national speed limit applies (60mph) this is a busy vehicle heavy trafficked road, a through road from the M18 to Moorends and further. This road is unlit with deep ditches either side which has seen numerous accidents from vehicles crashing into them. This route is again unsafe for both able bodied and disabled employees of the development.
Site 160 is in a significantly more accessible location that is easily accessible from the main urban area and main town and can be reached by train, Thorne South and Thorne North stations, already continuous footpaths and cycle routes in place to the site for all users without having to cross uncontrolled busy slip roads of a motorway or unmanned level crossings, a high frequency hourly bus service is already established that travels past the site, Site 160 is already easily accessible for the able-bodied and also people with disabilities.

National Planning Policy Framework With regard to developments states:
Safe and suitable access can be achieved by all users.
Give priority first to pedestrians and cycle movements.
Address the needs of people with disabilities and reduced mobility in relation to all modes of transport.

Site 001 fails the above NPPF policies.

How can the council justify the proposal of Site 001 for employment use when the facts state it is not easily accessible for employees to travel to and from the site, it would be putting the lives in danger of employees using these routes, it is evidently clear Site 160 is significantly more accessible with safe footpaths / cycle paths, bus routes already in place, so therefore Site 160 is sustainable, once again justification is needed as to why the council has proposed site 001 a much inferior site over Site 160? Justification from
the council required proving site 001 is the more sustainable site and chosen for employment allocation?

For the above reasons the plan is not sound or justified.