



## **DISCLAIMER**

This document or some parts of it may not be accessible when using adaptive technology.

If you require assistance with accessing the content of the document, please contact us and quote the document name and the web page you found it on:

- email: Planning – [planning.admin@ashfield.gov.uk](mailto:planning.admin@ashfield.gov.uk)



## **REBUTTAL OF STATEMENT BY COUNCILLOR ZADROZNY**

HIGHWAYS MATTERS

ON BEHALF OF THE APPELLANT, HALLAM LAND MANAGEMENT

LAND AT JUNCTION OF NEWARK ROAD, COXMOOR ROAD,  
SUTTON IN ASHFIELD, NOTTINGHAMSHIRE

PINS REF: APP/W3005/W/24/3350529

LPA REF: V/2022/0629

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

1.1 This Rebuttal is by David Cummins and addresses the Statement by Councillor Zadrozny [CD16.13].

## **2.0 SUSTAINABLE LOCATION**

2.1 The Statement starts by noting the changed bus route, and the walking distances to the Sutton Parkway rail station. Those are matters addressed in my Evidence, and in the Rebuttal of Councillor Relf's Statement. Therefore, for brevity, I refer the reader to those documents.

2.2 Councillor Zadrozny refers to secure cycle parking, but has ignored the Appellant's proposed contribution that addresses the matter.

2.3 The Statement makes considerable reference to the Travel Plan that was submitted with the application. The bus services altered after the application was submitted, and thus some of the content of the Travel Plan has been superseded. Nevertheless, the committee report reflected the up-to-date position. It also reflected the position of Nottinghamshire County Council, and their request for a bus contribution to support service alterations to ensure the development would be adequately served by buses.

2.4 Councillor Zadrozny refers incorrectly to a bus contribution of £150,000. The correct figure, which followed further consultation with NCC and recognised the changed bus service, is £220,000. £220,000 was the figure in the July 2024 Committee Report [CD3.1] and the updated October 2024 Committee Report [CD3.2]. Therefore, despite Councillor's Zadrozny's assertion in paragraph 1.2 of his Statement to have carefully considered the officer's report, the correct contribution is £220,000.

## **3.0 HIGHWAY NETWORK PRESSURES**

3.1 Councillor Zadrozny claims there was insufficient information to understand the impact on the road network because of the closure of the level crossing. That is despite the issue being addressed in both the 2017 and 2022 applications, through surveys of the level crossing, and the surrounding road network, and its assessment in future years with the development in place. Sections 10 to 15 of my Evidence addresses the issue and for brevity the information is not repeated here. However, it is not the case that there was insufficient information. Notably, NCC considered they had sufficient information to provide their consultation response of no objection subject to conditions and obligations.

3.2 Councillor Zadrozny misunderstands how the level crossing barriers operate. It leads him to suggest that the barriers could be closed for less time with some reconfiguration, and goes on to state that this has not been sought by the applicants and has not been resolved with Network Rail. In fact, there were discussions with Network Rail that were reported in both the 2017 and 2022 planning applications. Network Rail concluded that it was not possible to reconfigure the timings. They did not object to the development. Paragraphs 11.4 to 11.5 of my Evidence explains the situation in greater detail.

## **4.0 CONCLUSION**

4.1 The information provided by Councillor Zadrozny does not change the assessments already undertaken and the conclusions of my Evidence.