

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT
HIGHWAY REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT:	Ashfield	Date received	19/03/2020
OFFICER:	Robbie Steel		
PROPOSAL:	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 (3)
LOCATION:	Land Off, Ashland Road West, Sutton in Ashfield		
APPLICANT:			

A letter dated 20th November 2020 has been submitted addressing our previous Highway Observations dated 10th November 2020.

The HA still have reservations regarding the traffic flows which may not be representative of normal conditions due to the pandemic. It is not clear how this can be dealt with, or if it is indeed required to be dealt with. The HA would need the assessments to be acceptable to be able to consider this, but there remains a number of issues with the information submitted in the letter, as follows:

J1 – A38/ Common Road:

- Acceptable on the face value of the flows used.

J2 – Common Road/ Blackwell Road:

- Linsig model does not use the signal controller configuration data and is unacceptable.
- The phase to phase intergreen periods are not as per the configuration, nor is the operation. The private car sales access which is signalised has been missed – this is probably not too critical in the great scheme of things as this will run very rarely. However, the right turn green arrow for the movement from Common Road has been missed and the modelling changes to mimic this phase don't work.
- The model results show the expected pattern – the development makes the junction perform considerably worse than at present, however, the mistakes in the modelling mean that the actual level of %PRC before and after are not accepted.
- Please note that the junction is already equipped with pedestrian on-crossing detection.

J4 – Huthwaite Road/ Ashland Road:

- The junction geometry is shown in Appendix A/ Junction 4. The measurements are still slightly higher than anticipated but it is not thought there will be much difference made by amendments, so this is acceptable on the face value of the flows used.

J5 – Huthwaite Road/ Alfretton Road:

- Acceptable on face value of the flows used.

J6 – Lammas Road/ Hack Lane:

- Linsig model has been revised but does not use the signal controller configuration data and is unacceptable as what has been modelled is at best approximate.
- The phase to phase intergreen periods are not as per the configuration, nor is the operation. Nearly all of the intergreen periods are lower than what is configured. This is especially marked with the pedestrian clearance periods which are significantly lower than configured.
- Even given these limitations, the junction performance will be made significantly worse due to the development and should be mitigated.

J8 – High Pavement/ Forest Street:

- Linsig model has been revised but does not use the signal controller configuration data and is unacceptable as what has been modelled is at best approximate.
- The phase to phase intergreen periods are not as per the configuration, nor is the operation. Nearly all of the intergreen periods are lower than what is configured. The left turn filter phase on High Pavement has also been missed.
- Even given these limitations, the junction performance will be made worse due to the development and should be mitigated.

J9 – A38 Kings Mill Road/ Station Road:

- Linsig model has been revised as suggested and now resembles what is on street.
- The development flows have a small detrimental effect on the performance of the junction. However, it already has MOVA and Puffin style facilities so we would request further suggestions for mitigation.

J10 & 11 – Mansfield Rd/ Stoneyford Rd & Mansfield Rd/ Dalestorth St:

- Modelling uses our configuration data as previously but with stages running in correct order.
- Something has gone awry with the modelling in the PM peak however, as the overall %PRC of - 119.1 in the PM peak is totally different to that previously reported and indicative of the junction approaches not being balanced and, hence, not optimised.

Access Widening

The letter includes access drawing number ADC1032-DR-001-P8 indicating a widened western access road in lieu of the single point of access. This is acceptable. However, the letter also includes an amended masterplan (drawing number P19-1014-007D). The section of road indicated below serves more than the maximum allowable and therefore should also be widened, prior to linking to the proposed loop. The submitted masterplan is therefore not be considered acceptable as part of this application, other than for indicative purposes.



Accessibility

The pedestrian audit is noted. However, the route using North Street to access eastbound services is not acceptable as highway access as whilst it utilises a public right of way, this is unadopted and unlit (and this includes a significant section of North Street itself which is unadopted).

The only acceptable route to the closest bus stops is therefore along Ashland Road West, crossing Huthwaite Road. The refuge shown in Inset 3 of Figure 1 within the letter is in fact a traffic island which is not accessible to pedestrians and therefore we require an accessible means of crossing Huthwaite Road for pedestrians using westbound bus services.

In consideration of the above, the Highway Authority does not currently support this application as the impact on highway has not yet been properly determined/mitigated and therefore wish to lodge a holding objection.

Should the applicant submit further information we will review this stance.

Sarah Hancock
Principal Officer – Highway Development Control

7th January 2021