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| **Ref** | **NCC Comment** | **ADC Response** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1.0** | **Revised Newark Road Access** |  |
| 1.1 | The junction is far too spread out, increasing intergreen lost times, reducing the efficiency/performance of the junction. | Stop lines have been pulled into the junction, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.2 | FW visibility splays are indicated (90m SSD DMRB standards) coming up the hill travelling east, which is appropriate. There is a concern regarding the visibility to the nearside primary signal head where the splay crosses into land at the back of the footway which may be outside LHA control. We just need to ensure that the verge is never built on or has taller planting, but I believe this is public highway. It would be worth checking that we can also get forward visibility down to 260mm from the base of the pole (as per DMRB) just to ensure compliance with all visibility requirements. | Visibility splays are contained within public highway, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. Vertical visibility splays are shown on Drawing ADC1580-DR-014-P1. The maximum achievable splay to 260mm from the base of the pole is 86m rather than 90m.However, the NHDG states, "*a clear view of an obstacle must be available from a height of 0.6m to 2m within the visibility splay. This will reduce to 0.26m where the speed of traffic is >60kp/h* ."As detailed in the Transport Assessment, the recorded vehicle speeds in both directions along Newark Road are less than 60kph (37mph) and the speed limit will be reduced to 30mph with the development in place. Hence, the requirements in the NHDG and MfS should apply. Drawing ADC1580-DR-014-P1 shows the vertical visibility splays to 0.6m from the base of the pole. |
| 1.3 | Intervisibility envelope significantly crosses over the corners of the development site. These corners will need to be kept clear of building and shrubbery and be dedicated to be public highway. It is also incorrectly drawn on the NW side of Newark Road - it needs to extend to the back of the footway. | Intervisibility splay amended, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. They will be kept clear and dedicated as highway. |
| 1.4 | If the stop lines can be pulled into the junction reducing its footprint then the intervisibility envelope will also decrease and reduce land take/sterilisation | See above. |
| 1.5 | The internal stop line for the crossing over the Newark Road NE bound exit has reappeared. These are not encouraged and should be removed. The main junction staging can be altered to allow this to appear by holding back the Newark Rd NE bound phase opening up if the pedestrian phase is demanded. | Internal stop line removed, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.6 | There is no staggered stop line on the Newark Road SW approach (the right turn is a fully signalled facility, so the stagger is required). The right turn lane should also develop off the ahead lane (the ahead lane will be the default) so that right turners have to make a conscious decision to join the RT lane. The current proposal could result in ahead vehicles inadvertently ending up at the RT stop line. | Staggered stop lines provided and right turn lane has been developed off the ahead lane, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.7 | The refuge on the SW Newark Roadside is unnecessarily long – and the staggers on all ped crossings are too large (and the stagger on the NE side is reversed) | Length of refuge on the SW Newark Road and staggers overNewark Road have been reduced, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012- P8. |
| 1.8 | Staggered crossing facilities are not the correct way to go in the context of LTN1/20 Footway/Cycleway design. These crossings need to be designed as wider straight across segregated systems with separate pedestrian/cyclist stages. | Crossing facility over the site access has been amended, seeDrawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.9 | There is the opportunity to provide higher specification segregated cycleway - footways both sides of the entrance at the site frontage. With the SW bound facility crossing Searby Rd and continuing down Newark Road public highway grass verges to meet the existing route opposite Hamilton Road. See comment below about higher specification Cycleways – Footways. | Segregated footway/cycleway provided on both sides of the site access carriageway and along Newark Road, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.10 | This cycleway-footway should be clearly indicated crossing the unregistered land on same line, parallel with the kerb-line with a note indicating any necessary temporary diversionary works to be removed and be replaced permanently on the direct desire line, once land is registered/statutory declaration complete/area is formally adopted as highway. | The unregistered land is not in the control of the applicant and therefore they show what they are able to deliver. As an alternative, for discussion and not proposed by the applicant, Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8 shows an illustrative arrangement of the works that could be delivered in the future should the unregistered land becomes available. |
| 1.11 | The length of the 2 lane section on the SW exit from the junction going towards Searby Road is too short. The full 100m is needed from the junction exit to go from 2 lanes to 1. The layout as indicated will encourage racing to get to the merge and drivers may not be concentrating on what is happening at Searby Road. | The SW exit on Newark Road reduces from 7.0m wide to 3.4m wide over a distance of 100m, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |
| 1.12 | The separation between the exit of this junction and the stop line for the Cauldwell Road junction is only around 70m. This is very close and would normally require linking, potentially under SCOOT. However, the Cauldwell Road junction is under MOVA control and so we would want to see the new junction also running MOVA but with a hard link between the junctions so that they could be linked when required (running linked MOVA). | The desire for MOVA control is accepted. |
| 1.13 | This junction (and the Coxmoor Road/ Cauldwell Road crossroads) are very close to/potentially on a core strategic cycle route subject to the ATF LCWIP (Accelerated Town Fund, Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure plan). The projected route goes from Coxmoor Road/ Hamilton Road area to the Penny Emma Way/ Kirkby Folly Road linking the mixed use commercial areas/Amazon to the train station – Sutton Parkway. The junctions and linking tracks/ cycle paths/ footways should be compliant with higher specification (segregated) LTN1/20 guidance. This will mean separate cycle crossings at the junctions, cycle paths on the approaches and full segregation/ management of paths where cycles and pedestrian facilities intersect. The more direct preferred route for the core strategic cycleway is likely to along Hamilton Rd heading towards the Railway Station. Local cycleways should be proposed from the site to meet this core route. | See Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8 and ADC1580-DR-006-P5. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **NCC Comment** | **ADC Response** |
| **2.0** | **Coxmoor Road / Caudwell Road Junction** |  |
| 2.1 | The junction has no pedestrian facilities currently and the proposal maintains this position, however, in the light of the potential LCWIP route, LTN1/20, and the key planning requirement to provide active movement routes, there is no justification to have a new junction with no pedestrian/cyclist facilities. | The existing footway along Coxmoor Road is retained and therefore all existing pedestrian movements from Newark Road to Coxmoor Road can continue on the existing and improved network. For trips to and from the development, the pedestrian and cycle links have been upgraded to provide a segregated footway/cycleway along Newark Road that connects to the planned and fully funded ATF LCWIP scheme. Any trips heading to golf course, observatory and other facilities to the south of the site can use the dedicated pedestrian/cycle access on Coxmoor Road. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **NCC Comment** | **ADC Response** |
| **3.0** | **Coxmoor Road / Hamilton Road Junction** |  |
| 3.1 | No change from previous proposal. However, again, this will be affected by the proposed LCWIP route. A signalled junction has been proposed, but this raises all types of issues/problems, that ADC Infra found when they looked at signals here. | Noted. |
| 3.2 | The most likely proposal for the LCWIP scheme is to retain a mini-roundabout in some form and have a standalone crossing slightly away from the junction. If this is to the south east of the roundabout then it will affect the proposed lane arrangements and widening currently being put forward in this proposal and should be accommodated/provided as part of any mitigation works. | The ATF LCWIP scheme proposes the crossing to the northwest of the roundabout (Drawing ATF/VIA/HGN/KFR/DR/CH/009). As shown on Drawing ADC1580-DR-005-P9, the widening works required to support the proposed development can be provided without impacting the ATF LCWIP scheme. |
| 3.3 | There may also be either an on-carriageway cycle lane/ track going up the hill to the Cauldwell Road junction or an off carriageway facility going up the hill. Either way, this will be in opposition to the proposed lining arrangements for ADC INFRA. | See above and Drawing ADC1580-DR-005-P9 for updated Hamilton Road arrangements. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **NCC Comment** | **ADC Response** |
| **4.0** | **LTN 1/20 High Standard Cycleways and Footways** |  |
| 4.1 | The LHA recommends: the development proposal includes a higher specification segregated cycleway - footways both sides of the entrance at the site frontage. With the SW bound facility crossing Searby Road and continuing down Newark Road public highway grass verges to meet the existing route opposite Hamilton Roadjunction. | Segregated footway/cycleway provided on both sides of the site access carriageway and along Newark Road, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8 and Drawing ADC1580-DR-006-P5. |
| 4.2 | At the junction with Newark Road and Hamilton Way a sparrow crossing should be provided to enhance connectivity of the routes. An example is shown below for indicative purposes. | A sparrow crossing is proposed via the ATF LCWIP fully funded scheme, see Drawing ATF/VIA/HGN/KFR/DR/CH/009. The proposed footway/cycleway along Newark Road provided by the applicant will connect to the ATF scheme as shown in ADC1580- DR-006-P5. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Ref** | **NCC Comment** | **ADC Response** |
| **5.0** | **Internal Layout** |  |
| 5.1 | Road layout needs to be a short overwide transition, a full connected loop system spine road (suitable for bus access) covering the entire site, rather than just isolated parts of it. The road loop will be useful in helping route choice, connectivity/permeation, refuse collection, deliveries of domestic goods and traffic dispersal within the site, it needs to extensive and should be a circuitous link to prevent ‘back-tracking’. This will help to make a higher quality place with an inherentmovement function. | A 6.2m wide spine road will be provided through the centre of the site with two loop connections provided near the Newark Road access and towards the bottom of the site. In addition, a bus loop will be provided to ensure bus penetration through the site. See the revised illustrative masterplan. |
| 5.2 | Corridors of land need to be safeguarded to extend the looped system into adjacent undeveloped land to ensure potential development land is not sterilised. | Agreed. See the revised illustrative masterplan. |
| 5.3 | Pedestrian/cycleway connection required onto Coxmoor Rd – attractors - Golf Course,Observatory, other rural leisure routes, Nomanshill and Thieves Wood. | Pedestrian and cycle connection provided onto Coxmoor Road,see Drawing ADC1580-DR-013-P5. |
| 5.4 | Secondary 4m segregated cycleway/footway connection to Searby Rd through ‘left over’ land link too narrow to build on is welcomed, but does not connect to existingfacilities and falls short of being high standard design. | Pedestrian and cycle connection to Searby Road widened to 5.5m, see Drawing ADC1580-DR-013-P5. |
| 5.5 | Are the other 2m wide footway connections/access strategy to PRoW acceptable. These needs to be the same FW/CYC standards as immediately above | The development proposals will provide a footway/cycleway connection onto Searby Road, three connections to the PRoW, and one to Coxmoor Road. Two dedicated pedestrian connections will be provided, first to the bottom of Searby Roadand the other to the PRoW. See Drawing ADC1580-DR-013-P5. |
| 5.6 | 3m wide grassed verge alongside flaring on Coxmoor Road should be increased to 4mwide – future proofing and/or provision of another local cycleway route. | Grass verge alongside Coxmoor Road has been widened to 4m,see Drawing ADC1580-DR-012-P8. |