

**Bassetlaw Local Plan  
Bassetlaw Transport Study Addendum  
A57 Link Capacity Review November 2022  
And  
SRN Technical Note November 2022**

**Nottinghamshire County Council, Highway Comments for Bassetlaw District Council**

<b>Bassetlaw Transport Study Addendum</b>	
<b>Para.</b>	<b>Comment</b>
1.1.1	How robust is the BTS? Is the Apleyhead development (SEM001) scenario included in the BTS feasible in the context of BLP Policy 9?
1.1.2	What happens if the Developer's of SEM001 proposed alternative development details change? In response to the Matters, Issues and Questions for the Examination, Question 3.2, Caddick is seeking flexibility.
2.2.1	See 1.1.1 comment.
2.2.5	The trip rates used in the BTS are mean person trips. Model split percentages were then derived from Census 'Travel to Work' data. What sustainable transport measures would the Apleyhead development be able to deliver that would materially improve on the level of sustainable travel that already occurs in the area.
2.2.5	Who has 'openly acknowledged' that the BTS is robust? The use of mean trips was agreed such that the BTS was realistic.
3.1.2 Table 4	Will draft Policy 9 be amended to restrict the development to B2/B8 with the floor areas now proposed in the addendum?
3.1.3	Ditto
3.1.4	The County Council received details of the trip generation on 6/1/23 for B2 and B8 and is satisfied with the suggested trip rates as provided by National Highways.
3.1.6	What sustainable transport measures are to be proposed that would achieve a 5% reduction in car trips? How would highway network capacity be affected if a 5% mode shift isn't achieved? Do the NH trip rates already include an allowance for improvements in sustainable transport? We've seen no TRICS outputs.
4.1.7	The BTS only includes junction capacity assessments on links identified as being stressed. There are no other junction capacity assessments. Will the A57 junctions as well as the A60 Mansfield Road/A619 junction as identified in table 33 of the BTS still function within operational capacity under the addendum scenario?
Appendix A	Fore have used a PCU conversion factor of 2.0. Wouldn't 2.5 be more appropriate and would that make a material difference?
	The appended Fore roundabout plan supersedes those the subject of the appended road safety audit. The appended plan has not undergone a design check. It therefore should be treated as indicative.
<b>SRN Technical Note November 2022</b>	

Image 3	It should be noted that the majority, if not all the “Possible Mitigation at the A1 Apleyhead Interchange Western Roundabout” is within the County Road network. The slip roads are the responsibility of National Highways. The design would therefore require the County Council’s approval and the works would be subjected to a Section 278 agreement, Highways Act 1980.
---------	---

End]