

Hewitt 982176

Rushcliffe Borough Council

Civic Centre

West Bridgford

Michael Hewitt

Les Arcs

Delville Avenue

Keyworth

NG125JA

Date: 17 March 2015

Dear Sir

Rushcliffe Local Plan Consultation 2015

I attach comments on the consultation you are carrying out on the Local Plan.

These comments are mainly about issues that impact on Keyworth.

Yours faithfully

M Hewitt

Rushcliffe Local Plan Part 2 – Issues and Options

1. The Transport assessment carried out for the Keyworth Neighbourhood plan identified locations east of the village closer to the A606 and the strategic road network as the preferred location for development, reducing the traffic impact on village roads. The Platt Lane/A606 junction would also provide a safe access the road network. (My comments on the Neighbourhood plan including the transport impacts are attached).
2. Pages 12 – 14 The plan target for housing at East Leake is 400. Planning permission has already been granted for 800 homes at East Leake. The plan target for other areas could reasonably be reduced by 400 with a substantial element of this being reflected in the southern sector of the Borough. i.e. the plan housing target for Keyworth could be reduced by 200.
3. The proposed housing site off Bunny Lane, Keyworth (KeyA) should be removed. The site should be considered of medium-high Green Belt value. Being on the west side of Keyworth much of the generated traffic would pass through the village. In addition it would be difficult to provide a safe access onto Bunny Lane. There more suitable sites elsewhere.
4. The safe guarded site at Debdale Lane, Keyworth is not required in the plan period. Its identification in the plan now would prejudice any future review of the plan therefore it should be removed. Such safeguarded areas do not seem to have been considered for other key settlements.
5. The safeguarded site on the corner of Platt Lane and Nicker Hill (Green Belt review area Key1) could be considered as a housing site as it is on the east side of Keyworth. It has one of the lowest Green Belt assessment scores in Keywoth, assessed as low.
6. Edwalton Golf course has been identified as a safe guarded site. Perhaps it should be considered as a housing site as it is close to the main urban area.
7. The Melton Railway line provides a physical barrier between Keyworth and Normanton. Proposed housing area Key C could reasonably be extended further eastwards.
8. Page 63: Other green infrastructure areas that should be considered for identification in the plan should be: the Melton railway line, other disused railway lines and burial grounds.
9. The Transport chapter is very brief. Transport is an important factor in any development. Other issues which could have been addressed include the need for a transport assessment for major developments, the need for green travel plans for major development, cycling facilities, and the provision and management of public parking areas.

Comments on Traffic Assessment for Keyworth Draft Neighbourhood Plan

6. Traffic Assessment Report:

6.1 It is not easy to relate proposed development sites with those considered by the traffic assessment report. For example it is not clear that a traffic assessment has been carried out for employment sites.

6.2 Page 8 Bunny lane residential development would have a 60/40 split A606/A60. I.e most of the generated traffic would pass through the village.

6.3 Page 9 It should be noted that the Bunny Lane residential sites do not have “an inherently safe access strategy”. The report says the “site could be accessed from Debdale Lane however traffic generation would be very heavy and it is considered that this much larger site is likely to generate traffic at levels which may not be able to be appropriately mitigated within the local highway network throughout the environs of Keyworth village.” Presumably this comment would also apply to an employment site at Debdale Lane.

6.4 Page 11 Development on Platt Lane “would allow generated traffic onto major networks without a significant impact on the village of Keyworth itself”. And “The route to the A606 is likely to have capacity to take the generated traffic and the junction of Platt Lane with the A606 is of a very high standard with a high capacity GIRTL”. i.e. in transport terms new development should be sited to the east of Keyworth.

6.5 Page 18 In relation to the Debdale Lane residential development it is assumed that 75% of generated trips would be towards the A606. This location for development is likely to have the worst impact on the village road network compared to most other locations.

6.6 There has been no traffic assessment of the proposed 5Ha employment development at Debdale Lane. However assuming 40% floor area of the site area of 5Ha and a trip rate of 5 - 10 trips per day per 100m², at least 1000 - 2000 trips would be generated per day. Much of this would be in the peak hours. It is likely that traffic patterns would be the same as for the residential development i.e. 75% of generated trips would be towards the A606. As stated at 6.3 above the heavy traffic generation at this location may not be able to be mitigated within the local highway network. Again the location for the development is likely to have the worst impact on the village road network compared to most other locations.

Rushcliffe plan – Green Belt Review

1. The Green belt review scoring system is very subjective in that there is no definition for applying scores of 2 or 4. In addition even after using the scoring system the banding can be changed by a “professional opinion”. Many sites in Keyworth score between 14 – 17 and with the flaw to the assessment system a plot can easily move from the medium low to medium high banding or vice versa.
2. The strategic Green Belt areas for Keyworth seems to be in error as the North area is labelled North West. It is not clear where the boundary is between North and West areas. What areas are Key14 and Key15 in?
3. Keyworth to Bunny is 3 kilometres away. It is difficult to see why scores for preventing of merging of settlements on the western side of Keyworth should be different when the scale merging is similar. i.e. 100 metres – 300 metres.
4. The 3 sites off Bunny Lane, Key11, Key12 and key 13 are very reliant on each other and should be considered as one site as has been done for site Key4..
5. There is no clear reason why sites Key12 and Key13 should have different scores. The 1 point difference puts them in different assessment bands. If part of site Key12 is visible over a longer distance its score for checking unrestricted sprawl of developments should be the same as for Key13. This would put both sites in the medium-high assessment band.