

Matter 11 – Transport and Infrastructure Issue Whether the Local Plan has been positively prepared and whether it is justified, effective and consistent with national policy in relation to transport and infrastructure.

Relevant policies – S9, SD10 Questions Infrastructure overall

11.1 How will key infrastructure be delivered and funded?

Unclear. Developments (dispersed) under 500 dwelling do not benefit from sufficient S106 funding to support the provision of the necessary infrastructure to ensure that the site is sustainable.

11.2 Do the Plan's Strategic Policies clearly identify and make provision for infrastructure including, but not limited to, transport, telecommunications, security, waste management, water supply, flood risk and community facilities as required by paragraph 20 of the Framework?

No. The sites allocated in TSS area are not bringing with them improvements in infrastructure which suggests that the spatial strategy is not evidence based. In our area, since 2016 there have been upward of 800 new dwellings completed with 1400 in all identified in the draft LP, yet our GP practice collapsed and had to be rescued by the practice in Huthwaite. No new school places have been made available and we have lost one of our two main bus services. The conclusion has to be that draft Local Plan is a pre-designated plan where the evidence is being made to fit rather than the plan being shaped having taken into consideration the evidence. The evidence should dictate that the emphasis should be on larger sites that include new infrastructure to the south of the district or close to good transport networks.

11.3 Does the Plan's spatial strategy rely on any critical infrastructure which is subject to phasing?

There is no critical infrastructure planned for subject to phasing or not.

Transport

11.4 How have the potential impacts of the development proposed in the Plan been tested, and how will the necessary highways mitigation be delivered?

11.5 Does the Plan clearly identify necessary transport mitigation measures that arise from the overall spatial strategy, but also from specific site allocations?

Unclear. The Ashfield Local Plan Strategic Transport Modelling Assessment Full Report v2 (SYSTRA) makes little reference to congestion across TSS other than the Mansfield Road/A38 junction. It makes no reference to the current very limited bus services running to Stanton Hill, Teversal, Fackley or the Healdswood side of Skegby. There is no mitigation proposed to address the current issues, never mind future issues. The Report refers to mitigation for the TSS area as a change at the Mansfield Road/A38 junction to 'optimise signal timings' plus a new bus service running from Huthwaite/Sutton in Ashfield, via Lammas Road, Kings Mill Hospital, new developments at Beck Lane and Mansfield via Chesterfield Road. This plan does not address the acute issue in the TSS area which leaves bus services to and from Stanton Hill, Fackley, Teversal etc either to continue with a very limited service or in some of the areas no service at all. This is totally unsatisfactory, especially as considerable build is in progress, planned or features as proposed allocations in the draft Local Plan.

11.6 What effect does the Plan's strategy and site allocations have on the Strategic Road Network? What evidence is there that the mitigation measures proposed in the Strategic Transport Modelling Assessment Report (SEV.39.1) will be effective? Is this evidence sufficiently clear?

11.7 What effect does the Plan's strategy and site allocations have on the Local Highway Network?

Other routes to the M1 access at J29 are not mentioned. Although J29 sits within Derbyshire it is accessed from Ashfield via Chesterfield Road, Tibshelf and the lanes running through Stanley (Shepherds Lane, Stanley Lane and Silverhill Lane) mainly used as 'rat runs'. These lanes are single tracked (with passing places), hilly and in poor condition especially in the winter months. They also are affected by lane and total closures of the M1, when this occurs the roads block resulting in no access to the hamlet or access through at all until the block is cleared. With the huge increase in new dwellings (completed, in progress and planned) in Stanton Hill and Skegby mitigations need to be considered.

11.8 Is there clear evidence that the proposed highway interventions in the full mitigation scenario have been suitably assessed and any critical transport improvements identified and costed?

No. The Forum carried out traffic surveys during the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan which showed that in 2015 at times some roads were at capacity. Traffic has since increased including heavy vehicles since Chesterfield Road in Huthwaite was closed as an access to the M1.

11.9 What does 'large scale development' mean in the context of requirement in Policy SD10 for a Transport Assessment? Is there a threshold? If so, what is it and is it justified by evidence?

See above comments.

11.10 Has Policy SD10 been shaped by engagement with all stakeholders, including infrastructure providers and statutory consultees in seeking to address the impacts of development on transport infrastructure and potential mitigation strategies?

No. Given the volume of new housing proposed in the TSS area, the Forum would have expected and wanted to have discussions with the Council about effects on the local highway network, potential for improvements and other sustainable and active travel initiatives.