

Additional Submission for ISH 8

In response to comments made in Climate Change – Updated National Policy c)

In their answer to part (c) of the Climate Change section, HE seemed to claim that the A38 scheme would reduce volumes of traffic on the local road network and thereby make space for things like extra cycle lanes. I don't understand or believe that this is the case – reducing congestion on the A38 is not likely to affect local traffic volumes – surely the same number of people will be traveling in and out of Derby on a daily basis? In fact, if anything there will be induced traffic.

The related comment by Paul Clark of DCiC also worries me – he said that a decision on a housing development at Kingsway is being delayed until they know if the A38 scheme will go ahead – If the decision on this housing development hinges on the availability of an improved A38 then it is obvious that DCiC are not planning for Active Travel in the city but on the greater use of cars – this goes against the principles needed to create a sustainable city for the future! Planning policy should be focusing on developments based around active transport and good public transport so that people can live without being dependent on cars.

This also goes against DCiC own local planning policy CP23 which states that:

“the council will actively manage the pattern of development to ensure that new development:

- is located in accessible locations that are well served by frequent high quality bus services and which help to facilitate walking and cycling
- contributes to improving public transport, cycle and pedestrian infrastructure and public transport service provision “

In effect DCiC are claiming that they need the A38 to go ahead to reduce congestion on Kingsway, in order to approve an development that will presumably increase congestion on Kingsway. Instead the Council should be following its own policy to improve sustainable travel access, and prevent any further congestion on Kingsway, irrespective of any decision on the A38.

A report done for FoE on planning for fewer cars suggests that the most sustainable developments are compact, high density developments on brownfield sites in urban centres. And these should be based in areas where there is high quality public transport and active travel infrastructure.

<https://www.transportforqualityoflife.com/u/files/3%20Planning%20for%20less%20car%20use%20briefing.pdf>

It looks as if DCiC have not fully embraced what a Climate and Ecological Emergency means.

I conclude that DCiC are in favour of the A38 scheme so that local roads are freed up from traffic so they can immediately fill the local roads up again by building housing developments in places that will force people to use cars rather than the more sustainable alternatives. This does not sound like any strategy that is aimed at encouraging a sustainable city.