

**TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT****HIGHWAY REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT**

<b>DISTRICT:</b>	Ashfield	Date received	19/03/2020
<b>OFFICER:</b>	Robbie Steel		
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Outline planning application (with all matters reserved except access) for a residential development of up to 300 dwellings with associated infrastructure and landscaping.	D.C. No.	V/2020/0184(2)
<b>LOCATION:</b>	Land Off, Ashland Road West, Sutton in Ashfield		
<b>APPLICANT:</b>			

---

A Transport Assessment Addendum (TAA) has been submitted, document reference ADC1032-RP-G / rev 3.

The introduction of the TAA states that it was written to address the comments made by the Highway Authority. Paragraph 1.7 states that matters in relation to pedestrian access to the local bus stops and design of the access to the site will be addressed separately with the Highway Authority (HA). However, these matters need to be addressed as part of the planning application so that they can be conditioned.

The TAA presents revised trip rates with distribution applied in consideration of census data and assignment in accordance with online journey planning software, which is now acceptable. This exercise formed the basis of the study area and the TAA reviews the junctions requested to be assessed by the HA.

Unfortunately, due to the current pandemic, there are difficulties with new traffic count data. Whilst at the time of the counts, ATC data held by Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) indicated that traffic was up to circa 90% of post lockdown levels allowing a factor to be applied, there is doubt that the journey purposes are the same meaning that the turning proportions may not be representative of normal conditions. The HA therefore have reservations about the assessments carried out on the basis of these counts. There is no consideration given in the TAA as to how this issue could be overcome.

The TAA identifies committed developments from the planning portals from Mansfield and Bolsover. It was assumed that developments in Ashfield would be considered automatically, but this does not seem to have been done. The Ashfield website should therefore be consulted and any appropriate developments included. For example, the Beck Lane development of circa 322 dwellings (V/2016/0569) impacts on Junctions 10 and 11. This should therefore be included in the assessments, as a minimum.

Notwithstanding the above, the HA have reviewed the assessments as submitted and have the following comments to make:

**J1 A38 Alfreton Rd/ Common Rd**

Year of count: 2018

- Linsig modelling looks to be using NCC signal configuration data but has a 0 second pedestrian clearance intergreen. The presence of traffic phases means that reasonable intergreens are still seen in the model but a couple of vehicle to pedestrian intergreens have also been missed out.
- Model saturation flows are higher than those normally accepted, making the model (base and development) over optimistic.

We therefore require the errors in this model to be corrected.

**J2 Common Rd/ Blackwell Rd:**

Year of count: 2020

- The Linsig model is not based on the actual junction configuration; the phasing, staging and intergreens are wrong.

Given the above the results and conclusions in the TAA are not accepted and the junction should be remodelled.

**J3 Sutton Rd/ Market St:**

Year of count: 2020

- We accept the modelling on Picady and the conclusions drawn.

**J4 Huthwaite Rd/ Ashland Rd:**

Year of count: 2019

- The side road geometry values look to be a little over-exaggerated which will make the junction perform better. We therefore require a scaled drawing showing the parameters.
- The predicted performance of the junction is still okay in the development case – there is predicted to be significant headroom in the base scenarios so that, even with flows on the side road doubling the performance still has plenty in reserve.

However, we would need reassurance in respect to the side road geometry used prior to being able to accept the results.

**J5 Huthwaite Rd/ Alfreton Rd:**

Year of count: 2020

- The approach to use a mix of Arcady and Picady modelling seems reasonable.
- Lane mixes are reasonable in the Arcady model so there is no Arcady lane assignment issue. The right turn movement from Huthwaite Road to Alfreton Road should be assigned to the ahead movement so that the vehicles coming from Lammas Road have no opposing flow and can freely discharge into the junction – this will have a small effect on the Alfreton Road approach and should be more realistic.

- The Picady model for the give way at the Lammas Road entry looks to have been done reasonably.

The assessment should be revisited to address the above issues.

#### **J6 Lammas Rd/ Hack La:**

Year of count: 2020

- The Linsig model is not based on the actual junction configuration; the phasing, staging and intergreens are wrong.

Given the above the results and conclusions in the TAA are not accepted and the junction should be remodelled.

#### **J7 Kirkby Rd/ Spring Rd:**

Year of count: 2020

- The modelling on Arcady and the conclusions drawn are accepted.

#### **J8 High Pavement/ Forest St:**

Year of count: 2020

- The Linsig model is not based on the actual junction configuration; the phasing, staging and intergreens are wrong.

Given the above the results and conclusions in the TAA are not accepted and the junction should be remodelled.

#### **J9 A38 Kings Mill Rd/ Station Rd:**

Year of count: 2018

- 0 second pedestrian clearance periods for the ped phases have been used in the model. This is not acceptable.
- Compounding this error is a missed intergreen which allows the right turn arrow to run from Sutton at the same time as the opposite traffic stream is running and this needs to be addressed.
- It is contended that MOVA will provide significantly better results than Linsig predicts. However, this is not accepted.

As a result of the above errors the results and conclusions are not accepted.

#### **J10 & 11 Mansfield Rd/ Stoneyford Rd/ Dalestorth Rd:**

Year of count junction 10: 2019

Year of count junction 11: 2008

It is not clear why count data from 2008 has been used for Junction 11 as data from 2019 is available. The HA therefore do not accept the assessment due to the use of 2008 count data.

- Stoneyford Rd junction – the stage order has been changed round and so some other aspects of the model are affected.
- The estimated average crossing times are lower than anticipated.

- Dalestorth Rd junction – the stage order has been altered, similarly to Stoneyford Road.

Given the above, we do not accept the results and the model should be corrected.

**J14 Lammas Rd/ Forest St roundabout:**

Year of count: 2019

- The geometry looks to be reasonable.
- The biggest concern with this model is the usual caveat for any Arcady model with multiple lanes used for different turns – unless the movements in each lane are roughly balanced then the Arcady model will give over-optimistic results. This is a flaw with the Arcady model and applies to all scenarios.

In spite of the above concerns, it is not thought the development flows here will be significant enough to create a problem.

In summary, in consideration of the issues above, the Highway Authority do not currently support the development due to:

- the pedestrian access to the bus stops not having being addressed;
- the details of the access to the development not having been submitted and;
- the impact on the Highway network having not been properly assessed at 9 out of the 14 junctions forming the study area.

Sarah Hancock  
Principal Officer – Highway Development Control

10<sup>th</sup> November 2020