



TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT
HIGHWAY REPORT ON PROPOSALS FOR DEVELOPMENT

DISTRICT: Ashfield Date received 23/08/2022
OFFICER: Sam Muir
PROPOSAL: Outline with reserved matters - Access - Residential development of up to 300 dwellings D.C. No. V/2022/0629
LOCATION: Land at Newark Road, Coxmoor Road, Sutton in Ashfield,
APPLICANT:

Re-consultation

This is an outline application with all matters reserved, except for access, for a development of up to 300 dwellings. Access is to be provided from Newark Road for which there have been previous discussions between the Highway Authority and the applicant's Transport Consultants (ADC Infrastructure), and any future internal layout would incorporate a loop road arrangement.

The following comments arise due to a response being received from ADC Infrastructure relating to the previous highway comments. The points are numbered in accordance with ADC's response.

3. Coxmoor Rd/ Hamilton Rd mini rdbt (drawing ADC1580-DR-005 rev P9):

The response from ADC is that the improvements denoted by the pink lines shown on the above drawing are to be provided as part of the LCWIP. It should be noted that the LCWIP is aspirational, with no confirmed plans or funding for delivery of the scheme. In accordance with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), Section 9 (Promoting Sustainable Transport), Paragraphs 108-117 state that opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport use need to be pursued as part of development proposals. For example, Paragraph 114 states that *'in assessing sites that may be allocated for development in plans, or specific applications for development it should be*

ensured that (a) appropriate opportunities to promote sustainable transport modes can be – or have been – taken up, given the type of development and its location.

It is, therefore, reasonable to expect that for a development of this size, improvements should be provided by the applicant to encourage pedestrian, cycling and public transport activity in this location and the required cycle facilities should be included on the submitted drawings.

4. Newark Rd/ Hamilton Rd segregated cycle crossing (drawing ADC1580-DR-006 rev P5):

The response from ADC is that the improvements denoted by the pink lines shown on the above drawing are to be provided as part of the LCWIP. The above comments relating to the LCWIP are also relevant for this location and the required cycle facilities should be included on the submitted drawings.

5. Newark Rd/ Site Access signalised junction (drawing ADC1580-DR-012 rev P8):

Previous highway comments read ‘The layout can still be tightened up in terms of stop line locations, increasing storage space and lane lengths between junctions and reducing clearance periods between conflicting traffic and pedestrian phases’.

The response from ADC is that the junction could be conditioned for the detailed design process and implementation prior to occupation, however, it is beneficial if this could be addressed to ensure this can be suitably achieved.

It was requested in the previous highway comments that NMU facilities be provided at the Coxmoor Road/Newark Road signalised junction. The response from ADC is that the applicant is resistant to further design iterations. However, this is considered appropriate in accordance with NPPF, Paragraph 116 which states *‘applications for development should (a) give priority first to pedestrian and cycle movements, both within the scheme and with neighbouring areas. As Cauldwell Road is now ‘stopped up’ for vehicular traffic, this provides a suitable opportunity to further encourage active movement in the area, due to its link to the A617 Sherwood Way South which has suitable pedestrian crossing facilities onto a Right of Way (Sutton in Ashfield Bridleway 145), leading to Derby Road Mansfield.*

Such changes could have an impact on how the junction works and this has not therefore been tested and demonstrated that the access arrangements work in terms of capacity.

The previous highway comments read ‘The double set of pedestrian stud lines on the drawing indicates parallel pedestrian and cycle facilities across the access road, rather than the previous staggered puffin/toucan facilities, however, the staging diagram does not reflect this as it still shows a staggered style crossing for a shared facility. If it is parallel (as per LTN1/20) then the cycle facilities need to go across the road in a single movement, separate from the pedestrians alongside. This will require a separate ‘all red to traffic’ stage, affecting the capacity modelling for the junction. The type of

crossing is unclear. There are no tactile paving or junction treatment/road markings indicating where cyclists or pedestrians are expected to be directed.

This mismatch between the staging diagram and the submitted drawing means that the capacity of the proposed junction has not been demonstrated.

The information currently submitted does not satisfactorily demonstrate the effectiveness of the junction to be able to fully assess the potential traffic impact on Newark Road. There is a conflict between the staging diagram and the submitted drawing.

The previous highway comments read 'As with the crossing on Coxmoor Road at the end of Hamilton Road the interaction of pedestrian and cycle paths/facilities will need careful design. The drawing shows areas of buff paving at the junction corners which implies that the facilities at the junction are shared, in which case there is no requirement for segregation across the access road'.

These comments remain as they have not been addressed.

With regard to the SW bound exit merge being too long, due to the urban nature of this location the merge should end prior to the bend to discourage high speeds and overtaking. The 100m distance can be measured from the proposed 'stop line'. ADC have confirmed the layout can be amended to provide this.

Previous highway comments read *'The intervisibility zone still impinges on land outside the highway. It is understood that the corners will be dedicated as highway to preserve the zone, however, bringing the stop lines closer in could possibly bring the zone wholly within highway'*. ADC have agreed this point.

With regard to the "single direction" footway/cycleways into the development site ADC have indicated that this can be adjusted if necessary.

The cycle facility across Searby Road is of concern as drivers may not respect this when they are turning. Full NMU priority should be considered along with how this would affect capacity modelling.

Sustainability

6. The previous highway comments read *There is an existing 'old style' signed footway/cycleway facility on Newark Road which provides a link to the south to Kirkby Folly Road. The proposed footway/cycleway scheme on Newark Road is demonstrated on Drawing ADC1580-DR-006 rev P5, however, this does not connect to the **existing** infrastructure which can be seen to the west of the proposed crossing on this drawing, opposite Hamilton Road. This connection is required as Hamilton Road connects Newark Road to the existing infrastructure at the Hamilton Road/Coxmoor Road junction.*

As stated above, the response from ADC is that the improvements denoted by the pink lines shown on the above drawing are to be provided as part of the LCWIP. The above

comments relating to the LCWIP scheme are relevant for this location and the required cycle facilities should be included on the submitted drawings.

7. The previous highway comments read *Pedestrian/cycling links have been proposed from the Newark Road site access, linking to existing and improved infrastructure. A 'sparrow' crossing has been shown on drawing no. ADC1580-DR-006 P5 and labelled 'Improvements to Hamilton Road and Newark Road proposed by VIA East Midlands as part of the ATC LCWIP'. Providing transport solutions which encourage cycling and walking are key planning objectives when considering new developments, giving future residents alternatives to using a private car. To meet these objectives, in accordance with national policy, i.e. National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF), enhanced infrastructure and facilities should be provided to improve and promote sustainable travel when considering new development. Therefore, the proposed 'sparrow' crossing is required to be provided by the applicant as part of this development to enhance connectivity of the local routes and form a comprehensive network of high-quality walking/cycling networks to reduce car dependency.*

The response from ADC is that the improvements denoted by the pink lines shown on the above drawing are to be provided as part of the LCWIP. The above comments relating to the LCWIP scheme are also relevant for this location and the required cycle facilities should be included on the submitted drawings.

8. With regard to the unregistered piece of land, drawing no. ADC1580-DR-012 Rev. P9 has been submitted, demonstrating two layouts – one showing the segregated footway/cycleway within the unregistered land as requested by the Highway Authority (Works B on the drawing), and one layout avoiding the unregistered land, with the footway/cycleway at the rear of the verge (Works A). A covering letter dated 8 March 2024 from Pegasus Group has also been submitted indicating that it is the intention of the applicant to deliver Works A, however, the applicant is willing to enter into an agreement to use reasonable endeavours to deliver Works B.

The Highway Authority still request that Works B option is carried out and that the applicant should use best endeavours to achieve this.

The existing 30mph speed limit on Newark Road, in the vicinity of the proposed site access is to be extended further to the east as shown on drawing no. ADC1580-DR-012 Rev. P8. This may require the applicant to provide additional and/or upgrade the existing street lighting along the site frontage on Newark Road as it does not currently serve residential purposes and may not be appropriate to serve the proposed development.

9. The response from ADC regarding the existing lamp columns, gullies and trees being shown on a suitable drawing is that lighting columns and gullies will be relocated accordingly. The Highway Authority would like to clarify that any highway trees will need to be identified. Paragraph 136 of the NPPF states that existing trees should be retained wherever possible and the applicant has therefore not demonstrated this either way.

Travel Plan

10. The revised Travel Plan has been forwarded to colleagues for review, and any comments will be forwarded on receipt.

As there are still outstanding matters in relation to capacity at the site access junction, provision for active travel and alterations to the layout submitted, the Highway Authority object to the development on the grounds that the impact on highway has not been fully demonstrated.

Stella Euerby
Principal Development Control Officer

27/03/24