

**Bassetlaw Local Plan
Retford Transport Assessment (RTA) Addendum
Highway Mitigation and Sensativity Tests (Rev 1) – December 2022**

Nottinghamshire County Council, Highway Comments for Bassetlaw District Council

1.3.1	The Highway Authority would expect any Transport Assessment to be realistic and where necessary deal with worst case assumptions where there is uncertainty relating to the final form of development or effectiveness of traffic demand management measures and the likelihood of community buy in relating to potential alternatives to single-occupancy commuter travel. Although the Local Plan process is now at a late stage, it still has not been satisfactorily demonstrated that the assumptions or mitigations proposed in the RTA are realistic.
1.3.4	Further comments relating to the proposed junction mitigation measures at J6 (A620 / B6420 / Straight Mile / Sutton Lane), J7 (A620 Babworth Road / Ordsall Road), and J14 (A638 London Road / Whitehouses Road) are provided below. All involve the introduction of traffic signal control.
2.2.2	There is no certainty that a developer can secure third party land to deliver the proposed junction improvements (Addendum Appendix B). Whilst it may be possible to scale back on those designs, there are no scaled back proposals to demonstrate that they would offer sufficient mitigation to address proposed Local Plan growth.
2.2.3	LinSIG models now with Bob
3.2.1	<p>If the RTA was prepared using robust assumptions to reflect the early stage of the Local Plan process in the absence of details regarding how individual Local Plan allocations may be delivered and what sustainable transport they may provide, what details have since emerged to allow those assumptions to be refined?</p> <p>The RTA was based on the accepted Bassetlaw Transport Study (BTS). Are we now to understand that the BTS does not reflect the likely transport implications of Local Plan growth in Bassetlaw? In which case, what was it for? If the BTS is overly robust, shouldn't that be corrected to then allow the RTA to be updated based on those revised assumptions, and by implication, the Worksoop Transport Assessment (WTA)?</p>
3.2.3	<p>Sensitivity Test 1 – Removal of Covid uplift factors applied to Base flows. The covid uplift factor that was used to increase the 2021 base flows will need to remain. Permanent traffic counter sites in and around the Retford area have been scrutinised and the data shows that 2022 AADT flows were all higher than the 2021 observed flows across all six sites with growth ranging from 1 to 9%. Three of the six sites are now at 99% of the traffic flow that was observed prior to Covid (2022 vs 2018). It is anticipated that traffic volumes will return to Pre-Covid levels at most locations in the County by the end of 2023.</p> <p>The peak hour periods (08:00-09:00 and 17:00-18:00) for the six locations were also checked for neutral months (no school holidays) and whilst the AM peak in 2022 was still below the observed 2018 volumes the majority of the sites had a higher PM hour flow in 2022 when compared to the 2018 data. This confirms that the covid uplift factor is still applicable when using 2021 base flows.</p>
3.2.4	Sensitivity Test 2 – Removal of TEMPro Growth Factors

	The County Council will accept the use of the 'alternative assumptions' function within TEMPro to minimise the amount of potential double counting within the Retford Transport Assessment. The methodology and assumptions used will need to be supplied for verification.
3.2.8	Sensitivity Test 3 – Tests 1 & 2 combined This scenario is no longer relevant because Sensitivity Test 1 needs to remain as per comment above.
3.2.9	Sensitivity Test 4 – Removal of Trinity Farm Allocation Traffic It is accepted that the predicted traffic conditions would improve with the removal of the Trinity Farm allocation, as it would with the removal of Ordsall South, the scaling back of allocations, or potentially with alternative allocation locations. However, the BTS has not considered these scenarios, and nor is that proposed in the draft Local Plan. The Local Plan/Policy would need to be updated accordingly to reflect this change.
3.2.10	Sensitivity Test 5 – Modal Shift and Internalisation of Trips The reduction of 5% across the board for all committed developments and Local Plan allocation sites is overly optimistic and would need to be considered on a case-by-case basis. It is unlikely that walking and cycling facilities can be improved much beyond the site. The existing Ordsall conurbation already have access to public transport, and the location of the train station is fixed. The agreed Ordsall trip rates were based on sites in similar locations to Ordsall with similar car usage, both of which have Travel Plans in place, and presumably have internal trips (those that do not leave the site).
3.1.14	How many jobs are likely to be created by the inclusion of a primary school (1FE) and nursery, community park, care home, local shop, public house, and GP surgery / medical centre. Of those jobs, how many employees would likely live on-site, and how many of those people would likely drive to and from work in the peak hours if they were not employed on-site? How many new off-site car journeys would be generated without the inclusion of these facilities excluding pass-by and diverted trips? Does that equate to 5% of all car journeys? The agreed TRICS Wymondham and Horsham sites have on-site amenities and/or amenities with a reasonable cycling and walking distance. Why would Ordsall South be more likely to have less off-site car journeys due to the inclusion of the beforementioned facilities?
3.2.15	Sensitivity Test 6 – Tests 1, 2, 4 & 5 Combined Subject to confirmation of sensitivity test 2, 4 and 5.
3.3.2	If the Trinity Farm allocation is to be removed. That should be confirmed formally and the BTS updated accordingly.
4.1.2	A planning application reference 22/01633/FUL has now been submitted for the Ordsall South site. Whilst the Highway Authority has objected formally to the application and has not accepted any of the conclusions drawn in the supporting Transport Assessment (TA), the TA estimates that there are around 120 existing two-way movements through Eaton, increasing by 230 two-way peak hour trips to around 350 two-way. This is significantly higher than the 72/71 additional peak hour trips predicted in the RTA prior to a discount being applied. The TA estimates that High Street would experience an increase of around 100 two-way peak hour trips opposed to the 208/203 trips predicted in the RTA prior to a discount being applied. The difference in flows is likely to be because of differing traffic distribution assumptions. The actual increase in traffic on Main Road, Eaton and High Street,

	<p>Ordsall is likely to be a matter of personal choice based on the residents' experience in terms of journey time, distance, and general driver discomfort due to say the time of day or weather conditions. Given the relatively low numbers involved, any accepted discount to vehicle trips may not materialise on any given route simply because certain routes are favoured more than others.</p>
	Appendix B
J6	<p>J6 – Babworth Road/ Mansfield Road/ Sutton Lane</p> <p>Design comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The layout is much improved being squared up (by use of the corner of the field) and the access to All Saints Church being outside of the signalled junction. • Forward visibility to at least 1 of the primary traffic signal heads on Mansfield Road must be available on the approach for a minimum of the DMRB stopping sight distance appropriate to the speed of road. It would need to be demonstrated that this is available possibly with the acquisition of more land than shown to create a clear verge allowing the offside signal head to be seen. • The method of operation generally looks to be sensible. It is suggested that there is no need to split the pedestrian movement into 2 to cross Sutton Lane. This will mean having an additional all red to traffic stage to allow the pedestrians to run, however, the assumption is that the pedestrian demand will be very low so the crossing facility would only come up occasionally and, overall, would not affect the performance of the junction. • Has the junction design been assessed in terms of LTN1/20 guidance? The straight crossing over Sutton Lane (if it is a toucan) will help in this respect. • Acceptability of the junction modelling to be confirmed. <p>Highway safety comments</p> <p>The traffic signals may draw more traffic through from the A1 on Mansfield Road which has some problematic bends and isn't really suitable for more traffic with possibly a similar draw-through from the north. The outbound lane layout relies on road markings being clear otherwise drivers will try to go through in pairs; that could be resolved with some more work at detailed design; perhaps a little more widening so that some hatching could be implemented between left-and ahead-lanes. Right-turners will use the far-sided secondary signal for the eastbound to decide when to turn which could result in collisions with late-running oncoming vehicles. Why hasn't a signalized ped route to cross the A620 been included? Demands may be low but walking and cycling should be catered for. The junction will require street lighting and anti-skid.</p>
J7	<p>J7 – Babworth Road/ Ordsall Road</p> <p>Design comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As with the Mansfield Road junction the layout looks much better with pedestrians across Ordsall Road and Babworth Road east side, assisting pedestrian access to the bus stops. • The method of operation generally looks to be sensible. The right turn into Ordsall Road is an indicative arrow facility again which is probably the most appropriate method at this site. Pedestrians are served across Ordsall Road and Babworth Road east in a single all-round pedestrian stage. We still have concerns regarding the left turn filter facility out of Ordsall Road. The differential

	<p>movements at the shared stop line have proven problematic in the past in terms of safety and our road safety. Whether it is necessary would depend on the demand flows for the left and right turn movements out of Ordsall Road.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The location of the bus stop for westbound services in the left turn lane may still be a problem in terms of visibility and how the bus comes off the stop if wanting to go ahead towards Worksop. • There are still intervisibility zone issues with this design due to the woodland on both sides of Ordsall Road which look to be outside the highway boundaries. It may be that the refuge and stop line on Ordsall Road can be brought into the junction to reduce the incursion of the woodland into the visibility zones, however, this would also depend on checking turning movements. • Has the junction design been assessed in terms of LTN1/20 guidance? • Acceptability of the junction modelling to be confirmed. <p>Highway safety comments</p> <p>The bus stop seems too close, but it might be OK in that lane since it's for left turns only. A bus might struggle to get back into ahead stream. We do not like the far-sided secondary on the eastbound since right-turners will use that to decide when to turn which could result in collisions with late-running oncoming vehicles; however the proposed early cut-off Stage 2 will need that signal. A fully signalized right-turn arrangement would be safer. We do not like the westbound lane layout which relies on road markings being clear otherwise drivers will try to go through in pairs; that could be resolved with some more work at detailed design; perhaps a little more widening so that some hatching could be implemented between left- and ahead-lanes. Good to see some peds but what about cycling? Anti-skid and changes to lighting needed. Stage 2 might cause problems for pedestrians trying to cross the side road; it is suggested that the left-filter is deleted from that stage otherwise people might get run over when they cross against a "red man/bike" signal.</p>
J14	<p>J14 – London Road/ Whitehouses Road</p> <p>Design comments</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Again, the layout looks better than previous iterations. The pedestrian facility over London Road south is now not in line with the pub exit (being moved north) and the pub entrance/exit is now outside the confines of the junction. The refuges are of a better size to accommodate the required traffic signal equipment. The London Road alignments are also improved although the northbound may still require further finessing. • There is still a private access within the junction (the property to the north of the pub). It is not clear whether that can be addressed. The next property along also may be presented with access issues as the stop line (and refuge) on London Road north will be very close to their gateway and traffic queueing at the stop line may obstruct vehicles wanting to turn right into the property. • The method of operation generally looks to be sensible although, as with Ordsall Road, We still have concerns regarding the left turn filter facility out of Whitehouses Road. The differential movements at the shared stop line have proven problematic in the past in terms of safety. Whether it is necessary would depend on the demand flows for the left and right turn movements out of Whitehouses Road. • Acceptability of the junction modelling to be confirmed.

Highway safety comments

The far-sided secondary signal head on the southbound approach is likely to result in right-turners using it to decide when to turn which could result in collisions with late-running oncoming vehicles; however, the proposed early cut-off Stage 2 will need that signal. A fully signalized right-turn arrangement would be safer. We do not like the northbound lane layout which relies on road markings being clear otherwise drivers will try to go through in pairs; that could be resolved with some more work at detailed design; perhaps a little more widening so that some hatching could be implemented between left- and ahead-lanes. Good to see all-round peds but what about cycling? Anti-skid and changes to lighting needed.

[End]