North Derbyshire Local Development Frameworks:
North East Derbyshire
Stage 2: Traffic Impacts of Proposed Development (Individual Report)

Explanatory Note

Derbyshire County Council commissioned Scott Wilson (now URS) to prepare the Stage 2: Traffic Impacts of Proposed Development (Individual Report**)** to quantify the likely traffic impacts of the proposed LDF developments and give a broad indication of the mitigation schemes likely to be required to deliver the growth envisioned. This work is based on two options for North East Derbyshire. Similar reports were drafted for Chesterfield and Bolsover.

Although the report serves a useful purpose, it was never accepted as a final document by North East Derbyshire District Council, as the Council still had outstanding comments on the report. For the record, a list of outstanding comments is shown below.

Further work, such as the Stage 2: Traffic Impacts (Cumulative) Report (February 2012) and the SATURN modelling work has effectively superseded the report. Consequently, North East Derbyshire District Council considers that the report is best regarded as an intermediary report. .

NEDDC comments on Stage 2: Traffic Impacts of Proposed Development (Individual Report)

General Comments
Executive Summary – the report should include an Exec. Summary to summarise each District's report in plain English, with a clear summary of the issues and impacts for Option A and Option B.
The clarity and useability of the report could be improved by avoiding the use of technical jargon, or by explaining technical terms. The tables and figures would benefit from more detailed explanation. In addition the source of data within tables should be clearly identified.
Table and Figure headings should appear at the start of the figure, rather than at the end, particularly where they run over pages.
Greater description/interpretation of the data would help, along with clear discussion/assessment of the impacts of the two options. The report does present the data, but does not provide the additional and essential level of interpretation and analysis of implications.
Glossary – include glossary of terms
There is no mention of Junction 29a, which is a major flaw in the modelling and reporting.

Detailed Comments

Page	Para	Section	Comment
2	1.1.7	Introduction	Refer to fact that 2 options were tested.
5	1.4.8	Methodology	Define term TEMPRO
	1.4.9		4th bullet – define RSS
7		2	Amend title to 'North East Derbyshire Test Options'
7	2.1.1	2	Amend paragraph to ' …options based on the results of its Core Strategy …. (….. planning permission at March 2009)

			and those …..( ) and <u>March 2009</u>.'
7	2.1.2	2	Amend 1st sentence to ' … test options are <u>listed</u> in Appendix B'. Amend 3rd sentence to '…..generated by <u>the levels of development identified</u> for each option, …'
7		Tables 2.1 & 2.2	The terms 'generation' and 'attraction' need explaining. The table needs a clear and full explanation. Some zone names could be better named: e.g. Zone 71 should be 'Ashover' Zone 159 should be 'Wingerworth, Clay Cross Shirland (A61)' It is unclear how the housing figures in the test options have been incorporated into the time periods up to 2016 and 2026.
8	2.1.4	2	Para. should also refer to table 2.1 and text should refer to both test options.
	2.1.5	2	Para. should also refer to table 2.1 and text should refer to both test options. Reference to section 3 should include relevant paragraph numbers.
8		Table 2.3	Table needs clear explanation of terms, how figures are derived (based on what principles) and what do the percentages mean, percentage of what?
9	3.2.1		Refer to both test options
9	3.2.2		Clarify the AM peak period i.e. 8-9am
10 - 15		Tables 3.1 – 3.4	Would be easier to interpret if all Option A results are presented together (2016 & 2026) and then all Option B. In addition it would aid comparison if the roads appeared in each table in the same 'numerical' order Insert a column showing the Link number for easy identification when cross referencing to the Link map at Appendix 1 and to other data in subsequent table eg Tables 3.9 & 3.10. If the 'without development two way flow' column is the baseline traffic flow without development, why are figures different for the two options? There is no real analysis of this data, nor an explanation of whether the percentage change is an acceptable change. Table 3.1 Option A appears to have a greater % increase on the A61 south of Hornsbridge than Option B – why is this. Table 3.2 Option B has a greater impact upon the B6057 (Unstone/dronfield) than Option A – why? Table 3.2 It is unclear why Option B would impact upon the A6135 through Eckington. Table 3.3 & 3.4 why are the lists of roads longer for 2026

			data than for 2016.
			North Wingfield not Northwingfield
			Table 3.3 refers to the MARR, this is not included in 2016 table
16	3.2.3 & 3.2.4		For bullet point lists include the link number and percentage change for each location and put in order of % change.
			It is unclear why some of listed routes are included in this table as some have only low percentage increases. Please provide explanation of what dictates which links are listed.
			It is unclear why the B6419 is listed as a problem under Option B and not Option A, when development in the Zone 427 is lower for option B than for option A
17	3.2.5		1st sentence - Option B generates a greater degree of what??? Sentence not complete. I am not convinced that the bullet lists actually show anything other than a list of links. Greater interpretation of the tables is required, which should then link through into the bullet list, with associated data to support any assertion that one option has a greater impact than another.
17		Figures 3.1 & 3.2	Need definition of what represents a high change in flow. % changes should also be shown on the figure.
			The map should show the entire District and include the district boundary to clearly demonstrate effects both within and outside the District boundary.
19	3.3.1		Define term 'notional capacity'.
19 - 22		Tables 3.5 & 3.6	The notional capacity figure for each link should be shown on the table.
			The link number should also be shown.
			Some cells are let blank. If impact is zero then suggest this is stated.
22	3.3.2		What is the impact and why are the A61, A6175, A619 & A617 selected. The %'s for the A619 are not particularly high and are lower than for the A617.
22	3.3.3		This paragraph appears to be incomplete.
			Clearly identify why specific zones are highlighted.
			Zone 406 has thje highest % increase in Tables 3.5 & 3.6, but is not mentioned.
22 - 23		Tables 3.7 & 3.8	The table needs clear explanation and analysis.
			The source data for these tables should be signposted.
			If the source data for 2026 Attraction and Generation figures is table 2.1, then the figures have got mixed up. E.g. for zone 159 the 2026 Attraction figure is 1000, not 588 and

			vice versa for 2026 generation. This has an impact on overall car trip figures that have been calculated here. The same appears to apply for all zones in the table.
23	3.3.5		After Clay Cross insert: '(Zone 431)'.
23	3.3.6		Insert relevant zone numbers. This paragraph could usefully explain whether there is any major difference between the impacts of Options A & B. Perhaps this paragraph should combine findings of previous sections to clearly illustrate the combined impact of traffic model impacts and intra zonal trips.
24	3.4.1		Final sentence, define 'CRF'.
24	3.4.2		Include signposting to evidence (relevant tables/paragraphs) that supports this statement.
24		Tables 3.9 & 3.10	Tables need clear explanation and analysis. It is not clear why the routes in these tables have been highlighted. How are capacity issues identified as being problematic? Tables 3.5 & 3.6 show link capacity reduction, but these percentages are meaningless without further explanation. A high % reduction is not necessarily reflective of a problem if the link has lots of spare capacity.
25		Table 3.11	Table needs clear explanation and analysis.
25	3.4.4		Impacts on junctions – would like to see some advice in respect of the two options at this point in time. This report should help to inform the selection of a preferred strategy. We do not want to get to detailed site allocations stage to find that there are insurmountable junction problems with the chosen option.
26	3.4.7		'at appendix C'
27	4.1.1		Amend sentence: '….. LDF development outlined in Options A & B would be ….' The A 617 does not feature as an issue in Tables 3.9 & 3.10, but A6135 does!
27	4.2.2		Amend 1st sentence: ' south of Chesterfield (which is referred to in the North …' Final sentence, delete 'diversion'' and provide examples of 'further measures'.
28	4.2.3		Amend 'congestion' to 'congested'.
28			I would expect this section to contain some suggestions/recommendations. Any potential for a Park & Ride facility?
29	4.2.5		'If a congested network is accepted', who decides this?? Any analysis of the impact of this?? Role of DCC??
30	4.3.1		First sentence insert, 'of the M1' after Junction 30. Explain at what point further testing would be required.
30	4.3.2		Amend 1st sentence: ' …. Network with developments proposed in Options A & B of the North East ….'.

31	5.1.2		Does the report recommend a strategy under congested conditions? If it does this is not clear in the body of the main report. The summary and conclusions should be more detailed and more conclusive. Clear recommendations of further action required would be useful.
		Appendix A	Zone map and network diagram should clearly identify the study area i.e. boundaries of BDC, CBC & NEDDC
		Appendix B	For option B amend the table so that it prints the full width of the page.