

North Derbyshire Local Development Frameworks: North East Derbyshire, Chesterfield and Bolsover Stage 1: Strategic Transport Issues Report

Explanatory Note

Derbyshire County Council commissioned Scott Wilson (now URS) to prepare the Stage 1: Strategic Transport Issues Report to examine the broad locations (i.e. rather than specific sites) at which LDF-related development could occur, in terms of:

- the locations which are more sustainable (in transport terms) than others; and
- the key congestion “hot-spots” on the County network.

Although the report serves a useful purpose it was never accepted as a final version by Bolsover District Council, Chesterfield Borough Council and North East Derbyshire District Council as the Councils still had outstanding comments on the report. For the record therefore a list of outstanding comments that were raised by the three districts 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such as the Stage 2: Traffic Impacts (Cumulative) Report (February 2012) and the SATURN modelling work has effectively superseded the report.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 the three Councils consider that the report is best regarded as an intermediary report. .

Outstanding District's comments on stage 1:	
Page/Para	Comments
Fig 1, page i	The figure might be made more useful if it differentiated the three Derbyshire authorities which are the subject of the study.
Fig 1	On key: <u>Strategic</u> Cycle Network would be better. Route heading southwards is also NCR67
Page v	It would be useful to have the roads with highest flow as listed in the table, identified on a plan (e.g. using same base as Figure 1)
Page vi	It would help if the table could be more specific as to location. For example, what is centre of South Normanton, Pinxton, etc? Where are delays happening in Whitwell? Also raise queries over identification of Greer Lane (east of Glapwell) which seems to be a single lane track.
Figure 1, page 3	The figure might be made more useful if it differentiated the three Derbyshire authorities which are the subject of the study.
Para 2.2.5	Add DaSTS to glossary (along with all other ACRONYMS/Initials) for the benefit of those who don't catch their first occurrence in the document.
Table 4.3	In accessibility terms the number of community facilities and the number of jobs within 2 km and 5 km (table 4.8 page 26) are probably equally significant. Would it be worth combining these two tables?
Para 4.4.11	As walking to work is the most environmentally sustainable form of transport it would be useful to have a table showing walkable employment opportunities within 800 metres and 2 km.

Table 4.8	Why is Brimington south accessible to so many more jobs than Brimington North?
Para 4.4.12	Surely it would be better to make some assumption about Markham Vale. Why not assume 2,000 jobs there eventually? Significant for all three districts.
Para 5.4.8 Table 5.5	This table doesn't seem to match with Table 4 (locations of high and medium delay) or the hot spots shown on pages 59 and 60. The rationale for the issues identified in Table 5.5 is not clear.
Table 5.6 & Figures 7 – 12	<p>It is not clear how the figures in the table relate to the amounts shown on Figs 7-12. e.g. the arrows show a 2 way relationship, but only one figure is shown. A worked through example of how the figures and table work would be helpful.</p> <p>This whole section is to do with trips <u>generated</u> and going to other areas. Of course, these travellers pass others doing exactly the opposite. Whilst we want to change the behaviour of both groups of (largely) commuters, what is possibly of more interest than the outflows is the two-way flows or the <u>balance</u> between out and in.</p> <p>To be clearer, keys on maps might be better talking about <u>Percentages travelling outside the study area</u></p>
Table 6.1	<p>Column 1 Should probably refer to Staveley <i>Works</i>. That would have a certain Draw to Staveley Town Centre as well as the other draws.</p> <p>This table is an example of where the study falls down over the fact that we want to <u>propose a new road link</u> (Staveley Regeneration Route) and that is one of the proposals that we want assessed. If it can't feature in the left hand column, can it at least be referred to in the third column?</p>
Table 6.2	Clay Cross first row, comments: should acknowledge that in practice access to the M1 is via minor roads through North Wingfield and Holmewood
Table 6.2	Holmewood 4 th row, comments: Traffic travelling south from Holmewood would be unlikely to go via A6175 to A61. More likely to take minor roads through North Winfield and Clay Cross of Pilsley.
6.3.7	Query whether there is more potential for Calow/Long Duckmanton, in light of the comments made for Bolsover at para. 6.3.10 and for Chesterfield (Duckmanton) at para. 6.3.3.