



National Highways

Bassetlaw Local Plan

Examination in Public

HEARING STATEMENT:

Matter 6 – Housing Allocations

BLANK PAGE

1 Introduction

National Highways, formerly Highways England, has been appointed by the Secretary of State for Transport as strategic highway company under the provisions of the Infrastructure Act 2015, and is the highway authority, traffic authority and street authority for the Strategic Road Network (SRN). It is our role to maintain the safe and efficient operation of the SRN whilst acting as a delivery partner to national economic growth.

The SRN is a critical national asset and as such National Highways works to ensure that it operates and is managed in the public interest, both in respect of current activities and needs as well as in providing effective stewardship of its long-term operation and integrity. The SRN within and near to the district of Bassetlaw includes the A1 trunk road which bisects the plan area, and the M1 motorway approximately 8km to the west of the plan area.

This hearing statement has been prepared by National Highways in response to the Matters, Issues and Questions which have been identified by the Inspectors in relation to **Matter 6 – Housing Allocations**. We are not proposing to attend the hearing on this matter but do propose to attend the hearings for Matters 13 – Transport and Connectivity, and Matter 14 – Infrastructure, and delivery and Monitoring.

The questions identified for this matter focus on the issue ‘are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based’ and our responses are provided under the relevant questions on the next page.

2 Response to Questions

(Policies 16 –28)

Issue 6 – Are the proposed housing allocations justified, effective, developable, deliverable, in line with national policy and otherwise soundly based?

Note: This matter focusses on the merits of individual site allocations, the process for selecting site allocations is dealt with in Matter 2.

6.2 Is the site allocated as an urban extension at Peaks Hill Farm sound, and in particular:

- a) Are the various requirements set out in in the policy clear, justified and effective?*
- b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?*
- c) Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be implemented and that all necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support it are achievable and can be delivered?*
- d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and developable during the plan period?*
- e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?*
- f) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policy necessary to make the plan sound?*

Our response to the above question should be read in conjunction with our responses to Matter 13 – Transport and Connectivity and Matter 14 – Infrastructure and Delivery and Monitoring.

As per our response to Matter 13, the Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS) has set out to identify the cumulative transport impacts of Local Plan growth within the district up to the end of the Plan period (2038).

Although National Highways has not completed our verification of the modelling which underpinned the BTS, we have noted the BTS identified congestion at the A1 Apleyhead junction and the requirement for mitigation. Policy 16: HS1 (Peaks Hill Farm) of the Local Plan does not currently identify the need for financial contributions towards highways mitigation at the A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1 roundabout although this requirement has been identified in policies relating to SEM:001 Apleyhead employment site and HS27 Ordsall South. Contributions from the Peaks Hill Farm

site towards the A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1 roundabout are however listed in the IDP. For consistency, we would suggest that they should also be listed under Policy 16 for this site in recognition of the cumulative traffic impacts identified through the BTS.

However, as per our response under Matter 13, until we have completed our verification of the transport modelling results, we cannot state for certain that no other highways improvements on the A1 trunk road will not be required. As such, we would suggest some flexibility in the wording of the policy to allow for the inclusion of subsequent highways improvements, not just the one mentioned above.

We would also add that whilst the BTS has identified a cumulative need for highways improvements to the A1 junction at the end of the Plan period, the precise timescale for the requirement of any mitigation is not yet known. This will be dictated by the quantum of development and build-out rates of individual development proposals and will be therefore assessed at the planning application stage.

In addition, we would highlight that whilst the use of S106 agreements can be an effective way of securing financial contributions towards highway infrastructure improvements, there are risks to this approach for developments reliant on its delivery. This is outlined in further detail in our response to Matter 14.

6.4 Is the site allocated as an urban extension at Ordsall South sound and in particular:

- a) Are the criteria set out in in the policy clear, justified and effective?*
- b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?*
- c) Is there sufficient evidence to demonstrate that the site can be implemented and that all necessary infrastructure and mitigation measures required to support it are achievable and can be delivered?*
- d) Is there evidence that the development of the allocation is viable and developable during the plan period?*
- e) Are there any omissions in the policy, and is it sufficiently flexible?*
- f) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policy necessary to make the plan sound?*

Our response to the above should be read in conjunction with our responses to Matter 13 – Transport and Connectivity and Matter 14 – Infrastructure and Delivery and Monitoring.

As per our response to Matter 13, the Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS) has set out to identify the cumulative transport impacts of Local Plan growth within the district up to the end of the Plan period (2038).

Although National Highways has not completed our verification of the modelling which underpinned the BTS, we have noted the BTS identified congestion at the A1 Apleyhead junction and the requirement for mitigation. Policy 27: HS13 (Ordsall South) of the Local Plan identifies the need for financial contributions towards highways mitigation at the A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1 roundabout which is the western-most roundabout of the A1 Apleyhead interchange.

However, as per our response under Matter 13, until we have completed our verification of the transport modelling results, we cannot state for certain that no other highways improvements on the A1 trunk road will not be required. Given the proximity of the Ordsall South allocation to the A1, this site may have a direct impact on other SRN junctions not previously identified. This is not least the eastern roundabout forming the A1 Apleyhead interchange and the overbridge connecting the two roundabouts.

In light of the above, we raise concern that there will not be sufficient evidence to indicate that this site can be implemented until we have at least accepted the findings of the BTS. We would suggest some flexibility in the wording of the policy to allow for the inclusion of subsequent highways improvements, not already identified under Policy 27.

We would also add that whilst the BTS has identified a cumulative need for highways improvements to the A1 junction at the end of the Plan period, the precise timescale for the requirement of any mitigation is not yet known. This will be dictated by the quantum of development and build-out rates of individual development proposals and will therefore be assessed at the planning application stage.

In addition, we would highlight that whilst the use of S106 agreements can be an effective way of securing financial contributions towards highway infrastructure improvements, there are risks to this approach for developments reliant on its delivery. This is outlined in further detail in our response to Matter 14.

6.5 Are the other 6 housing allocations in Retford and the allocation in Tuxford sound, and in particular:

- a) Are the criteria set out in the policies clear, justified and effective?*
- b) Have the site constraints, indicative yield, development mix and viability considerations been adequately addressed?*
- c) Is there evidence that the development of the allocations is viable and developable during the plan period?*
- d) Are there any omissions in the policies, and are they sufficiently flexible?*
- e) Are the main modifications suggested to the Policies necessary to make the plan sound?*

Our response to this question should be read in conjunction with our responses to Matter 13 – Transport and Connectivity and Matter 14 – Infrastructure and Delivery and Monitoring.

As per our response to Matter 13, the Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS) has set out to identify the cumulative transport impacts of Local Plan growth within the district up to the end of the Plan period (2038).

Although National Highways has not completed our verification of the modelling which underpinned the BTS, we have noted the BTS identified congestion at the A1 Apleyhead junction and the requirement for mitigation. Policy 21: HS7 (Trinity Farm) of the Local Plan does not currently identify the need for financial contributions towards highways mitigation at the A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1 roundabout whilst this requirement has been identified in policies relating to SEM:001 Apleyhead employment site and HS27: Ordsall South. Contributions from the Trinity Farm site towards the A614 Blyth Road/A57/A1 roundabout are however listed in the IDP. For consistency, we would suggest that they should also be listed under Policy 21 for this site in recognition of the cumulative traffic impacts identified through the BTS.

However, as per our response under Matter 13, until we have completed our verification of the transport modelling results, we cannot state for certain that no other highways improvements on the A1 trunk road will not be required. As such, we would suggest some flexibility in the wording of the policy to allow for the inclusion of subsequent highways improvements, not just the one mentioned above.

We would also add that whilst the BTS has identified a cumulative need for highways improvements to the A1 junction at the end of the Plan period, the precise timescale for the requirement of any mitigation is not yet known. This will be dictated by the quantum of development and build-out rates of individual development proposals and will be therefore assessed at the planning application stage.

In addition, we would highlight that whilst the use of S106 agreements can be an effective way of securing financial contributions towards highway infrastructure improvements, there are risks to this approach for developments reliant on its delivery. This is outlined in further detail in our response to Matter 14.